

Establishing School Counselors as Leaders in Bullying Curriculum Delivery: Evaluation of a Brief, School-Wide Bystander Intervention

Professional School Counseling

Volume 21(1): 1-9

© 2018 American School

Counselor Association

Reprints and permission:

sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/2156759X18778781

journals.sagepub.com/home/pcx

Aida Midgett¹, Diana M. Dumas¹, and April D. Johnston¹

Abstract

The authors evaluated a brief, school-wide, bystander bullying intervention (STAC) designed to establish school counselors as leaders in curriculum delivery. Elementary school students trained in the program reported an increase in perceived knowledge and confidence to act as “defenders,” utilizing the STAC strategies when they observed bullying, and a decrease in bullying victimization and perpetration at a 4-month follow-up. We discuss implications for school counselors.

Keywords

bullying, bystander program, elementary school, defenders, STAC

Bullying represents a significant problem in the United States, with national survey data indicating 20.8% of students report being a victim of bullying (U.S. Department of Education, 2017). Bullying is defined as often repeated, unwanted, intentional aggressive behavior that takes place within the context of a relationship with a perceived power imbalance (Brank, Hoetger, & Hazen, 2012; Olweus, 1993). Although the prevalence of bullying peaks in middle school, with 31% of sixth-grade students reporting bully victimization (U.S. Department of Education, 2017), national data indicate that bullying behaviors start as early as elementary school. Specifically, as many as 22% of students in Grades 3–5 report being bullied and 50% report being afraid of being bullied at school (Luxenberg, Limber, & Olweus, 2015).

Bullying in elementary school is associated with multiple problems for both students who are victims of bullying and those who perpetrate bullying. Victims of bullying report psychological problems, such as being withdrawn, depressed, anxious, and avoidant (Cook, Williams, Guerra, Kim, & Sadek, 2010), and victimization is related to increased suicide attempts and completions in adulthood (Klomek et al., 2009). Further, bullying victimization is associated with stomachaches and headaches, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, cognition problems, conduct problems (Kim et al., 2015), and poor academic achievement (Glew, Fan, Katon, Rivara, & Kernic, 2005). Students who perpetrate bullying also report negative consequences including both externalizing and internalizing behaviors (Cook et al., 2010). Furthermore, students who are involved in bullying as either a victim or perpetrator are at higher risk of psychotic episodes in adolescence (Wolke,

Lereya, Fisher, Lewis, & Zammit, 2014). Findings also indicate that students who are bullied in elementary school continue to experience victimization into middle school and are at greater risk of school disengagement (Buhs, Ladd, & Herald, 2006). For these reasons, identifying efficacious antibullying programs for elementary school students is imperative to disrupt patterns of bullying and the associated negative consequences both during elementary school and into adolescence.

School-Based Interventions

Numerous studies support the efficacy of comprehensive, school-wide programs in reducing bullying among elementary school students (Tofti & Farrington, 2011). Comprehensive programs often include training of all students, teachers, staff, administrators, and parents (Menard & Grotzger, 2014). Although generally effective, these programs require significant resources for training all key school stakeholders (Garrity, Jens, Porter, Sager, & Short-Camilli, 2004), up to 15 hr of classroom instruction (Menard & Grotzger, 2014), and access to a licensed educational expert (KiVa Antibullying, 2014) who may not always be available. Because comprehensive programs place a high demand on schools, not all schools are able

¹ Boise State University, Boise, Idaho, ID, USA

Corresponding Author:

Aida Midgett, EdD, Boise State University College of Education, 1910 University Drive, Boise, ID 83725, USA.

Email: aidamidgett@boisestate.edu

to adopt and implement such programs. Thus, identifying brief antibullying programs that can be more easily implemented in the school setting is important.

Results from a meta-analysis examining effective bullying prevention programs indicate that training student bystanders (i.e., those who witness bullying behavior) to intervene in bullying incidents is an important component of school-based bullying reduction programs (Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott, 2012). Researchers estimate that between 60% and 85% of students in elementary school witness bullying as bystanders (Aboud & Miller, 2007). When bystanders respond to bullying instances by intervening or defending victims, bullying behaviors decrease (Hawkins, Pepler, & Craig, 2001; Salmivalli, Voeten, & Poskiparta, 2011). In contrast, when bystanders encourage bullying either directly or indirectly, bullying behaviors increase (Kärnä, Voeten, Poskiparta, & Salmivalli, 2010). Unfortunately, the majority of bystanders respond to bullying by reinforcing the bully; this may occur because students do not know how to intervene on behalf of victims (Forsberg, Thornberg, & Samuelsson, 2014; Hutchinson, 2012; Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Björkqvist, Österman, & Kaukiainen, 1996). Thus, training student bystanders to intervene on behalf of victims, rather than acting passively or reinforcing the bullying, represents a promising strategy for bullying prevention.

Training student bystanders to intervene on behalf of victims, rather than acting passively or reinforcing the bullying, represents a promising strategy for bullying prevention.

School-based interventions typically rely on teacher-delivered bullying education curriculum, posing another barrier to implementation due to multiple demands placed on teachers (Biggs, Vernberg, Twemlow, Fonagy, & Dill, 2008). According to the ASCA National Model from the American School Counselor Association (ASCA, 2012), school counselors are systemic change agents within schools, promoting student achievement through school-wide initiatives, including programs that foster a safe learning environment. School counselors help students develop emotional and social skills fostering positive and supportive relationships and empathy, and engage students as advocates (ASCA, 2014), thereby promoting leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change (ASCA, 2012). Thus, taking a leadership role in antibullying curriculum delivery may be well suited to school counselors.

The STAC Program

The STAC program, which stands for the four bystander interventions strategies of “stealing the show,” “turning it over,” “accompanying others,” and “coaching compassion,” was developed by the authors as a brief, stand-alone, bullying bystander intervention program (Midgett, Dumas, Sears, Lundquist, & Hausheer, 2015). A central focus of the program is to teach students strategies they can use to intervene in

bullying situations as “defenders” on behalf of victims. A unique feature of the STAC program is that it establishes school counselors as leaders by shifting program implementation from teachers to school counselors. Furthermore, the STAC program aligns with the ASCA mind-set standards because it was designed to help students develop self-confidence to succeed in intervening against bullying and to increase their sense of belonging in the school environment (ASCA, 2014). It also supports ASCA (2014) behavior standards for social skills including developing positive relationships with peers and demonstrating empathy, social responsibility, advocacy, and behaviors appropriate to the situation and environment.

In previous studies, we found support for the STAC program at the elementary school level. In the initial feasibility study, in which the school counselor selected students identified as leaders to be trained in the program, the researchers found that the STAC program could be successfully implemented as a 90-min training by graduate students in a Masters in Counseling program (Midgett & Dumas, 2016). Results of that study also indicated that students trained in the STAC program reported an increase in knowledge of bullying, knowledge of the STAC strategies, and confidence to intervene in bullying situations (Midgett & Dumas, 2016). More recently, results of a randomized controlled trial (RCT) evaluating the efficacy of the STAC program indicated that student leaders trained in the program reported an increase in knowledge and confidence to intervene as defenders (Midgett, Dumas, & Trull, 2017). Further, upper elementary school students (sixth graders) in the RCT reported an increase in self-esteem compared to students in a wait-list control group at a 30-day follow-up (Midgett et al., 2017). We have also found positive effects of the STAC program on bullying behavior. In an RCT with students identified by the school counselor as occasionally bullying, students in the intervention group reported a decrease in bullying perpetration compared to those in a wait-list control group at a 30-day follow-up (Midgett, Dumas, Trull, & Johnson, 2017).

Prior to this study, the authors have demonstrated the fidelity and short-term efficacy of the STAC program among elementary school students specifically selected for the training (e.g., student leaders or students who bully occasionally). Although these findings suggest the STAC program is a promising approach for bullying prevention among elementary school students, the methodology for all of these studies consisted of selecting a small group of students based on personal characteristics to be trained in the STAC program (Midgett & Dumas, 2016; Midgett et al., 2017; Midgett, Dumas, Trull, & Johnson, 2017). However, we had not evaluated the STAC program delivered as a school-wide intervention. Because bullying is embedded within the culture of schools (Waasdorp, Pas, O’Brennan, & Bradshaw, 2011) and school-wide programs are considered the standard for practice in bullying intervention (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011), assessing the efficacy of STAC when implemented as a school-wide intervention is important.

The Current Study

The purpose of this study was to extend the literature by evaluating the STAC program as a brief, school-wide, counselor-delivered intervention at the elementary school level. To achieve this aim, we used a single-group repeated measures design. The school counselor at one elementary school delivered the STAC program to all students during school-wide core curriculum classroom lessons. Students were given assessments at baseline, postintervention, and at a 4-month follow-up. We were interested in the following research questions: (1) Did students report an increase in perceived knowledge and confidence to intervene from baseline to posttraining and were these changes sustained at the 4-month follow-up? (2) Did students report utilizing the STAC strategies at a 4-month follow-up? and (3) Did students report a decrease in bullying victimization and a decrease in bullying perpetration from baseline to at the 4-month follow-up?

Method

Research Design

We used a single-group repeated measures design within one elementary school to explore the delivery of the STAC program as a school-wide intervention. All students were invited to participate in the STAC intervention. All participants completed baseline, posttraining, and 4-month follow-up assessment surveys.

Participants

The authors recruited elementary school students from an urban, public, northwestern school with a total enrollment of 323 students in Grades K–6 for participation in this study. Students in Grades 3–6 were invited to participate in the study ($N = 144$). Of these 144 eligible students, 113 (78%) received parental consent to participate in the study. Of these 113 students, 100% were present for the baseline assessment and the STAC training and assented to participate. Our final response rate of 78% is higher than the range of response rates (30–60%) typical of other school-based intervention studies using active parental consent (Smith, Boel-Studt, & Cleeland, 2009). The sample of 113 students (60.2% female; 39.8% male) included students in third ($n = 30$), fourth ($n = 28$), fifth ($n = 27$), and sixth ($n = 28$) grades. Participants ranged in age from 8 to 12 years old ($M = 9.74$ and $SD = 1.26$), with reported racial backgrounds of 64.2% White, 10.1% African American, 9.2% Hispanic, 7.3% Asian, 0.9% Pacific Islander, and 8.3% other.

Of the 113 students who completed baseline assessment and the STAC training, 85% ($n = 96$) completed the posttraining assessment and 82% ($n = 93$) completed the 4-month follow-up. There were no demographic differences or differences on outcome variables between students who completed follow-up

measures and those who did not complete follow-up measures either at the posttraining assessment or the 4-month follow-up.

Procedure

Members of the research team worked closely with the school counselor to conduct the study procedures. In the fall semester, during regularly scheduled core curriculum classroom lessons, the school counselor explained that all students at school would be trained in a bystander antibullying program to learn strategies they could use to help reduce bullying. The school counselor also indicated that researchers would be evaluating the training, introduced the study procedures to students, and invited them to participate. The school counselor informed students there would be no negative consequences if they declined participation. All students in Grades 3–6 were given an informed consent form to take home to their parents/guardians to provide written consent for their student's participation in the study. The school counselor also followed up with a phone call or e-mail to a parent/guardian when necessary. Once students returned the signed informed consent to the school counselor, she provided them with an assent form and read the form to students in lower grades.

All eligible students were given the research questionnaires, which included the Student-Advocates Pre- and Postscale (SAPPS; Midgett et al., 2015), Use of STAC Strategies (Midgett, Doumas, Trull, & Johnston, 2017), Bullying Behavior Survey (Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire; Olweus, 1996), and demographic questions. Students completed SAPPS, the Bullying Behavior Survey, and the demographic questions at baseline (October). Upon completion of four 30-min STAC classroom lessons (December), students completed the SAPPS. Four months after baseline (February), students completed follow-up questionnaires, which included SAPPS, Use of STAC Strategies, and the Bullying Behavior Survey. Members of the research team read each item from every questionnaire to students. The university's institutional review board and the school district approved all study procedures. We followed the American Counseling Association (ACA, 2014) ethical standards for the study.

Measures

Knowledge and confidence to intervene. The SAPPS (Midgett et al., 2015) was used to measure knowledge of bullying, knowledge of the STAC strategies, and confidence to intervene. The questionnaire comprises 11 items that measure student knowledge of bullying behaviors, knowledge of the STAC strategies, and confidence intervening in bullying situations. Examples of items include: "I know what verbal bullying looks like," "I know how to use humor to get attention away from the student being bullied," and "I feel confident in my ability to do something helpful to decrease bullying at my school." Items are rated on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*I totally disagree*) to 4 (*I totally agree*). Items are summed to create a

total scale score. The questionnaire has established content validity and adequate internal consistency for the total scale with Cronbach's α ranging from .77 to .81 (Midgett & Doumas, 2016; Midgett et al., 2015). For this sample, Cronbach's α was .80.

Use of STAC strategies. Students' use of STAC strategies was measured by the Use of STAC Strategies questionnaire (Midgett, Doumas, Trull, & Johnston, 2017). Each STAC strategy was measured using a single item. Students were asked, "How often would you say that you used these strategies to stop bullying in the past month? (a) stealing the show—using humor to get the attention away from the bullying situation, (b) turning it over—telling an adult about what you saw, (c) accompanying others—reaching out to the student who was the target of bullying, and (d) coaching compassion—helping the student who bullied develop empathy for the target." Items were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*never/almost never*) to 5 (*always/almost always*).

Bullying victimization and perpetration. Bullying victimization and perpetration were measured using the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (Olweus, 1996). The Olweus Questionnaire comprises 39 self-report items that measure bullying victimization, perpetration, and student perception of adult support. Bullying victimization and bullying perpetration items include verbal, relational, physical, and cyberbullying. The 9-item Bullying Victimization Scale includes items such as "I was called mean names, was made fun of, or was teased in a hurtful way," "Other students left me out of things on purpose, excluded me from their group of friends, or completely ignored me," "I was hit, kicked, pushed, shoved around, or locked indoors," and "I was bullied with mean or hurtful messages, calls or pictures, or in other ways on my mobile phone or over the internet (computer)." The 9-item Bullying Perpetration Scale includes items such as "I called another student(s) mean names, made fun of him or her, or teased in a hurtful way," "I kept him or her out of things on purpose, excluded him or her from my group of friends, or completely ignored him or her," "I hit, kicked, pushed, shoved him or her around, or locked him or her indoors," and "I bullied him or her with mean or hurtful messages, calls or pictures, or in other ways on my mobile phone or over the internet (computer)." Items are rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (*It hasn't happened in the past couple of months*) to 4 (*several times a week*). The questionnaire has moderate to high internal reliability ranging from $\alpha = .74$ to .98 and satisfactory construct validity (Kyriakides, Kaloyirou, & Lindsay, 2006). For this sample, Cronbach's α was .83 for the Bullying Victimization Scale and .84 for the Bullying Perpetration Scale.

The STAC Intervention

The STAC intervention is designed to train students to act as defenders on behalf of victims of bullying (Midgett et al., 2015). In previous studies, counselor education graduate

students delivered the STAC program at the elementary school level in a 75-min training format (Midgett & Doumas, 2016; Midgett et al., 2017) that included a didactic component, experiential activities, and role plays to teach students the four STAC strategies followed by two biweekly, 15-min small group meetings (for details, see Midgett et al., 2015). For the present study, the STAC program was modified to shift program curriculum delivery from counselor education students to the school counselor. The school counselor delivered the training during four 30-min core curriculum classroom lessons and conducted two 5-min follow-up meetings at the end of subsequent guidance lessons following the training. The counselor-delivered STAC training included four 30-min lessons.

Lesson 1. During the first lesson, the school counselor used an audiovisual presentation to teach students the definition of bullying and explain the different types of bystander roles.

Lesson 2. In the second lesson, the school counselor reviewed didactic material from Lesson 1 and facilitated a discussion about the different types of bullying students can observe at school (i.e., physical, verbal, relationship, and cyberbullying). Next, students participated in a small group activity where they created a poster, writing, or drawing about different types of bullying they learned.

Lesson 3. The third lesson also began with a review of the material previously covered followed by a "basketball" activity in which students wrote on a piece of paper about a bullying incident they had experienced or witnessed, crumpled the paper up into a ball, and tossed it into a basket. The school counselor read a few of the examples students provided and facilitated a brief discussion to help unite the class and motivate students to act as defenders. Next, the school counselor used an audiovisual presentation to introduce students to the four STAC strategies (Midgett et al., 2015).

Stealing the show. This strategy involves teaching defenders to use their sense of humor when they observe bullying to distract the peer audience's attention away from the target. The school counselor provides examples such as the defender telling a funny joke or pretending to trip by acting silly.

Turning it over. This strategy consists of encouraging defenders to identify and tell a safe adult at school when they witness bullying. Elementary school students learn to always use this strategy when they observe physical bullying and when they are unsure as to how to intervene.

Accompanying others. For this strategy, the school counselor teaches defenders to reach out to the student who was targeted after a bullying incident to offer support. Students learn they can use accompanying others either by letting victims know they witnessed the incident and communicating that what happened is not acceptable or defenders can support victims indirectly by spending time with them and nonverbally communicating that they are not alone at school.

Coaching compassion. This strategy involves gently confronting the student who bullies after the bullying incident to communicate that his or her behavior is unacceptable. The school counselor instructs defenders to use coaching compassion when they have an established friendship with the student who bullied or if the student who bullied is in a younger grade and the defender believes he or she will respect them.

Lesson 4. The school counselor started the fourth STAC lesson with a review of the four STAC strategies. Then, she separated students into small groups and provided each group with a prewritten role play for students to practice using the STAC strategies and then perform a skit for the class where they act as defenders. After concluding the role plays, the school counselor encouraged students to implement the strategies when they witness bullying at school and to ask her for help if they had any questions or concerns.

Follow-up meetings. The school counselor conducted two 5-min follow-up meetings at the end of two subsequent biweekly guidance lessons following the training. The school counselor asked students what types of bullying incidents they observed and helped them brainstorm effective ways to use the STAC strategies on behalf of victims. The school counselor also encouraged students to share honest feedback about their experience acting as defenders and reminded them that she was available to meet individually with students if they had any concerns.

Intervention fidelity. The researchers created an STAC training video to help prepare the school counselor to conduct the program. Research team members also observed the school counselor delivering each of the four STAC lessons one time to ensure she was delivering the curriculum with fidelity. Team members rated the training delivery on a dichotomous scale, *Yes* or *No*, to evaluate whether the school counselor accurately taught the definition and types of bullying, the STAC strategies, and whether she deviated from training materials. Furthermore, the researchers evaluated whether the school counselor conducted all role plays included in the training and whether students had an opportunity to practice all four STAC strategies.

Power Analysis

We conducted an a priori power analysis using the G*Power 3.1.3 program (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) for a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with one factor (time) at three time points and a paired sample *t* test. Results of the power analysis indicated that a sample size of 36 is needed for power of ≥ 0.90 to detect a medium effect size for the main effect of time with three measurements with an α level of .05. For a paired sample *t* test, a sample size of 35 is needed for power of ≥ 0.90 to detect a medium effect size with an α level of .05.

Statistical Methods

Prior to analysis, we examined all variables for outliers at baseline and follow-up assessments and adjusted them to 3.3 *SD* above the mean before conducting analyses (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). To assess perceived knowledge confidence gained in the intervention group, we conducted a GLM repeated measures ANOVA with one independent variable, time (baseline, postintervention, follow-up) and follow-up paired *t* tests to examine post hoc differences between time points. To assess skill usage in the intervention group, we computed descriptive statistics to examine frequency of use of STAC strategies at the follow-up assessment. We conducted two paired *t* tests to examine differences from baseline to follow-up assessments for bullying victimization and bullying perpetration. For these analyses, we were interested in determining changes in bullying victimization among students who reported at least one incident of bullying victimization at baseline and changes in bullying perpetration among students who reported at least one incident of bullying perpetration at baseline. We used an α level of $p < .05$ to determine statistical significance and used partial eta squared (η_p^2) as the measure of effect size for the GLM ANOVA and Cohen's *d* for paired *t* test with magnitude of effects interpreted as follows: small ($\eta_p^2 \geq .01$; $d = .20$), medium ($\eta_p^2 \geq .06$; $d = .50$), and large ($\eta_p^2 \geq .14$; $d = .80$; Cohen, 1969; Richardson, 2011). We used SPSS version 24.0 to conduct all analyses.

Results

Increase in Perceived Knowledge and Confidence

We examined changes in perceived knowledge and confidence to intervene to determine whether students learned the information presented in the STAC training across three time points (baseline, postintervention, and 4-month follow-up). Results indicated a significant main effect for time, Wilks's $\lambda = .79$, $F(2, 81) = 11.05$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .21$. Follow-up paired *t* tests indicated a significant difference in perceived knowledge and confidence between baseline ($M = 33.72$, $SD = 6.21$) and postintervention ($M = 36.41$, $SD = 5.21$), $t(82) = -4.81$, $p < .001$, Cohen's $d = -.46$; and between baseline ($M = 33.72$, $SD = 6.21$) and 4-month follow-up ($M = 36.47$, $SD = 5.06$), $t(82) = -4.25$, $p < .001$, Cohen's $d = -.49$; but not between postintervention ($M = 36.41$, $SD = 5.21$) and 4-month follow-up ($M = 36.47$, $SD = 5.06$), $t(82) = -0.13$, $p = .90$, Cohen's $d = -.01$. As hypothesized, students reported an increase in perceived knowledge and confidence from baseline to postintervention, and this increase was sustained at the 4-month follow-up.

Use of STAC Strategies

Next, we examined rates of use of STAC strategies among students in the intervention group at the 4-month follow-up to determine whether students used the STAC strategies taught

in the STAC training. Among students who indicated they witnessed bullying (60.2%, $n = 93$), 90% reported using at least one STAC strategy in the past month. For specific STAC strategies, 50.9% reported using stealing the show, 78.2% reported using turning it over, 76.4% reported using “accompany others,” and 44.4% reported using coaching compassion.

Bullying Victimization and Perpetration

Among students who reported bullying victimization at baseline ($n = 70$, 63.1%), results indicated a significant difference in bullying victimization between the baseline ($M = 8.40$, $SD = 6.43$) and the 4-month follow-up assessment ($M = 6.05$, $SD = 5.89$), $t(57) = 3.24$, $p < .01$, Cohen’s $d = .43$. As hypothesized, students reported a decrease in bullying victimization between baseline and the 4-month follow-up assessment. Similarly, among students who reported bullying perpetration at baseline ($n = 27$, 24.8%), results indicated a significant difference in bullying perpetration between the baseline ($M = 2.52$, $SD = 2.76$) and the 4-month follow-up assessment ($M = 1.13$, $SD = 1.49$), $t(22) = 2.15$, $p < .05$, Cohen’s $d = .47$. As hypothesized, students reported a decrease in bullying perpetration between baseline and the 4-month follow-up assessment.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to extend the literature by evaluating the counselor-delivered STAC program implemented as a brief, school-wide intervention at the elementary school level. Because approximately one in four students in upper elementary school report being bullied at school (Luxenberg et al., 2015; U.S. Department of Education, 2017), identifying effective school-wide interventions that can be used in the elementary school setting is important. Overall, results indicated that the STAC program can effectively be delivered as a school-wide program conducted by the school counselor during core curriculum classroom lessons for elementary school students. Further, results suggest that the STAC program is a promising approach for reducing bullying victimization and perpetration when implemented as a counselor-led, school-wide training.

As hypothesized, students reported an increase in perceived knowledge of bullying, knowledge of the STAC strategies, and confidence to intervene from baseline to posttraining. Further, we found that these changes were sustained at a 4-month follow-up. In previous studies conducted at the elementary (Midgett & Doumas, 2016; Midgett et al., 2017) and middle school (Midgett et al., 2015; Midgett, Doumas, Trull, & Johnston, 2017) levels, we found similar results immediately post-training (Midgett & Doumas, 2016; Midgett et al., 2015) and at a 30-day follow-up (Midgett et al., 2017; Midgett, Doumas, Trull, & Johnston, 2017). This is the first study to demonstrate that students report retaining their perception of increased knowledge and confidence to act as defenders across the school year.

As hypothesized, students reported an increase in perceived knowledge of bullying, knowledge of the STAC strategies, and confidence to intervene from baseline to posttraining.

Findings also supported our second hypothesis that students would use the STAC strategies. Results at the 4-month follow-up indicated that among students who witnessed bullying, 90% had used at least one STAC strategy to “defend” a student being bullied. This finding is similar to previous research conducted at the middle school level, in which 95% of middle school students reporting using at least one STAC strategy at a 30-day follow-up (Midgett, Doumas, Trull, & Johnston, 2017). Among the STAC strategies, more students utilized turning it over (78%) and accompanying others (76%), compared to stealing the show (51%) and coaching compassion (44%).

Although patterns reported by middle school students are similar, with 91% turning it over, 95% accompanying others, 76% stealing the show, and 57% coaching compassion (Midgett, Doumas, Trull, & Johnston, 2017), a smaller percentage of elementary school students reported using each strategy. One possible explanation is the different length of follow-up assessments. In the middle school study, students reported use of STAC strategies 30 days after training, whereas in the elementary school study, students reported use of STAC strategies 4 months after training. An alternative explanation is that the different rates of use may be due to the age of the students. Due to developmental differences, older students may be more likely to apply the skills they learned during the STAC training, whereas younger students may need additional support. For example, younger students may need to participate in more role plays during the training than older students or may need additional or longer follow-up sessions.

Findings also suggest that elementary students reported using coaching compassion less often than the other three STAC strategies. This finding is also consistent with prior research examining use of strategies among middle school students (Midgett, Doumas, Trull, & Johnston, 2017). Defenders may be reluctant to use coaching compassion because they fear becoming a target of bullying (Midgett, Moody, Reilly, & Lyter, 2017). Coaching compassion requires defenders to directly engage with students who bully rather than to address the problem through engaging with a peer audience (stealing the show), supporting the victim (accompanying others), or asking for adult help (turning it over). Moreover, defenders may be appropriately avoiding direct engagement with students who bully to avoid situations that may pose a greater risk for them to become a target of bullying.

Finally, as hypothesized, students who reported bullying victimization at baseline reported a decrease in bullying victimization and students who reported bullying others at baseline reported a decrease in bullying perpetration at the 4-month follow-up. These results are consistent with previous research indicating that elementary students who occasionally bully and

are trained in the STAC program report a decrease in bullying perpetration at a 30-day follow-up compared to students in a control group (Midgett, Doumas, Trull, & Johnson, 2017). Researchers have demonstrated that comprehensive, school-wide bystander programs can be effective at reducing school bullying (Kärnä et al., 2010; Polanin et al., 2012; Salmivalli et al., 2011); however, implementing these types of programs can be difficult due to time and financial demands they place on schools (Garrity et al., 2004; KiVa Antibullying, 2014; Menard & Grotper, 2014). Our findings suggest that a brief, school-wide bystander intervention that establishes school counselors as leaders in antibullying program delivery can be an effective approach to reducing bullying. This is an important finding when considering the wide range of negative consequences associated with bullying in elementary school (Buhs et al., 2006; Cook et al., 2010; Glew et al., 2005; Kim et al., 2015; Klomek et al., 2009; Wolke et al., 2014).

Students who reported bullying victimization at baseline reported a decrease in bullying victimization and students who reported bullying others at baseline reported a decrease in bullying perpetration at the 4-month follow-up.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Although this study contributes to our understanding of how to train students to act as defenders to reduce bullying at the elementary school level, it has certain limitations. The primary limitation is the lack of a control or comparison school. Thus, whether study outcomes were related to selection variables, the STAC intervention, or other unmeasured variables is not clear. Furthermore, results are limited to one school. Future research using a randomized controlled design with several schools in each condition (intervention and control) would improve the validity of the study. Next, the sample is predominantly female, limiting the generalizability of the results. Thus, further studies are needed that evaluate the STAC program as a school-wide intervention with samples that are more evenly distributed across males and females. This study obtained information through self-report questionnaires, potentially leading to biased or distorted reporting, especially at the elementary school level. However, children are able to provide useful information about their experience when asked Likert-type questions in a manner that is meaningful to them (Christensen & James, 2008). Therefore, the researchers read the surveys to the students in an effort to increase the quality of the data. Future studies, however, could include objective measures in addition to self-report to strengthen findings, including observational data of students acting as defenders and bullying incidents reported to school personnel. We did not track whether there was a relationship between types of bullying students observed and strategies they utilized. Therefore, future research could investigate whether that relationship exists.

Implications for School Counselors

This study has practical implications for elementary school counselors. Extant literature indicates that elementary school bullying is prevalent, with many negative associated consequences (Buhs et al., 2006; Cook et al., 2010; Glew et al., 2005; Kim et al., 2015; Klomek et al., 2009; Wolke et al., 2014). For this reason, equipping elementary school students with tools they can use to act as defenders to reduce bullying victimization and perpetration is imperative. Programs such as STAC can be delivered as brief, school-wide interventions through core curriculum classroom lessons as part of a school counseling curriculum. Because the program places a low demand on schools in terms of time and financial resources, a broader range of schools can have access to bullying reduction program implementation. Further, this approach to implementing the STAC program aligns with the ASCA (2012, 2014) National Model establishing school counselors as leaders in implementation of a program that fosters a safe learning environment for students.

Our findings also provide important implications for school counselors to train elementary students how to intervene as defenders to reduce bullying at school. Although our findings indicate a sustained increase in perceived knowledge and confidence to intervene in bullying postintervention, we also found that fewer students reported using stealing the show and coaching compassion relative to turning it over and accompanying others. Thus, school counselors providing students with additional practice to implement stealing the show and coaching compassion could be helpful. For example, elementary students might struggle to come up with an appropriate joke when they witness bullying. Therefore, school counselors could teach students to use distraction instead of humor to intervene. Instead of telling a funny joke, a defender could interrupt a bullying situation by attempting to initiate a game such as foursquare, inviting the students who are observing the bullying situation and the student who was targeted to join the game. School counselors could also teach defenders to use coaching compassion indirectly to decrease students' potential fear of becoming a target. For example, a defender could interrupt a fifth-grade boy who is teasing a younger student by asking the fifth grader if he saw his favorite sports team's most recent game on television. After the defender interrupts the bullying situation, the defender could gently state to the student who bullied that teasing others is not "cool" and that it can be hurtful to be teased. If the student who bullies has an established relationship with the defender, the student who bullies could be open to considering what the defender is communicating. Our findings indicate that turning it over and accompanying others were used more often by elementary students than the other strategies. Therefore, elementary school counselors can rely more heavily on these strategies when beginning to teach students how to intervene as defenders since the strategies were a natural fit for this population.

Implications for Counselor Educators

This study also has practical implications for counselor educators. When preparing school counseling students to become advocates for a safe learning environment for elementary school students (ASCA, 2012, 2014), counselor educators can introduce school counseling students to brief antibullying programs such as STAC. Counselor educators can share the specific STAC strategies with school counseling students to help them feel equipped to combat the issue of bullying. Further, counselor educators can focus on turning it over as an important strategy for elementary school students and engage counseling students in a discussion regarding how they can help foster a culture at school where adults are equipped to support elementary school students when they report bullying.

When preparing school counseling students to become advocates for a safe learning environment for elementary school students, counselor educators can introduce school counseling students to brief antibullying programs such as STAC.

Conclusion

This study evaluated a brief, school-wide, bystander antibullying program for elementary school students uniquely designed to establish school counselors as leaders in curriculum delivery. This is the first study to examine the effectiveness of the STAC program implemented as a school-wide program. Results indicated that students reported an increase in perceived knowledge and confidence to act as defenders, utilized the STAC strategies when they witnessed bullying, and reported a decrease in bullying perpetration and victimization at school at a 4-month follow-up. These findings provide evidence that positive outcomes from the STAC training can be sustained throughout the school year, extending from the fall to spring semester. Results provide support for the STAC program as a promising brief, school-wide, counselor-delivered approach that can be implemented with significantly fewer resources than many comprehensive school-wide programs that rely on teachers for implementation.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- About, F., & Miller, L. (2007). Promoting peer intervention in name-calling. *South African Journal of Psychology, 37*, 803–819. doi:10.1177/008124630703700409
- American Counseling Association. (2014). *2014 ACA code of ethics*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- American School Counselor Association. (2012). *ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.
- American School Counselor Association. (2014). *ASCA Mindsets & Behaviors for student success: K-12 college- and career-readiness standards for every student*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/home/MindsetsBehaviors.pdf>
- Biggs, B. K., Vernberg, E. M., Twemlow, S. W., Fonagy, P., & Dill, E. J. (2008). Teacher adherence and its relation to teacher attitudes and student outcomes in an elementary school-based violence prevention program. *School Psychology Review, 37*, 533–549.
- Brank, E. M., Hoetger, L. A., & Hazen, K. P. (2012). Bullying. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 8*, 213–230. doi:10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-102811-173820
- Buhs, E. S., Ladd, G. W., & Herald, S. L. (2006). Peer exclusion and victimization: Processes that mediate the relation between peer group rejection and children's classroom engagement and achievement? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*, 1–13. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.98.1.1
- Christensen, P., & James, A. (Eds.). (2008). *Research with children: Perspectives and practices* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cohen, J. (1969). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Cook, C. R., Williams, K. R., Guerra, N. G., Kim, T. E., & Sadek, S. (2010). Predictors of bullying and victimization in childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic investigation. *School Psychology Quarterly, 25*, 65–83. doi:10.1037/a0020149
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G* power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*, 175–191.
- Forsberg, C., Thornberg, R., & Samuelsson, M. (2014). Bystanders to bullying: Fourth- to seventh-grade students' perspectives on their reactions. *Research Papers in Education, 29*, 557–576. doi:10.1080/02671522.2013.878375
- Garrity, C., Jens, K., Porter, W., Sager, N., & Short-Camilli, C. (2004). *Bully-proofing your school: Administrator's guide to staff development in elementary schools* (3rd ed.). Longmont, CO: Sopris West.
- Glew, G. M., Fan, M. Y., Katon, W., Rivara, F. P., & Kernic, M. A. (2005). Bullying, psychosocial adjustment, and academic performance in elementary school. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 159*, 1026–1031. doi:10.1001/archpedi.159.11.1026
- Hawkins, D. L., Pepler, D. J., & Craig, W. M. (2001). Naturalistic observations of peer interventions in bullying. *Social Development, 10*, 512–527. doi:10.1111/1467-9507.00178
- Hutchinson, M. (2012). Exploring the impact of bullying on young bystanders. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 28*, 425–442. doi:10.1080/02667363.2012.727785
- Kärnä, A., Voeten, M., Poskiparta, E., & Salmivalli, C. (2010). Vulnerable children in different classrooms: Classroom-level factors moderate the effect of individual risk on victimization. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 56*, 261–282. doi:10.1353/mpq.0.0052

- Kim, J. W., Lee, K., Lee, Y. S., Han, D. H., Min, K. J., Song, S. H., . . . Kim, J. O. (2015). Factors associated with group bullying and psychopathology in elementary school students using child-welfare facilities. *Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment, 11*, 991–998. doi:10.2147/NDT.S76105
- KiVa Antibullying. (2014). *Frequently asked questions*. Retrieved from <http://www.kivaprogram.net/faq>
- Klomek, A. B., Sourander, A., Niemelä, S., Kumpulainen, K., Piha, J., Tamminen, T., . . . Gould, M. S. (2009). Childhood bullying behaviors as a risk for suicide attempts and completed suicides: A population-based birth cohort study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 48*, 254–261. doi:10.1097/chi.0b013e318196b91f
- Kyriakides, L., Kaloyirou, C., & Lindsay, G. (2006). An analysis of the revised Olweus bully/victim questionnaire using the Rasch measurement model. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*, 781–801. doi:10.1348/000709905X53499
- Luxenberg, H., Limber, S. P., & Olweus, D. (2015). *Bullying in U.S. schools: 2014 status report*. Center City, MN: Hazelden. Retrieved from http://www.violencepreventionworks.org/public/document/bullying_2015_statusreport.pdf
- Menard, S., & Grotper, J. K. (2014). Evaluation of bully-proofing your school as an elementary school antibullying intervention. *Journal of School Violence, 13*, 188–209. doi:10.1080/15388220.2013.840641
- Midgett, A., & Dumas, D. M. (2016). Training elementary school students to intervene as peer-advocates to stop bullying at school: A pilot study. *Journal of Creativity and Mental Health, 11*, 353–365. doi:10.1080/15401383.2016.1164645
- Midgett, A., Dumas, D. M., Sears, D., Lundquist, A., & Hausheer, R. (2015). A bystander bullying psychoeducation program with middle school students: A preliminary report. *The Professional Counselor, 5*, 586–500. doi:10.1524/am.5.4.486
- Midgett, A., Dumas, D. M., & Trull, R. (2017). Evaluation of a bystander bullying intervention program for elementary school students. *Professional School Counselor, 20*, 72–183. doi:10.5330/1096-2409-20.1.172
- Midgett, A., Dumas, D. M., Trull, R., & Johnson, J. (2017). Training students who occasionally bully to be peer advocates: Is a bystander intervention effective in reducing bullying behavior? *Journal of Child and Adolescent Counseling, 3*, 1–13. doi:10.1080/23727810.2016.1277116
- Midgett, A., Dumas, D. M., Trull, R., & Johnston, A. D. (2017). A randomized controlled study evaluating a brief, bystander bullying intervention with junior high school students. *Journal of School Counseling, 15*. Retrieved from <http://jsc.montana.edu/articles/v15n9.pdf>
- Midgett, A., Moody, S., Reilly, B., & Lyter, S. (2017). The phenomenological experience of student-advocates trained as defenders to stop school bullying. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, 56*, 53–71. doi:10.1002/johc.12044
- Olweus, D. (1993). Victimization by peers: Antecedents and long-term outcomes. In K. H. Rubin & J. B. Asendorpf (Eds.), *Social withdrawal, inhibition, and shyness in childhood* (pp. 315–341). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Olweus, D. (1996). *The Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire*. Bergen, Norway: University of Bergen, Research Center for Health Promotion (HEMIL Center).
- Polanin, J. R., Espelage, D. L., & Pigott, T. D. (2012). A meta-analysis of school-based bullying prevention programs' effects on bystander intervention behavior. *School Psychology Review, 41*, 47–65.
- Richardson, J. T. E. (2011). Eta squared and partial eta squared as measurements of effect size in educational research. *Educational Research Review, 6*, 135–147. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2010.12.001
- Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K., Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (1996). Bullying as a group process: Participant roles and their relations to social status within the group. *Aggressive Behavior, 22*, 1–15. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(1996)22:1<1::AID-AB1>3.0.CO;2-T
- Salmivalli, C., Voeten, M., & Poskiparta, E. (2011). Bystanders matter: Associations between reinforcing, defending, and the frequency of bullying behavior in classrooms. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 40*, 668–676. doi:10.1080/15374416.2011.597090
- Smith, D. C., Boel-Studt, S., & Cleeland, L. (2009). Parental consent in adolescent substance abuse treatment outcome studies. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 37*, 298–306. doi:10.1016/j.sat.2009.03.007
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A systematic and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 7*, 27–56. doi:10.1007/s11292-010-9109-1
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics. (2017). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2016* (NCES 2017-064). Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=719>
- Waasdorp, T. E., Pas, E. T., O'Brennan, L. M., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2011). A multilevel perspective on the climate of bullying: Discrepancies among students, school staff, and parents. *Journal of School Violence, 10*, 115–132. doi:10.1080/15388220.2010.539164
- Wolke, D., Lereya, S. T., Fisher, H. L., Lewis, G., & Zammit, S. (2014). Bullying in elementary school and psychotic experiences at 18 years: A longitudinal, population-based cohort study. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 41*, 309–323. doi:10.1017/S0033291713002912

Author Biographies

Aida Midgett, EdD, is an associate professor and associate chair of the Department of Counselor Education at Boise State University in Boise, ID.

Diana M. Dumas, PhD, is a professor and chair of the Institute for the Study of Behavioral Health and Addiction at Boise State University.

April D. Johnston is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Counselor Education at Boise State University.