Influence of Media on School-Based Bullying Intervention Program in Primary Schools: A Focus on Preventive Social Medicine

Eric U Dogini, PhD
Clark Atlanta University
111 James P. Brawley SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30114
United States of America

Abstract

This paper focuses on influence of media on school-based bullying intervention programs as a preventive social medicine in primary school. Bullying behavior has reached pandemic proportions and is a growing concern in primary school. Even though school bullying is not as extreme as portrayed by the media, elementary schools are deeply troubled by incidents of bullying behavior. The goal of the study is to explore the impact of media on school-based bullying intervention program in primary school to attain a positive outcome. The methodology used to explore the influence of media on bullying intervention evolved from a qualitative approach and unified literature review from meta-analysis of scholarly works available on media impact on school-based intervention programs in primary schools. Findings indicate that news and investigative reporting will minimize aggressive behavior and impact the effectiveness of school-based bullying intervention program and keep our school environment safe and conducive for teaching and learning.

Keywords: Media Influence, Preventive Social Medicine, Intervention Program, School Bullying, Primary school, Program effectiveness, Media Outlets, investigative story, News, Transform and Power

Introduction

Primary schools are seeing record numbers of intervention programs, in some cases required by state law for social skill improvement, academic performance, safety, and personal understanding. Due to the need for new social skills, decreased bullying incidents, and heightened awareness of prevalence of bullying by media, several primary schools around the world have instituted intervention programs. Primary schools in the 21st century are having progressively more social responsibilities to address, because there are growing needs to combat bullying behavior (Smith, 2004).

Intervention is a program and a process where media advocacy, neutral person, schools, school personnel and children facilitate and learn to resolve disputes in a primary school setting. This process has been effective in schools and is helping change the way children understand and resolve conflict in their lives, because intervention in primary schools focuses on improving self-esteem, listening and critical thinking skills, and school climate for learning (Olweus, 1993, 1994), as well as reduced disciplinary actions and fewer fights and violence in school (Smith, 2004).

According to Wood & Moore III, (2008), primary school level is the groundwork for a child educational progression and crucial phase for children at their first formal school, in meeting someone outside their family for the first time and learning the meaning of friendship. Hence, the children of the 21st century are busy dealing with and trying to cope with different forms of bullying incidents. Informing and educating primary school children in skills of conflict resolution sets the foundation for a peaceful world. McMahon, (1995) stated that most school systems are choosing to give children an opportunity to be informed and to develop communication and conflict resolution skills.

Conflict is a natural part of life and will always be part of school children's lives. School-based bullying intervention program offers a positive constructive skill approach to handle disputes at school.

It is known that bullying intervention programs have shown mixed result in reducing aggressive behaviors in primary school (Cook, et al., 2010). Based on media investigative reporting and literature, it is clear that bullying intervention programs designed to prevent bullying in primary schools have limited success (Cook et al., 2010; Merrell et al., 2008; Song & Stoiber, 2008; Hawton & James, 2005; J. D. Smith et al., 2004). Few will reject the importance of media publicity and investigative reporting on aggressive behavior for the purpose of intervention of school bullying in primary school. According to Atlanta journal constitution (AJC), wrote that the primary school reports on school bullying have pointed to many potential areas of investigative reporting, media publicity and research. It is the author's opinion that if school-based intervention programs were to be investigated by local media outlets or followed up, our understanding of school-based bullying intervention program in primary school would prompt school administrators to develop a more effective intervention strategies that could drastically reduce aggressive behavior in schools. The need to justify this paper on influence of media on school-based bullying intervention program in Primary School is to guide policymaking, school administrators, teachers and staff, prevent and reduce bullying in primary school.

Media broadcast of aggressive behavior in schools has made the school system to become increasingly aware that bullying is a problem and need to be addressed. It has become obvious that bullying happens in most, if not all, primary school. The focus of this paper, therefore, is centered on developing a greater understanding on how media publicity and investigative reporting on bullying intervention program in primary school has influenced the effectiveness of school-based bullying intervention program and whether a child who has experienced bullying, know of intervention programs, inside and outside primary school environment. This paper probes to understand the influence of media on school-based intervention program, and whether school-based intervention worked effectively, according the study evaluating the current school-based intervention program in the primary school (Dogini, 2012).

Definition of Bullying

Understanding the definition of bullying is central in determining the effectiveness of school-based bullying interventions programs in primary schools to combat it. Students bully other student to gain power and control, gain acceptance or peer status, or eliminate emotional discomfort. Orpinas and Home (2005) defined bullying acts as intentional behaviors that may cause psychological or physical harm to others, whereas bullying behaviors are characterized by an imbalance of power, its intentionality, and its repetitiveness. Bullying is a "negative and often aggressive or manipulative act or series of acts by one or more people against another person or people usually over a period of time" (Sullivan et al., 2004, p. 3).

School bullying can be defined as "incidents where an individual or a group are abused, threatened or assaulted (Cook et al., 2010). Smith, Morita, Junger-Tas, Olweus, Catalano, and Slee, (1999) defined bullying as recurring violent behavior directed at a student who is incapable of defending him or herself. Olewus (2001) noted that this violent behavior does not necessarily have to be a violent act to be classified as bullying. Williams & Guerra, (2007) described bullying as an act of premeditated physical aggression, verbal aggression, relational aggression, and cyber-aggression a new setting for causing hurt in the growing interactive social media and increasingly electronic age. It is critical that the primary school personnel respond to these new challenges presented by social interactive actuality in the new technology age that is changing the world.

Theoretical Framework of Intervention

According to McMahon, (1995) intervention is a process by which the participants, together with the assistance of a neutral person or persons, media publicity systematically isolate disputed issues in order to develop options, consider alternatives and reach a consensual settlement that will accommodate their needs. Folberg and Taylor (1984) defined intervention, as a process that emphasizes the participants' own responsibility for decisions that affect their lives. It is a process that transforms and empowers the children in primary school (Folberg & Taylor, 1984). Intervention programs ensure that the balance of power is equalized and though participation in such program is voluntary. Most media outlets are concerned about the effectiveness of the program, but most certainly want to be confident that the program is empowering and transforming the primary school children using school-based bullying intervention program, even though the most program's effectiveness is still unclear (Beran & Shapiro, 2005).

2

Empowering

A school-based bullying intervention program with support of media publicity is empowering, because it allows victims, bullies, bully-victims and bystanders to become better learners and successful human beings (Gay, 2000). Gutek (2004) defined empowerment as the social, informed and personal support that shields primary school children as they are being taught social developmental skill and how to take ownership of their own learning and behavior. Empowerment is the outcome of a critical pedagogy, news and investigative stories, which are used to control and to liberate victimized children (Freire, 1970; Gutek, 2004). It is a social engagement that helps individuals to develop a critical stance toward the world. Merriam (2001) asserted that empowerment gives the participants in intervention programs a new perspective and enables them to reject things that they once accepted as part of their culture.

Transformative

Freire (1970) asserted that for children to be successful in their academic stance, they need information and interactions that foster respect and hope. Freire (1970) defined transformative learning as consciousness-raising promoted by media outlets. Freire was more concern about social transformation, which caused him to share his early life with the poor of his country helping adults to read and write (Gutek, 2004). This process of consciousness (Freire 1970) is the process whereby the victimized groups learn to confront elements of aggressive behavior, which enables them to become aware of their capacity to shape their environment and to obtain the means to do so (Gutek, 2004). Freire (1970) asserted that in order to help the victimized group, the key to rising above their circumstances was by learning how to "think and act", which he called this process as conscious raising. It is obvious that the preventive social medicine in conscious raising in reducing aggressive behavior is media outlets. The consciousness within the victimized person is defined by what is available to them in their local media outlet, political views, socioeconomic context and cultural upbringing (Freire, 1970). Consciousness is to have the power to transform reality.

There are benefits to a successful intervention program, such as choosing to resolve the conflict, feeling comfortable in the process, fostering trust and respect, openly exchanging information, and, most importantly, understanding the reason for the implementation of a bullying intervention. According to Haft and Weiss (1998), there are other reasons, such as reducing school violence, freeing up teachers to teach more and discipline less, and increasing student morale. The purpose of implementing school-based bullying intervention program at primary school is to promote a safer school climate and reduce the number of student conflicts referred to teachers and principals. For a bullying intervention program to be effective and successful, the process of program implementation must be in place, and the program must be examined for performance and results. This paper suggest that broadcast media outlet direct their attention on effectiveness of school-based bullying intervention program in primary school than the victim and the bully.

Media and School-Based Bullying Intervention

Recently, research has increased due to media frenzy in the incidents of school violence due to bullying (Bauman, 2008). The majority of research and public interest in school bullying has been in response to tragic and highly publicized events of bullying in media outlet. Media representations of bullying have heightened the public awareness of bullying in primary schools and documented occurrence of school bullying. Media coverage of aggressive and violent behavior in the past decade on major network has also increased (Brooks et al., 2001). The slanted coverage of school bullying has stimulated a misconception and brought awareness to anti-bullying and peer mediation programs in primary schools. According to Gladden (2002) asserted that a more accurate and balance portrayal of elementary school children bullying in the media is needed. Even though school bullying is not as extreme as portrayed by the media, elementary schools are deeply troubled by incidents of bullying behavior (Gladden, 2002). Given the fact that bullying occurs frequently and it is one of the most common types of aggressive behavior that is carried out by group of kids on one or interpersonal conflict (Reid et al., 2004). For that reason, there is the possibility for several students to be affected by the programs.

Literature Review

Intervention programs have become increasing common in schools designed to reduce bullying (Ross & Horner, 2009). These intervention programs are geared towards specific behavior problems and the consequences of those behavior problems have the capability to hamper bullying intervention efforts (Smokowski & Kopaz, 2005).

Since, intervention programs are designed to accomplish many other goals, counters the goals of bullying intervention programs by discouraging students, teachers and staff to report known or suspected bullying behavior because of severe consequences accompanied with intervention policy. Further more, reporting suspected behavior may result to suspension and exclusion of bullies from school, which can be harmful and defeats the purpose of bullying intervention programs, thus, will not prohibit bullies from bullying in the future.

Olweus' research on bullying did not become influential until 1982 when three 14-year-old boys committed suicide in Norway because of severe school bullying and gained media attention (Olweus, 1993). Tolan, Guerra and Kendall (1995) advocated that intervention and prevention of primary school children aggression should be considered an important social problem. In recent years there have been ongoing media investigation and studies on the impact of bullying on children's lives (Arseneault, et al., 2010). Studies have shown that bullying interventions programs projected at preventing and reducing or minimizing bullying behaviors in primary schools have not been effective (Smith et al. 2003; Bauer et al. 2007; Vreeman & Carroll, 2007).

Among all the studies associated with bullying, there are no known studies that involved determining how effective is bullying intervention programs in primary (Battaglio, 2006). Cornell (2006) asserted that few of the recent researches on bullying are focused on understanding and prevention of bullying, none on the effectiveness of bullying intervention programs in primary. Olweus's program which, called for questionnaires to be administered to children to find out the occurrence of bullying, supervision in area where bullying most likely occurs, meeting with school personnel and parents and teachers effort in improving school climate (Olweus, 1993). This program revealed that there was a decrease of 50% in student's self-reported bullying and became national anti-bullying media campaign (Song & Stoiber, 2008; Wood & Moore III, 2008; Limber et al., 2004). Two years later, after the program was implemented showed insignificant reduction (Limber et al., 2004). Roland (1989) evaluated comparable programs and found increase bullying among boys during the years the program was implemented. A study in Norway points out an increase in bullying behavior three years later after implementation of the Olweus's program (Roland, 1993). Comparing these two programs, the major difference in the two programs was that Olweus programs had direct involvement while Roland provide material with no support (Wood & Moore III, 2008.

A study on classroom bullying intervention to improve social skill for bullying status group showed limited success. One study on a program P4, intended to augment children's knowledge and social skill about bullying behavior was ineffective (Beran & Shapiro, 2005). Also study on classroom bullying intervention to improve social skill for bullying status group showed limited success. One study on a program P4, intended to augment children's knowledge and social skill about bullying behavior was ineffective (Beran & Shapiro, 2005). A systematic review of school based bullying intervention programs that used evaluating curricular intervention, 6 out of 10 studies concluded there was no decline in bullying and detected increase in bullying incidents (Vreeman & Carroll, 2007). No intervention is faultless, as result it is imperative that an ongoing media campaign and study are conducted to determine the effectiveness of bullying intervention program (Song & Stoiber, 2008)

Whether primary schools are completely liberated or free from all bullying behavior and what is primary school personnel's response remains unclear to prevent children from participating in aberrant behavior is needed, because the progress in implementing effective programs in primary school is slow (Greenwood, 2008; Arseneault, et al., 2009). Meraviglia, Becker, Rosenbluth, Sanchez, and Robertson, (2003) studied a program called "Expect Respect", supported by Atlanta Center of Disease based on Olweus's model, though showed limited result but researcher learned that student expect adult at primary school to take control. A study on "Step to respect" a school wide intervention program focused on anti-bullying policies, training for school personnel, procedures and the support of social responsible behavior reported an encouraging result (Frey, Edstrom, & Hirschhstein, 2005).

From literature on bullying intervention programs, in England, Germany, Canada, Belgium and the United States with the modest effect of initial success of Olweus project in Bergen have shown mixed result (Merrell, et al., 2008). It is important to note that some intervention programs show impressive results, but the overall general results of bullying intervention effort to effectively prevent bullying have been mixed (Merrell, et al., 2008; Rigby, 2006, J. D. Smith, et al., 2004).

The inconsistency in literature about the bullying intervention effectiveness is a problem when schools are trying implement the most effective program.

4

Literature has been unable to establish a consistent understanding that bullying interventions in primary schools are effectively reducing bullying incidents. Some literature shows bullying intervention programs are significant and other showing bullying intervention program are limited success. This type of incongruence confuses the school system, public and lawmaker. This has caused lack of understanding on how effective is bullying intervention program in primary schools. As result primary schools have developed a varying number of bullying interventions program to address the frequency of bullying behavior (Hirschstein et al., 2007). Until this is resolved how many more children will be murdered, commit suicide and meet the fate of homicidal hazing. This article discusses how media publicity of bullying incidents in school affected the evaluation of bullying intervention program to determine the gaps in the effectiveness of bullying intervention programs and identify the factors that may have caused inconsistency showing some to be successful and other have limited success.

The problem of violence and aggressive behavior is still challenges children in primary school (Bell, Raczynski & Horne (2010). Despite the efforts and initiatives by media outlet to combat aggressive behavior, bullying continues to be a important issue in the lives of primary school children (Livesey et al., 2007). Bullying has reached pandemic percentage in primary school (Smith, Cousin & Stewart, 2005). School bullying problem is convoluted and should encompass an emphasis on effective intervention (Song & Stoiber, 2008). Woods & Moore III, (2008) asserted that more media publicity and studies are needed to find out what programs actually works and for whom and under what circumstances. Bell, Raczynski and Horne (2010) recommended that future studies should continue to evaluate the complexities of an effective intervention program in primary. And also more investigative reporting on the convolutions of bullying intervention program are indispensible for the aim of reducing bullying behavior in primary school.

Media Publicity On Incident Like The Suicide Of An Eleven-Year-Old Boy In Decatur, Georgia, Due To Bullying Has Lead To Most School's Adoption Of Intervention Programs To Protect The Children. It's Clear That Extreme Effects Of Bullying Behaviors Can Lead To Death As This Particular Incident Has Demonstrated. Bullying In Schools And Aggressive Behavior Became A Concern In Light Of Massacres Similar To Columbine High School, Which Occurred On April 20, 1999, And Virginia Polytechnic University, Which Also Occurred On April 16, 2007 has also brought awareness to many school to start intervention programs, media publicity. Furthermore, as a result of the way media has portray bullying in schools, there has been a concern over school violence in the late 90's such as the shootings in, Colorado, Santana, California and Jonesboro, Arkansas (Fox & Harding, 2005). Even though parents fear for the safety of their children at school, public schools are still safe haven for children, despite the fact that too much violence and aggressive behavior exist in schools (Brooks, Schiraldi, & Ziedenberg, 2000). The occurrence of bullying in primary school is not as recurrent as has been portrayed by media in most cases (Arseneault, et al., 2010; Nansel et al., 2001; Pellegrini & Long, 2002; Swearer & Cary, 2003).

A 13-year-old Vijay Singh was found hanging from the banister rail at his home because of effects of school bullying (Marr & Field, 2001). Because of media these deaths taunted by bullying incidents have renewed national attention on bullying intervention programs and defined how schools intervene, and respond to bullying behaviors. In the wake of suicides in Georgia and the other in Massachusetts, due to the attention and publicity by media, a bill was introduced in Congress that would protect all students from bullying and harassment and would require schools to report on the prevalence of such harmful activity to the US Department of Education each year.

Recent reports about school bullying are found to be insidious in the United States and other parts of the world (Cook, Williams, Guerra, & Kim, 2009; Carney & Merrell, 2001; Hazler, Miller, Carney, & Green, 2001; Olweus, 1994). Bullies and victims and bully-victims at some point in their life may develop psychosocial and psychiatric problems (Nansel, et al., 2001; Olweus, 1993). Germain and Bloom (1999) asserted that when children are entrenched in a distinct social and environmental context, individual characteristic, social interaction and culture are some of the factors that may influence the social behavior pattern.

Literature has shown that research is lacking on determining how effective is a bullying intervention programs designed to train teachers, administrators, and students to intervene and respond to bullying in primary school. As a result, most media outlet has looked and evaluated some of the bullying intervention programs currently implemented in a primary school to find out how effective a bullying intervention programs is in primary school.

Furthermore, investigative report were intended to identify the factors that may have contributed to the program's ineffectiveness and help understand why the bullying intervention programs presently implemented have limited success.

According to investigative report the primary schools that employed the Olweus Bullying Prevention Programs and other anti-bullying programs recognize the importance of addressing school bullying. The Olweus multiple component programs have shown some success in reducing levels of bullying (Vreeman & Carroll, 2007; Bauer, Lozano, & Rivara, 2007). A review of studies that used quantitative approach to study effectiveness of bully intervention revealed that none of the programs studied showed a reduction of the observed bullying incidents (Merrell et al., 2008; Cook, et al., 2010). Also, a study of all bullying intervention programs in primary schools discovered that none reduced bullying incident (J.D. Smith, Schneider, Smith, & Ananiadou, 2004), only Olweus' program prevention and Olweus's Bergen antibullying intervention are the only programs that show promising effect, and made the best practice (Osher & Dwyer, 2008; Limber, 2004). Literatures supported that, implementing a resource-intensive bullying intervention programs is difficult (Rigby, 2006; Limber et al., 2004). The more pubilicity by media outlet and study of any bullying intervention program and its effectiveness over time is needed (Cook, et al., 2010; Ross & Horner, 2009).

One study on bullying intervention known as bullying prevention in positive behavior support (BP-PBS), teachers and staffs rated the program as effective and efficient and easy to implement (Ross & Horner, 2009). The BP-BPS was a program created to support positive behavior support (PBS) programs in place of school wide intervention and the focus was on efficiency of changing behavior and teaches kids to withhold the social rewards and was assumed to combat bullying (Horner Sugai, Todd, & Lewis-Palmer, 2005; Sugai & Horner, 2009). Positive behavior support (PBS) is the scrutiny of behavior in elementary school where children have difficulty maintaining appropriate behavior and PBS had helped improve social outcomes in primary school (Horner et al., 2009, Bradshaw, Koth, Bevans, Ialongo & Leaf, 2008). Though the program reduced the frequency of aggressive behavior on selected students, but the problem behavior was not completely eliminated; neither did it reach a level to conclude that the entire program was effective (Ross & Horner, 2009).

Craig, Henderson, and Murphy (2000) researched different forms of bullying and teacher attitude with regards to bullying intervention programs and their involvement in preventing bullying and recommended for more study on effectiveness of bullying intervention and more media exposure in desirable. Nicolaides, Toda, and Smith (2002) investigated the teacher's confidence in managing and dealing with bullying and also noted that the study to determine how effective.is bullying intervention in primary school is needed. From the analysis of literatures on intervention programs to prevent bullying, the overall results of bullying intervention programs effort have been mixed (Rigby, 2006; Merrell, et al., 2008). As a result the need for more investigative reporting, media publicity, exposure and study to determine how effective bullying intervention program is in primary school is essential. Based on these analyses it is known that intervention programs in primary schools to prevent bullying are not yet proven to be effective. The author of this article looked at current intervention programs in a primary school and concluded that some school based intervention program are effectiveness and some are ineffective (Dogini, 2012). As a result understanding the factors that contribute to ineffectiveness of school-based bullying intervention programs in primary is essential (Dogini, 2012). With the increasing use of social media and the attention and promotion accorded to investigative reporting, it is clear that more media involvement in school-based bullying intervention program in primary will effectively help in addressing bullying in primary schools.

Because of media publicity, the House of Representatives introduced the federal anti-bullying bill that required schools receiving funding from the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to implement comprehensive research base anti-bullying policies that define categories targeted by bullies. Due to this, many school districts are mandated to implement bullying intervention programs. Dogini (2012) evaluated school-based bullying intervention programs currently implemented in a primary school, which are aimed at reducing, preventing and countering bullying and recommends more studies, school personnel and media involvement on the effectiveness of school-based intervention program.

Methodology

The methodology used by the researcher to explore the concern on influence of media on bullying intervention evolved from a qualitative approach and unified literature review from meta-analysis of scholarly works available on media impact on school-based intervention programs in primary schools.

The goal of qualitative study was to explore the impact of media on school-based bullying intervention program in primary school to attain a positive outcome (Swearer et al., 2010). Although many of the studies on influence of media on school-based bullying intervention were quantitative, while some were qualitative, the reasons that the preferred results were not attained remain unclear. The method of research used to study the bullying intervention programs has been surveys and questionnaires (Fontana, 1999). This method is important in answering the questions, but lacked social interaction with participants (Olweus (2003). Additionally, this approach is limited in bringing out an understanding of social activity for participants in social context (Addison, 1988; Torrance, 2000), and the components that affect the success of media impact on intervention programs. In an effort to understand and capture the meaning of the impact of media on school-based intervention program as interpreted by individuals within its context, the research was grounded theory, an inductive qualitative research method.

Grounded theory is rooted in social interactionism and contains components that guided the media personnel and primary school community to address the critical components that affect the success of media influence on school-based intervention program (Glaser, 1978). The goal of this grounded theory methodology was to explore a school-based bullying intervention program to determine the influence of media on school-based intervention program as a social medicine, find out if media actually influences school-based bullying intervention programs to effectively address individual child bullying experience in a primary school setting, and determine whether school-based bullying intervention program is an effective method for reducing bullying behaviors within the primary school population.

Also, the investigator used a unified literature review to review and synthesize descriptive literature on the results of conflicting perceptions that media influence bullying behavior and it's influence on intervention programs helps reduce bullying in primary school. A unified literature review on media impact on bullying behavior in primary school and it's influence on school-based intervention was essential to generate new frameworks and perspectives on how media publicity can help guide school-base intervention program become effective in reducing bullying and a social medicine cure of aggressive behavior. The examination of influence of media on school-based bullying intervention programs in primary schools as a social medicine lacks recent inclusive meta-analysis study, as a result this unified literature review was appropriate.

The investigator conducted an extensive search with the terms " school-based intervention, bullying programs, media influence, and social interactive medicine, and found that there was limited information on influence of media on bullying school-based intervention programs in primary schools as social interactive medicine.

This absence of recent studies on influence of media on bullying school-based intervention programs in primary schools as social interactive medicine suggests the need to explore media influence on bullying behavior and school-based intervention programs in primary schools as social interactive medicine. Through this meta-analysis and semi-structured interview, a foundation for more investigation in this area will be positioned to create new channels.

Findings

The communication strategies explored in this study were effective and ineffective results of influence of media on school-based bullying intervention program recognized in this study. The finding in this study is supported by research.

Lerner, (2006) findings on lack of low self-esteem, need to seek respect or attention from other; self- respect, self-identity, self-acceptance and building confidence is consistent with the findings of this study that media publicity seek to advocate. These categories identified in this study such as self- respect, low self-esteem, self-identity, self-acceptance and building confidence are all connected to bullying behavior and affects the positive and the negative outcomes of media impact on school-based bullying intervention program (Lerner, 2006). Additionally, Olweus (1994) conclusion supports the findings from this study that low self-esteem, as well as self-acceptance are connected to effectiveness and ineffectiveness of school-based intervention program in primary school.

From the finding of the exploration of the influence of media publicity on school-based intervention program in primary school, several conclusions are made. In reviewing the categories and subcategories that contributed to the program's success, can be attributed to media denouncing bullying or aggressive behavior.

Due to the similarities in categories found in the components of intervention theory, the researcher concluded that these categories and subcategories identified from involvement in school-base bullying program would not determine the ineffectiveness of the program, just as much as the categories and subcategories found in this study would necessarily guarantee the program success. Since many of the categories and subcategories in the components in the intervention theory are similar and related, the influence of media on school-base bullying programs' effectiveness depended on school location and implementation.

Discussion

Beran and Shapiro (2005) suggested that for bullying intervention programs to be effective, school personnel, bullies, victims of bullying and the bystanders need social skill training. Therefore, media involvement and study of an effective bullying intervention programs will provide support to victimized primary school children, and educate them about bullying conflict resolution and provide social skill training for both victims and bullies. Whitney and Smith (1993) noted that the bystanders are mostly children that witness bullying, and does not know what to do or how to help, as a result did nothing to help. Furthermore, the bystanders are not trained to intervene; therefore, they feel it is not there business (Rao, et al., 1995). Rao, Wright and Stark (1995) argued that studies, as this will reveal the ineffectiveness of bullying intervention programs and displays the accomplishment of bullying intervention programs. For bullying intervention programs to work effectively, primary school children should be trained not only to bully others but also not to accept bullying of other children.

As discussed in the literature review, bullying in primary school is a problem that has a negative effect on children. With the recent acts of violence, many school-based bullying intervention programs have been developed with various approaches to help reduce bullying in primary school. This study explored the effectiveness of school-based bullying intervention program in primary school; the result of the findings was mixed. Research in this area would help primary schools; teachers and administrators to discuss what might determine the optimum approach and consider on continuing implementing the most effective school-based bullying intervention program and use of media. This study has added distinctive contribution to the literature by presenting the experiential component of media influence on school-based bullying intervention program in primary school.

The researcher in this study wish to encourage primary schools, teachers and administrators to realize the importance for action to protect, transform and empower primary school children with strategies to respond appropriately to aggressive behavior. This study may serve, as a model for other primary schools to examine the possibility that the school-based intervention program designed to address individual child encounter and reduce aggressive behavior is an effective method.

From the findings of this study, primary school educators need to understand that media advocate of the school-based intervention program in their school may not be the effective method of addressing individual child encounter and reducing bullying behavior. But, primary school will need to train teachers and administrators often as needed, provide resources, safe school environment, support from districts, and teachers and administrators involvement to implement and seek media support for an effective school-based bullying intervention program.

Conclusion

The publicity of effective intervention program in primary is intended to increase students understanding of the behaviors that exemplify bullying. Thus, more publicity and the study of effectiveness of bullying intervention programs will help educate children who are bully, bullied, bully-victim and bystanders on the tools to use to discourage it, which in effect improve the program in existence. Studies have shown that the perceptions of bullying problems vary according to who is involved and asked (Smith, et al., 2005). Bullying is carried out in the absences of adult as a result bullying intervention programs and information should be directed mostly to children instead of teachers, staffs and administrators (Pellegrini & Bartini, 2000).

Fullan (2001) asserted that educational program takes time to penetrate into the school culture. Thus, bullying intervention programs will take time to integrate its effects into the school culture and influence attitudes and behaviors of students and school personnel (Smith, et al., 2005). It is important to mention that an effective bullying intervention programs in primary school will depend on adequacy and sufficiency of resources provided in the programs.

Limber (2004) suggested that the lack of resources to support bullying intervention programs may have an impact on bully, bully victim and victim, as a result students, and school personnel get agitated about insufficient progress in the intervention programs.

Primary schools have and are implementing bullying intervention programs but very little research has been conducted to determine how effective are these programs (Smith, et al., 2005). There have been very little studies that address how bullying interventions programs in primary schools have effectively influenced children (Baldry & Farrington, 2004; Crick & Nelson, 2002). More research and media publicity is definitely needed to assist and support school officials to institute effective bullying intervention programs.

Smith, Cousin and Stewart (2005) asserted that more research and media events are needed on evaluation of bullying intervention programs in primary schools and the outcomes to determine their effectiveness. School bullying is a convoluted social problem, thus an effective program intended to reduce bullying in primary school will only be identified through continued, investigative reporting, media publicity, research and program evaluations (Baldry & Farrington, 2004; Crick and Nelson, 2002; Smith, et al., 2005).

It is the author strong conviction and belief that more investigative reporting and media publicity on mixed result of effectiveness of school based bullying intervention programs in primary school (Dogini, 2012), will provide safe school environment, save primary school kids lives from being wasted and prevents bullies from being career criminal as well as reduces burden of bullying on victims and on schools (Greenwood, 2008).

References

Addison, R.B. (1988). Grounded interpretive research: an investigation of physician socialization. In M. Parker (Ed.), *Entering the circle* (pp 39-57). Albany: University of New York Press.

Arseneault, L., Milne, B. J., Taylor, A., Adams, F., Delgado, K., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E. (2009). Being bullied as an environmentally mediated contributing factor to children's internalizing problems. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine* 162, 145–150.

Arseneault, L., Bowes, L., & Shakoor, S. (2010). Bullying victimization in youths and mental health problems: 'much ado about nothing'? *Psychological Medicine, 40*(5), 717. Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.library.capella.edu/pqdweb?did=1996760161&Fmt=7&clientId=62763&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Baldry, A. C. & Farrington, D. P. (2004). Evaluation of an intervention program for the reduction of bullying and victimization in schools. *Aggressive Behavior, 30*, 1-15.

Battaglio, C. (2006). School bullying: The inside story. (Ph.D., The University of British Columbia (Canada))., 224. Retrieved on August 3, 2011 from http://proquest.umi.com.library.capella.edu/pqdweb?did=1253487171&Fmt=7&cl   ientId=62763&RQT=309&VName=PQD. (NR19937)

Bauer, N. S., Lozano P., & Rivara F. P. (2007). The effectiveness of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program in public middle schools: A controlled trial. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 40*, 266–274.

Bauman, S. (2008). The role of elementary school counselors in reducing school bullying. *Elementary School Journal, 108*(5), 362-375.

Bell, C. D., Raczynski, K. A., & Horne, A. M. (2010). Bully busters abbreviated: Evaluation of a group-based bully intervention and prevention program. *Group Dynamics, 14*(3), 257-267. doi:10.1037/a0020596

Beran, T., & Shapiro, B. (2005). Evaluation of an anti-bullying program: Student reports of knowledge and confidence to manage bullying. *Canadian Journal of Education / Revue Canadienne De l'Éducation, 28*(4), pp. 700-717. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4126451

Bradshaw, C., Koth, C., Bevans, K., Ialongo, N., & Leaf, P. (2008). The impact of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) on the organizational health of elementary schools. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23, 462–473.

Brooks, K., Schiraldi, V., & Ziedenberg, J. (2000). *School house hype: Two years later. Washington,* DC: Justice Policy Institute/Children'LsawCenter.

Carney, A. G., & Merrell, K. W. (2001). Bullying in schools: Perspectives on understanding and preventing an international problem. *School Psychology International, 22,* 364–382.

Cook, C. R., Williams, K. R., Guerra, N., & Kim, T. (2009). Variability in the prevalence of bullying and victimization: A cross-national and methodological analysis. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *The international handbook of school bullying* (pp. 347–362). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cook, C., Williams, K., Guerra, N., Kim, T., & Sadek, S. (2010). Predictors of bullying and victimization in childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic investigation. *School Psychology Quarterly, 25*(2), 65-83. Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.library.capella.edu/pqdweb?did=2107966401&Fmt=7&cl ientId=62763&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Cornell, D. G. (2006). *School violence: Fears versus facts.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Craig, W. M., Henderson, K., & Murphy, J. G. (2000). Propesctive teachers' attitudes toward bullying and victimazation. *School Psychology International*, *21*(1), 5-21.

Crick, N. R. and Nelson, D. (2002). Relational and physical victimization within friendships: Nobody told me There'd be friends like these'. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 30*, 599-607.

Dogini, E., U (2012). Effectiveness of School-Based Bullying Intervention Programs in Primary School (Ph.D., Capella University (USA), . Retrieved on March 30, 2013 from http://proquest.umi.com.library.capella.edu/pqdweb

Freire, P (1970). *Padegogy of the oppressed.* New York: Seabury press.

Folberg, J., & Taylor, A. (1984). *Mediation: A comprehensive guide to resolving conflicts without litigation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Fontana, J. (1999). Bullying in Montana's K-8 schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International, Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences, 34*, 105-210

Fox, C. & Harding, D.J. (2005). School shootings as organizational deviance. *Sociology of Education, 78*, 69-97.

Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Frey, K. S., Edstrom, L.V.S., & Hirschstein, M.K. (2005). The steps to respect program uses a multi-level approach to reduce plyground bullying and destructive plyground behaviours. In D. L. White M. K. Faber, & B. C. Glenn (Eds,) *Proceedings of Persistently Safe Schools 2005*, (pp. 47-55). Washington, DC: Hamilton Fish Institute, George Washington University

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research & practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Germain, C. B., & Bloom, M. (1999). *Human behavior in the social environment: An ecological view* (Second Edition). New York: Columbia University Press.

Gladden, R. M. (2002). Reducing school violence: Strengthening student programs and addressing the role of school organizations. *Review of Research in Education, 26*, pp. 263-299. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3568146

Greenwood, P. (2008). Prevention and intervention programs for juvenile offenders. *The Future of Children, 18*(2), Juvenile Justice, 185-210. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/20179984

Gutek, G. (2004). *Educational philosophy changes*. Boston, Massachusetts: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Haft, W. S. & Weiss, E. R. (1998). Peer mediation in schools: Expectations and evaluations. *Harvard Negotiation Law Review,* (Spring), 213-270.

Hawton, K., & James, A. (2005). Abc of adolescence: Suicide and deliberate self harm in young people. *BMJ: British Medical Journal, 330*(7496), pp. 891-894. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/25459436

Hazler, R. J., Miller, D. L., Carney, J. V., & Green, S. (2001). Adult recognition of school bullying situations. *Educational Research*, 43(2), 133-146.

Hirschstein, M. K., Edstrom. L. V. S., Frey, K. S., Snell, J. L., & MacKenzie. E. P. (2007). Walking the walk in bullying prevention: Teacher implementation variables related to initial impact of the Steps to Respect program. *School Psychology Review, 36,* 3-21.

Horner, R., Sugai, G., Smolkowski, K., Todd, A., Nakasato, J., & Esperanza, J. (2009). A randomized control trial of school-wide positive behavior support in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 11(3), 133–144.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Todd, A. W., & Lewis-Palmer, T. (2005). School-wide positive behavior support: An alternative approach to discipline in schools. In L. Bambara &

L. Kern (Eds.), *Individualized supports for students with problem behavior: Designing positive behavior plans* (pp. 359–390). New York: Guilford.

Lerner, R. M. (2006). Editor's introduction: Developmental science, developmental systems, and contemporary theories. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.). *Theoretical models of human development*. Volume 1 of *Handbook of Child Psychology* (6th ed.). Editors-in-chief: W. Damon & R. M. Lerner. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Limber, S. P. (2004). Implementation of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program in American Schools: Lessons learned from the field. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention* (pp. 351-364). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Limber, S. P., Maury, N., Allison, J., Tracy, T., Melton, G. B., & Flerx, V. (2004). Implementation of the Olweus bullying prevention program in the south- eastern United States. In P. K. Smith, D. Pepler, & K. Rigby (Eds.), *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?* (pp. 58–80). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Livesey, G., McAleavy, G., Donegan, T., Duffy, J., O'Hagan, C., Adamson, G., & White, R. (2007). *The nature and extent of bullying in schools in the North of Ireland: Research report.* Jordanstown, UK: Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency and Lifelong Learning Research Centre, University of Ulster.

Marr, N. & Field, T. (2001). *Bullycide: Death at playtime. An expose of child suicide caused by bullying. Didcot* (UK): Success Unlimited. ISBN 0952912120.

McMahon, C (1995) *Implementing peer mediation. Teachers guide and student workbook.* Queensland, Australia: Conflict Resolution Network Schools Development. Retrieved February 10 from www.peacelink.nu

Meraviglia, M. G., Becker, H., Rosenbluth, B., Sanchez, E., & Robertson, T. (2003). The Expect Respect Project: Creating a positive elementary school climate. *Journal of InterpersonalViolence, 18*, 1347-60.

Merriam, S. B. (2001). *Andragogy and self-directed learning: Pillars of adult learning theory*. San Franscisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merrell, K. W., Gueldner, B. A., Ross, S. W., & Isava, D. M. (2008). How effective are school bullying intervention programs? A meta-analysis of intervention research. *School Psychology Quarterly, 23,* 26–42.

Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B. and Scheidt,.(2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment'. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 285*, 2094-100.

Nicolaides, S., Toda, Y., & Smith, P. K., (2002). Knowledge and attitudes about school bullying in trainee teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 72,* 105-118.

Olweus, D. (1993). Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do. *Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.*

Olweus, D. (1994). Bullying at school: Long-term outcomes for the victims and an effective school- based intervention program. In R. L. Huesmann (Ed.), *Aggressive behavior: Current perspectives* (pp. 97–130). New York: Plenum Press.

Olweus, D. (2001). Peer harassment: A critical analysis and some important issues. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 3-20). New York: Guilford

Orpinas, P., & Home, A. M. (2005). *Bullying prevention: Creating a positive school climate and developing social competence*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Osher, D., & Dwyer, K. (2008). Safe, supportive, and effective schools: Promoting school success to reduce school violence. In S. R. Jimerson & M. J. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety: From research to practice* (pp. 51–71). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pellegrini, A. D., & Bartini, M. (2000). A longitudinal study of bullying, victimization, and peer affiliation during the transition from primary school to middle school. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(3), pp. 699-725. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1163486

Pellegrini, A. D., & Long, J. D. (2002). A longitudinal study of bullying, dominance, and victimization,during the transition from primary through secondary school. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 20,* 259–280.

Rao, V., Wright, J., & Cameron S. (1995). Bullying in schools. *BMJ: British Medical Journal, 310*(6986), pp. 1065-1066. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/29727059

Reid, P., Monsen, J., & Rivers, I. (2004). Psychology's contribution to understanding and managing bullying within schools. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 20,* 241-258.

Rigby, K. (2006). What we can learn from evaluated studies of school-based programs to reduce bullying in schools. In S. R. Jimerson & M. J. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety: From research to practice* (pp. 325-337). Mahwah, NJ:Erlbaum.

Roland, E. (1993). Bullying: A developing tradition of research and management. In D. P. Tattum (Ed.), *Understanding and managing bullying* (pp. 15-30). Oxford, England: Heinemann Educational.

Roland, E. (1989). "Bullying: The Scandinavian Research Tradition," in *Bullying in Schools,* D. Tattum and D. Lane eds. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham, 21-32

Ross, S., & Horner, R. (2009). Bully prevention in positive behavior support. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 42*(4), 747.

Smith, P. K. (2004). Bullying: Recent developments. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 9*(3), 98- 103.

Smith, P. K., Ananiadou K., Cowie, H (2003). Interventions to reduce school bullying. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* 48, 591–599.

Smith, J. D., Cousins, J. B., & Stewart, R. (2005). Antibullying interventions in schools: Ingredients of effective programs. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne De l'Éducation, 28*(4), pp. 739-762. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4126453

Smith, J. D., Schneider, B. H., Smith, P. K., & Ananiadou, K. (2004). The effectiveness of whole- school antibullying programs: A synthesis of evaluation research. *School Psychology Review, 33,* 547–560.

Smith, P.K., Morita, Y., Junger-Tas, J., Olweus, D., Catalano, R, and Slee , P. (1999), *The nature of school bullying: A cross-national perspective* (pp. 7–27). Florence,KY: Routledge.

Smokowski, P.R., & Kopasz, K. H. (2005). Bullying in school: An overview of types, effects, family characteristics, and intervention strategies. *Children and Schools,* 27,101-110.

Song, S. Y., & Stoiber, K. C. (2008). Children exposed to violence at school: An evidence-based intervention agenda for the "real" bullying problem. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 8*(1), 235-253. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.library.capella.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.asp x?d irect=true&db=sih&AN=33321126&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2009). Defining and describing school wide positive behavior support. In W. Sailor, G. Dunlap, G. Sugai, & R. Horner (Eds.), *Handbook of positive behavior support* (pp. 307–326). New York: Springer

Sullivan, K., Cleary, M., & Sullivan, G. (2004). *Bullying in secondary schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Swearer, S. M., & Cary, P. T. (2003). Perceptions and attitudes toward bullying in middle school youth: A developmental examination across the bully/victim continuum. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 19,* 63–79.

Swearer, S. M., Espelage, D. L., Vaillancourt, T., & Hymel, S. (2010*).* What Can Be Done About School Bullying? Linking Research to Educational Practice. *Educational Researcher; Vol. 39, No. 1; pp. 38–47.*

Tolan, P. H., Guerra, N. G., & Kendall, P. H. (1995). Prediction and prevention of antisocial behavior in children and adolescents. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63,* 515–517.

Torrance, D. A., (2000). Qualitative studies into bullying within special schools. *British Journal of Special Education, 27*(1), 16-21.

Vreeman R. C., & Carroll A. E., (2007). A systematic review of school based interventions to prevent bullying. Archives of *Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine* 161, 78–88.

Williams, K. R., & Guerra, N. G. (2007). Prevalence and predictors of Internet bullying. Journal of Ad- olescent Health, 41, s14–s21.

Whitney I., Smith P. K. (1993). A survey of the nature and extent of bullying in junior/middle and secondary schools. *Education Research* 35, 3–25.

Wood, C., & Moore III, J., (2008) Introduction: Elementary School Counseling-Intervention and Programs. *Elementary School Journal* 108, 359-361