Training Students Who Occasionally Bully to Be Peer Advocates: Is a Bystander Intervention Effective in Reducing Bullying Behavior?

Aida Midgett, Diana M. Doumas, Rhiannon Trull & Jamie Johnson

Training Students Who Occasionally Bully to Be Peer Advocates: Is a Bystander Intervention Effective in Reducing Bullying Behavior?

Aida Midgett, Diana M. Doumas, Rhiannon Trull, and Jamie Johnson

Department of Counselor Education, Boise State University, Boise, Idaho, USA

Bullying is a major public health problem faced by youth today. This randomized controlled study evaluated a brief, counselor-led bystander bullying intervention for elementary school students with a history of occasionally bullying ($N = 54$). The intervention—stealing the show, turning it over, accompanying others, and coaching compassion (STAC)—is designed to train students to intervene as peer advocates when they witness bullying situations at school. Students in the STAC intervention group reported a significantly lower level of bullying perpetration compared to students in the wait-list control group. Findings suggest that training students who bully to be peer advocates may be a promising approach to bullying prevention. The authors discuss future directions for research and implications for counselors.

Keywords: bullying, bystander program, bullies, STAC, elementary school

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). According to the U.S. Department of Education (2016), the most prevalent types of bullying are (a) physical (i.e., being pushed, shoved, tripped, or spit on, and having one's property intentionally destroyed), (b) verbal (i.e., being made fun of, called names, and/or insulted), and (c) and relational (i.e., being the subject of rumors, and being intentionally excluded from activities). Cyberbullying, which includes the use of electronic or digital media to intentionally cause harm or humiliate another student in front of a wide audience (Tokunaga, 2010), is also prevalent among youth. Examples of cyberbullying include creating fake profiles on social media, posting embarrassing pictures or videos of another student, and sending mean text messages or e-mails (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 2015).

Bullying is a widespread social problem for youth in the United States, with approximately 25% of students reporting being bullied at school (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). The actual prevalence of being a target of bullying, however, is likely higher, because students underreport their involvement in bullying incidences (Petrosino, Guckenburg, DeVoe, & Hanson, 2010). Researchers have identified myriad problems related to both bully victimization

and perpetration. Being a victim of bullying is associated with anxiety, low self-esteem, depression (Rueger & Jenkins, 2014), post-traumatic stress symptoms and diagnosis (Nielsen, Tangen, Idsoe, Matthiesen, & Mageroy, 2015), suicidal ideation and suicidal attempts (Copeland, Wolke, Angold, & Costello, 2013; Holt et al., 2015), decreased school attendance (Rueger & Jenkins, 2014), and lower academic achievement (Juvonen, Wang, & Espinoza, 2011; Nakamoto & Schwartz, 2010; Rueger & Jenkins, 2014). Students who perpetrate bullying are more likely to use addictive substances in adolescence than victims (Kelly et al., 2015; Kim, Catelano, Haggerty, & Abbott, 2011; Radliff, Wheaton, Robinson, & Morris, 2012), including illicit drug use (Niemela et al., 2011). Students who bully also have higher rates of antisocial personality disorder (Copeland et al., 2013) and experience higher incidences of violence (Kim et al., 2011), antisocial behavior, criminal violence, and contact with the police (Renda, Vassallo, & Edwards, 2011) in adulthood. These findings suggest that decreasing bullying is important due to the associated emotional, academic, and legal issues associated with bullying behavior. Therefore, there is a need for professional counselors to help decrease bullying behaviors among children and adolescents, particularly within the school setting.

Researchers have identified a difference between students who occasionally bully and students who bully more frequently (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006; Niemela et al., 2011; O'Moore & Kirkham, 2001; Wang, Nansel, & Iannotti, 2011). Specifically, students who occasionally bully have significantly higher levels of empathy (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006), higher levels of self-esteem (O'Moore & Kirkham, 2001), and lower rates of depression (Wang et al., 2011) than students who bully frequently. In addition, frequent bullying is more strongly associated with future illicit drug use than occasional bullying (Niemelä et al., 2011). Together, these studies suggest that occasional bullying and frequent bullying are different phenomena. Thus, a different intervention approach may be indicated for students who bully on occasion than those traditionally used to reduce bullying behavior.

SCHOOL-BASED BYSTANDER INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

One school-based approach to bullying prevention is to instruct students to intervene when they witness bullying. Research indicates how students respond to bullying impacts bullying behavior; specifically, when bystanders (e.g., students who observe a bullying situation) intervene or defend the target, bullying behavior decreases (Hawkins, Pepler, & Craig, 2001; Salmivalli, Voeten, & Poskiparta, 2011). On the other hand, when bystanders join in and help bullies, bullying behaviors increase (Salmivalli et al., 2011). Recent research suggests that comprehensive, schoolwide programs that include bystander interventions are effective in reducing bullying and victimization among students (Garandeau, Poskiparta, & Salmivalli, 2014; Menard & Grotpeter, 2014).

There is also some research suggesting brief, school-based bystander interventions may be a promising alternative to more intensive interventions that require a significant commitment of financial resources (KiVa Antibullying, 2014) and time (Menard & Grotpeter, 2014). For example, one group of researchers investigated the efficacy of an eight-hour, teacher-delivered bystander curriculum adapted from a comprehensive, schoolwide program (Andreou, Didaskalou, & Vlachou, 2008). Students participating in the program reported an increase in negative attitudes toward bullies, an increase in positive attitudes toward

victims, an increase in perceived efficacy in intervening in bullying incidents, and an increase in intervening behaviors relative to students in a control condition (Andreou et al., 2008). This study provides some support for the use of brief, bystander interventions as a promising approach to bullying prevention.

SHIFTING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION TO SCHOOL COUNSELORS

Another aspect of bullying programs that can pose a barrier to implementation is that both comprehensive and brief bystander interventions often rely heavily on teachers to instruct students through the context of their classroom setting (Andreou et al., 2008; Menard & Grotpeter, 2014). Program implementation, however, may be better suited for school counselors. The American School Counselor Association (ASCA, 2012) model describes the role of school counselors as systemic change agents, improving student achievement through schoolwide initiatives, including programs that promote a safe learning environment. Thus, shifting program implementation to school counselors is both consistent with the role of school counselors and reduces demands that are placed on teachers.

THE STAC PROGRAM

The STAC intervention—components of which include stealing the show, turning it over, accompanying others, and coaching compassion—is a school-based, brief bystander intervention designed to be implemented by school counselors rather than taught through a teacher-delivered curriculum (Midgett, Doumas, Sears, Lundquist, & Hausheer, 2015). This program provides students with the necessary knowledge, skills, and confidence to become peer advocates against bullying by training bystanders to act as "defenders" (Midgett et al., 2015). Research suggests the STAC intervention is effective in teaching student bystanders strategies they can use to intervene on behalf of students who are victims of bullying (Midgett et al., 2015; Midgett & Doumas, 2016). Specifically, after completing the STAC program, both elementary school (Midgett & Doumas, 2016) and middle school (Midgett et al., 2015) students identified by school staff as school leaders reported an increase in their ability to identify different types of bullying behavior, knowledge of the STAC strategies, and general confidence intervening in bullying situations. Research also indicates that the STAC program has a positive impact on self-esteem (Midgett, Doumas, & Trull, 2016) and that using the STAC strategies to intervene in bullying incidents was perceived as taking a risk that was, in turn, associated with a more positive sense of self and positive values (Midgett, Moody, Rilley, & Lyter, in press). These studies provide support for the STAC intervention as a promising approach to bullying prevention and provide important information about training students to intervene when they observe bullying at school.

THE CURRENT STUDY

Research supports the effectiveness of brief bystander interventions on increasing rates of intervening behaviors among students witnessing bullying situations (Andreou et al., 2008). More recent research provides support for a brief counselor-led bystander intervention as a promising approach for bullying prevention that may also have a positive impact on the self-esteem of students trained to act as peer advocates for victims of bullying (Midgett et al., 2015; Midgett et al., 2016; Midgett, 2016; Midgett & Doumas, 2016). Missing from the literature, however, is the evaluation of the efficacy of a brief bystander intervention approach on decreasing rates of bullying perpetration among students who occasionally bully.

The purpose of this study is to extend the literature by evaluating the impact of a brief, bystander intervention program on students who occasionally engage in bullying behaviors. More specifically, this study investigates the efficacy of the STAC program on decreasing bullying perpetration by training students who occasionally bully to be peer advocates. Providing education about bullying and ways to intervene in bullying situations to students who bully may shift their identity from bully to peer advocate, thereby decreasing bullying behavior. To our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate the impact of a bystander intervention implemented with students with low rates of bullying behavior. Thus, this study presents an innovative approach to working with students who have a history of bullying by teaching these students an alternative set of skills that school staff typically teach to students who are bystanders.

To achieve this aim, we conducted a randomized controlled trial to evaluate the impact of the STAC intervention on students with a history of occasional bullying. We selected a randomized controlled design to employ a rigorous research methodology, control for confounding variables, and increase internal reliability (Erford, 2015). We investigated the following research question:

RQ1: Is the STAC intervention effective in decreasing rates of bullying perpetration among students who bully compared to a wait-list control group?

We hypothesized that elementary students in the intervention group would report a decrease in bullying perpetration behaviors at a 30-day follow-up compared to students in the wait-list control group.

METHODS

Participants

A sample of 54 elementary school students from a Northwestern school participated in this study. The researchers selected the school because the school counselor identified a need for a bullying intervention program and contacted the researchers to implement the STAC program. The sample included 66.7% males and 33.3% females, enrolled in fourth ($n = 19$), fifth ($n = 17$), and sixth ($n = 18$) grades. Participants ranged in age from nine to 12 years old ($M = 10.12$ and $SD = 0.97$), with reported racial backgrounds 62.3% White, 11.3% Hispanic, 7.5% African American, 5.7% Asian, 3.8% Native American, 7.5% of mixed race, and 1.9% other.

Procedure

The school counselor selected 72 students to participate in the program. Along with input from teachers, the school counselor selected students she identified as having a history of bullying other students occasionally (i.e., less than once a week), lacking impulse control, and lacking effective social skills. After students were selected, the school counselor briefly met with each student to discuss potential interest in the program. Of the 72 identified students, 62 (86.1%) students expressed interest.

The school counselor sent interested students home with an informed consent document to be signed by a parent or guardian and returned to the school counselor. The school counselor followed up with a phone call to the parent or guardian when necessary. Of these 62 parents or guardians, 59 (95.2%) provided written consent for their child to participate. The school counselor then met with each of these students briefly to explain the research in more detail and collect student assent. All students with parental or guardian consent assented to participate. Once the school counselor provided the researchers with a list of eligible participants, the researchers randomly assigned identified elementary school students to the STAC intervention group or a wait-list control group. Students names were listed, and students were assigned a 1 (intervention group) or a 2 (control group). Of the 59 students with parental consent and student assent, three students were absent from school when baseline data were collected and an additional two students were absent during the 30-day follow-up assessment. Thus, we have a final sample of 54 students with complete pre- and posttest data.

Students in the sample completed a research packet at baseline and 30-day follow-up. To improve quality of data collection, research assistants who were graduate students in a master's in counselor education program read each item from every questionnaire to students. After completing the questionnaires at baseline, the intervention group completed a 75-minute training program during classroom time. Research assistants conducted the training in the school library. Following the training, students in the intervention group participated in two 15-minute, small group, follow-up meetings by grade level with either the first or third author. After completing the questionnaires at the 30-day follow-up, participants in the wait-list control group completed the 75-minute training program. The university's institutional review board (IRB) and the school district approved all study procedures.

Instruments

Bully perpetration was measured using the Forms of Bullying Scale—Perpetration (FBS-P; Shaw, Dooley, Cross, Zubrick, & Waters, 2013). The FBS-P is composed of 10 self-report items that measure the frequency of students' bullying perpetration behaviors. Examples include: "I teased someone in nasty ways," "I deliberately physically hurt or ganged up on someone," and "I tried to hurt someone by leaving them out of a group or by not talking to them." Students were asked to indicate how often they bullied another person either alone or in a group. Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*I did not do this*) to 5 (*Several times a week or more*). All items were summed to create a total scale score. The FBS-P has demonstrated reliability with alphas ranging from .85 to .91 (Shaw, Cross, & Zubrick, 2015; Shaw et al., 2013) and good convergent and discriminant validity (Shaw et al., 2013). Cronbach's alpha for the sample in the current study was $\alpha = .66$.

Demographic variables were measured at baseline using a standard demographic questionnaire. Questions included self-reported age, gender, year in school, and race or ethnic background.

The STAC Intervention

The STAC intervention is designed to train students to become peer advocates by intervening in bullying situations (for details, see Midgett et al., 2015). The researchers sent an e-mail to all graduate students enrolled in a master's of arts in counseling program, inviting them to volunteer and participate in the project. Eight graduate students who agreed to participate conducted the STAC program. The intervention is a 75-minute training session that includes didactic and experiential role-play components used to train the students in the four STAC strategies. The strategies include *stealing the show, turning it over, accompanying others*, and *coaching compassion* (Midgett et al., 2015; Midgett et al., 2016; Midgett, 2016). Following the training, the first and third authors conducted two 15-minute small-group meetings with students in the intervention group over the next 30 days.

The STAC Training

The 75-minute STAC training includes an audiovisual presentation with information about bullying and the STAC strategies followed by small-group exercises to engage students. Students are divided into groups by grade level where they practice the STAC strategies through role-play. At the end of the program, each student shares a favorite STAC strategy, signs a "the ends of bullying begins with me" petition, and receives a certificate of participation. The following STAC strategies are taught during the 75-minute training.

Stealing the Show

Stealing the show involves using humor to turn students' attention away from the bullying situation. Trainers teach peer advocates to use their sense of humor when they observe bullying to displace the attention away from the target. Trainers provide examples, such as advocates could tell a funny joke or pretend to trip by acting silly.

Turning It Over

Turning it over involves informing an adult about the situation and asking for help. During the training, students identify safe adults at school who can help. Students are taught always to turn it over if they observe physical bullying or if they are unsure as to how to intervene.

Accompanying Others

Accompanying others involves the peer advocate reaching out to the student who was targeted to communicate that what happened is not acceptable, that the student who was targeted is not alone at school, and that the peer advocate cares about that student. Trainers

teach this to students by providing examples of how they can use this strategy, such as approaching a peer who was targeted and inviting him or her to go for a walk during recess.

Coaching Compassion

Coaching compassion involves gently confronting the bully after the bullying incident to communicate that his or her behavior is unacceptable. In addition, the peer advocate encourages the student who bullied to consider what it would feel like to be the target in the situation, thereby fostering empathy toward the target. Peer advocates are encouraged to implement coaching compassion when they have a relationship with the student who bullied or if the student who bullied is in a younger grade and the peer advocate believes the bully will respect him or her.

Posttraining Groups

Students who participated in the STAC training met with the researchers for two 15-minute group meetings, groups separated by grade level, after the training was conducted. During these meetings, the researchers helped students recall the STAC strategies, discussed with students which strategies they had used, and asked whether the strategies seemed to be effective in stopping bullying. Further, the researchers answered any questions from students related to being a peer advocate and helped them brainstorm additional ways to implement the STAC strategies effectively. The researchers also discussed how students can link several strategies together and, when appropriate, work as a team to intervene during or after a bullying incident.

Intervention Fidelity

The first author created a STAC training video to train all graduate student involved in the project to conduct the STAC program. All students watched the training video prior to conducting the STAC intervention. The first author was also present at the 75-minute training to ensure the training was accurately delivered by the graduate student trainers. Futhermore, the first author developed a standard set of scripted questions used for the two 15-minute follow-up meetings. The first author led a debriefing session immediately after each follow-up meeting to ensure trainers had not deviated from the script.

Statistical Analysis

The authors conducted all analyses using SPSS, Version 21. Means and standard deviations for baseline and follow-up assessments of the bully perpetration are reported in Table 1. The researchers examined the outcome variable bully perpetration for skew and kurtosis at baseline and follow-up assessments to test for assumptions regarding normality of the variable distributions. The researchers did not identify any outliers, and variables were within the normal range. To determine whether student characteristics differed between the two groups, the researchers examined demographic differences between the groups with t tests for continuous variables and chi-square tests for categorical variables. The researchers

TABLE 1
Means and Standard Deviations for Bullying Perpetration by Group

Bully Perpetration	STAC Intervention		Wait-List Control	
	M	SD	M	SD
Baseline	11.44	1.65	11.48	2.17
Follow-up	10.52	0.98	11.15	1.77

Note. M = mean; *SD* = standard deviation.

found no significant differences in age, t (52) = 0.41, p = .68), or ethnicity, χ^2 (6) = 3.59, p = .73, between the two groups. However, the researchers found significantly more males in the intervention group (92.6%) than in the control group (40.7%), χ^2 (1) = 16.33, $p < .001$. Thus, the researchers included gender as a covariate in the subsequent analysis to control for gender effects. The researchers conducted a one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to examine differences in bully perpetration at the follow-up assessment controlling for gender and bully perpetration at the baseline assessment. The independent variable was group (intervention, control) and the covariates were gender and baseline bullying perpetration. Effect size was calculated by partial eta squared (η^2_p), with .01 considered small, .06 considered medium, and .14 considered large (Cohen, 1969); Richardson, 2011). The researchers set the significance level at $p < .05$.

RESULTS

Table 2 reports the results of the one-way ANCOVA analysis. As seen in Table 2, results indicated a significant group differences in bully perpetration at the follow-up assessment when controlling for gender and bully perpetration at baseline, F (1, 54) = 4.58, $p < .05$, η^2_p = .08. The effect size for group differences is medium. Examination of the means in Table 1 indicates that, at follow-up, students in the STAC intervention group reported significantly lower levels of bullying behavior relative to those in the control group.

TABLE 2
One-Way Analysis of Covariance Results for Bullying Perpetration

Source	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2_p
Intercept	1	72.24	39.84	> .001	.44
Gender	1	3.15	1.74	.19	.03
Baseline FBS-P	1	8.93	4.93	.03	.09
Group	1	8.31	4.58	.04	.08
Error	50	90.66			

Note. df = degrees of freedom; η^2_p = partial eta squared.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to extend the literature by evaluating the efficacy of a brief, counselor-led bystander intervention on decreasing rates of bullying perpetration among students who occasionally bully. To our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate the effects of training students with a history of bullying to act as peer advocates. Results provided support for our hypothesis that training students with a history of occasionally bullying to be peer advocates would reduce bullying behaviors. Specifically, we found lower levels of bully perpetration at the 30-day follow-up among students in the STAC intervention group compared to students in the wait-list control group. Although the actual difference between the follow-up scores was small, the effect size was in the medium range. Further, we consider any change in bullying behavior to be meaningful given the problems associated with bullying for both victims (Copeland et al., 2013; Holt et al., 2015; Juvonen et al., 2011; Nielsen et al., 2015; Rueger & Jenkins, 2014) and perpetrators (Kelly et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2011; Radliff et al., 2012; Renda et al., 2011).

This study extends the literature on brief bystander interventions by examining the efficacy of the STAC program in reducing bullying perpetration with students who have a history of occasionally bullying. Prior research indicates the STAC program is a promising approach to bullying prevention when implemented with students identified as school leaders (Midgett et al., 2015; Midgett et al., 2016; Midgett & Doumas, 2016; Midgett et al., in press). Results of this study suggest that training students who occasionally bully to become peer advocates may be also be an effective approach to decreasing bullying behavior. Findings from the current study are also consistent with research suggesting social skills training can be effective in reducing bullying behavior (Kõiv, 2012). Thus, programs that provide prosocial skills and support peer advocacy may be a promising approach for shifting students who occasionally bully away from bullying behaviors.

We can only speculate why training students who occasionally bully to be peer advocates was effective. One explanation is that when students with low rates of bullying are taught to defend victims of bullying, their identity may shift from being a "bully" to being an "advocate." This shift may change how they interact with peers, including decreasing rates of aggressive behavior in relation to peers with whom they have a power differential. Alternatively, by providing strategies to support victims of bullying, the STAC program may have changed student perceptions of victims, bullying behavior, or both, leading to a decrease in bullying perpetration. It is also possible that students' behavior shifted because the school counselor told them adults at school selected them because their teachers and school counselor believed they could make a positive contribution to the school. Thus, this communication may have impacted students' self-perceptions to identifying themselves as students who can make a positive difference.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

While this study fills a gap in the literature investigating brief bystander intervention programs, certain limitations should be considered. First, a relatively small sample size and largely White male sample limit the generalizability of the results. Future research with larger, more diverse samples, including more female participants, is needed to replicate results related to decreased bullying perpetration. In addition, the researchers did not randomly select participants; instead, the school counselors invited students to participate based on identification as students with low

rates of bullying behavior. Thus, selection procedures also limit the generalizability of the study results. Further, the duration of the follow-up was short (30 days), and future research should examine bullying behaviors over longer periods of time, particularly in light of other research suggesting short-term effects may not be sustained (Andreou et al., 2008).

Next, the researchers obtained information through self-report questionnaires, potentially leading to biased or distorted reporting, especially at the elementary school level. However, when researchers utilize unambiguous measures and take steps to help children understand what is being asked of them, children can provide accurate information about their life circumstances and behavior, including sensitive information such as bullying perpetration that can be unknown to adults and teachers (Scott, 2008). Therefore, we used a psychometrically validated measure of bullying behavior and the research assistants read the survey items to students and answered student questions to improve data quality. However, for this sample, the reliability coefficient for the FBS-P was lower ($\alpha = .66$) than prior studies ($\alpha = .85$ to .91), suggesting that students in this study may not have responded to the items in a consistent manner. Thus, readers should interpret the results of this study within this context. Further, the authors recommend using multiple measures of bullying behavior in future studies, including objective outcomes with observational measures, to increase the validity of the results.

Finally, although the current study represents an important first step in evaluating the efficacy of a brief bystander intervention with students with a history of occasional bullying, it is unclear why this type of intervention was effective with this population. As discussed, training students who occasionally bully to become peer advocates may have shifted the students' identity; alternatively, the intervention may have changed students' attitudes toward victims and bullying behavior. Future studies examining the mechanisms of change (i.e., mediators of the intervention) are warranted. In addition, results of this study are limited to students identified as having a limited history of bullying. Future research examining moderators of intervention effects, such as severity and/or frequency of bullying behavior, is also important to identify subgroups of students for whom the STAC intervention may be appropriate or effective.

Implications for Counselors

This study has practical implications for counselors working with students who occasionally bully. Because of the prevalence and wide-range problems associated with bullying, all 50 states within the United States have legislation that requires school personnel to intervene and protect students against school bullying (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2015). Although comprehensive, schoolwide programs are considered a best practice for bullying intervention (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011), these programs can be difficult to implement because they can require extensive resources and time commitment from schools and often rely heavily on teachers for program implementation. The STAC program, which is brief, cost-effective, and implemented by school counselors, can serve as an alternative to comprehensive programs, thereby increasing accessibility to a broader range of schools. School counselors can utilize the STAC program to reduce school bullying by teaching students who occasionally bully the STAC strategies, instilling in these students a belief that, instead of bullying, they can act in a prosocial manner and make a positive impact on the school's culture. Furthermore, the implications can also extend to counselors working with children and adolescents outside the school setting.

Professional counselors can teach clients who occasionally bully the STAC strategies as an alternative approach to interacting with peers to help combat the problem of bullying.

CONCLUSION

This study evaluated the efficacy of a brief, school-based, counselor-led bystander bullying intervention for elementary school students who occasionally bully. Results indicated the STAC intervention was effective in decreasing bullying perpetration behaviors for students who participated in the intervention group compared to students in a wait-list control group. Overall, results suggest the STAC intervention is a promising approach to bullying intervention that places a low demand on schools and establishes counselors as leaders in program implementation.

REFERENCES

American School Counselor Association (ASCA). (2012). *ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.

Andreou, E., Didaskalou, E., & Vlachou, A. (2008). Outcomes of a curriculum-based anti-bullying intervention program on students' attitudes and behavior. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 13, 235–248. doi:10.1080/13632750802442110

Brank, E., 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

Cohen, J. (1969). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Copeland, W. E., Wolke, D., Angold, A., & Costello, E. J. (2013). Adult psychiatric outcomes of bullying and being bullied by peers in childhood and adolescence. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 70(4), 419–426. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2013.504

Erford, B. T. (2015). *Research and evaluation in counseling* (2nd ed.). Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.

Garandeau, C. F., Poskiparta, E., & Salmivalli, C. (2014). Tackling acute cases of school bullying in the KiVa anti-bullying program: A comparison of two approaches. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 42, 981–991. doi:10.1007/s10802-014-9861-1

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

Holt, M. K., Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., Polanin, J. R., Holland, K. M., DeGue, S., Matjasko, J. L. . . . Reid, G. (2015). Bullying and suicidal ideation and behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Pediatrics*, 135(2), e496–e509. doi:10.1542/peds.2014-1864

Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2006). Examining the relationship between low empathy and bullying. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32(6), 540–550. doi:10.1002/ab.20154

Juvonen, J., Wang, Y., & Espinoza, G. (2011). Bullying experiences and compromised academic performance across middle school grades. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 31, 152–173. doi:10.1177/0272431610379415

Kelly, E. V., Newton, N. C., Stapinski, L. A., Slade, T., Barrett, E. L., Conrod, P. J., & Teesson, M. (2015). Suicidality, internalizing problems, and externalizing problems among adolescent bullies, victims, and bully-victims. *Preventive Medicine*, 73, 100–105. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2015.01.020

Kim, M. J., Catalano, R. F., Haggerty, K. P., & Abbott, R. D. (2011). Bullying at elementary school and problem behaviour in young adulthood: A study of bullying, violence, and substance use from age 11 to age 21. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 21(2), 136–144. doi:10.1002/cbm.804

KiVa Antibullying. (2014). Frequently asked questions. Retrieved from http://www.kivaprogram.net/faq

Kõiv, K. (2012). Attachment styles among bullies, victims, and uninvolved adolescents. *Psychology Research*, 2(3), 160–165.

Menard, S., & Grotpeter, J. K. (2014). Evaluation of bully-proofing your school as an elementary school antibullying intervention. *Journal of School Violence*, *13*(2), 188–209. doi:10.1080/15388220.2013.840641

Midgett, A. (2016). Bullying: How counselors can intervene. *Counseling Today*, *58*(12), 39–43.

Midgett, A., & Doumas, D. (2016). Training elementary school students to intervene as peer-advocates to stop bullying at school: A pilot study. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health*, *11*(3–4), 353–365. doi:10.1080/15401383.2016.1164645

Midgett, A., Doumas, D., Sears, D., Lundquist, A., & Hausheer, R. (2015). A bystander psychoeducational program with middle school students: A preliminary report. *The Professional Counselor*, *5*(4), 486–500. doi:10.15241/am.5.4.486

Midgett, A., Doumas, D., & Trull, R. (2016). Evaluation of a bystander bullying intervention program for elementary school students. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Midgett, A., Moody, S., Rilley, B., & Lyter, S. (in press). The phenomenological lived experience of student-advocates acting as "defenders" to stop bullying. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling*.

Nakamoto, J., & Schwartz, D. (2010). Is peer victimization associated with academic achievement? A meta-analytic review. *Social Development*, *19*, 221–242. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9507.2009.00539.x

Nielsen, M. B., Tangen, T., Idsoe, T., Matthiesen, S. B., & Mageroy, N. (2015). Post-traumatic stress disorder as a consequence of bullying at work and at school: A literature review and meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *21*, 17–24. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2015.01.001

Niemelä, S., Brunstein-Klomekb, A., Sillanmäkic, L., Heleniusc, H., Pihad, J., Kumpulainene, K., ... Souranderd, A. (2011). Childhood bullying behaviors at age eight and substance use at age 18 among males: A nationwide prospective study. *Addictive Behaviors*, *36*(3), 256–260. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2010.10.012

Olweus, D. (1993). Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do. *Psychology in the Schools*, *40*(6), 699–700. doi:10.1002/pits.10114

O'Moore, M., & Kirkham, C. (2001). Self-esteem and its relationship to bullying behavior. *Aggressive Behavior*, *27*(4), 269–283. doi:10.1002/ab.1010

Petrosino, A., Guckenburg, S., DeVoe, J., & Hanson, T. (2010). *What characteristics of bullying, bullying victims, and schools are associated with increased reporting of bullying to school officials?* (Issues and Answers Report, REL 2010–No. 092). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast and Islands. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs

Radliff, K. M., Wheaton, J. E., Robinson, K., & Morris, J. (2012). Illuminating the relationship between bullying and substance use among middle and high school youth. *Addictive Behaviors*, *37*(4), 569–572. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2012.01.001

Renda, J., Vassallo, S., & Edwards, B. (2011). Bullying in early adolescence and its association with anti-social behavior, criminality, and violence 6 and 10 years later. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, *21*, 117–127. doi:10.1002/cbm.805

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

Rueger, S. Y., & Jenkins, L. N. (2014). Effects of peer victimization on psychological and academic adjustment in early adolescence. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *29*, 77–88. doi:10.1037/spq0000036

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 and Adolescent Psychology*, *40*, 668–676. doi:10.1080/15374416.2011.597090

Scott, J. (2008). Children as respondents: The challenges for quantitative methods. In P. Christensen & A. James (Eds.), *Research with children: Perspectives and practices* (2nd ed., pp. 87–108). New York, NY: Routledge.

Shaw, T., Cross, D., & Zubrick, S. R. (2015). Testing for response shift bias in evaluations of school antibullying programs. *Evaluation Review*, *39*(6), 527–554. doi:10.1177/0193841X16629863

Shaw, T., Dooley, J. J., Cross, D., Zubrick, S. R., & Waters, S. (2013). The Forms of Bullying Scale (FBS): Validity and reliability estimates for a measure of bullying victimization and perpetration in adolescence. *Psychological Assessment*, *25*(4), 1045–1057. doi:10.1037/a0032955

Tokunaga, R. S. (2010). Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of research on cyberbullying victimization. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *26*, 277–287. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2009.11.014

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 Education Statistics. (2015). *Student reports of bullying and cyber-bullying: Results from the 2013 School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey* (NCES 2015-056). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2015056

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2016). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2014* (NCES 2015-072). Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=719

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). Student reports of bullying and cyber-bullying: Results from the 2013 school crime supplement to the national crime victimization survey. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2013/2013329.pdf

Wang, J., Nansel, T. R., & Iannotti, R. J. (2011). Cyber bullying and traditional bullying: Differential association with depression. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *48*(4), 415–417. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2010.07.012