

Violence and victimization among schoolchildren. Bullying: identification and intervention based on the Bull-S Test.

Fuensanta Cerezo

Dept. of Developmental and Educational Psychology,
University of Murcia

Spain

fcerezo@um.es

Abstract

The report by the Ombudsman on violence in schools –bullying- served to highlight that there are instances of abuse and violent behaviour among schoolchildren at the majority of educational institutions (AA.VV., 2000). From contacts with experts in teaching, we know that this phenomenon is frequently only made known to the educational community when, unfortunately, it is too late, i.e. when aggressive behaviour and victimization have set in, and with dramatic effects.

A number of studies have described bullying as a manifestation of bad interpersonal relations between students (Sutton & Smith, 1999; Ortega, 1994). In an attempt to delve more deeply into this issue, we look at the possible influences of the network of relations within the class, and deliberate to what extent the victim is a victim of not only the attacks of the aggressor but also of the social climate prevailing within the group, which being a closed system excludes the victim and gives importance to the aggressor (Cerezo, Calvo & Sánchez, 2004).

Since the earliest research, we have sought techniques for prompt detection of bullying which also serve as a basis for the development of intervention programmes. We proposed the design of the Bull test as a tool to inform on the social and affective reality of the class group and on the involvement of its members in bullying. It would also point to some characteristics – personal, social interaction - of the students in the group. The Bull-S Test for assessment of aggression levels among school pupils (Cerezo 2000), is a valid tool to detect, measure and assess instances of aggression among school children. Based on Sociometric methodology and using peer nomination, it analyses the internal structure of the classroom under the following criteria: acceptance-rejection, aggression–victimization and the appreciation of certain personal characteristics that may be associated with those pupils directly involved. The test has three aims: (a) to facilitate analysis of socio-affective characteristics of the peer group; (b) to help teachers detect situations of abuse among pupils; and(c) based on results, to further develop intervention proposals.

This paper summarizes the characteristics of the tool and its applicability. It includes an intervention proposal for a group of students, drawn up on the basis of the analysis of the Bull-S test.

Key words: *Bullying. Assessment of bullying. Intervention strategies.*

Introduction

Experience has shown that violence among school children is a fact, and it would seem that we have all the ingredients to justify it: “it has always happened”; “it’s not as bad as it seems”; “children have to learn to defend themselves”. Furthermore, our social environment presents violence as a way of behaving which is both valued and considered attractive – witness the content of best selling games and box office hits, not to mention what is on television. Instances of violence among school children go beyond isolated episodes of aggression and victimization. They are evidence of a prolonged imbalance of strength which is resolved in a non socialized way, with the victim systematically suffering the aggressions of another to the extent that they become the habitual victim of the other. The position of defencelessness is highly contagious in the perception of victimization, and generally extends rapidly to the peer group, leading the victim to perceive the whole school environment as hostile, with subsequent development of serious anxiety problems. Meanwhile, the aggressor grows in antisocial behaviour, leading to social exclusion and paving the way towards delinquency.

Bullying was the term adopted by Dan Olweus (1993) to define a specific type of mistreatment among school children. It is characterized by its intentional and persistent practice on the part of a student or group of students towards another student. It is unprovoked and allows for no response. These aggressors or bullies are usually motivated by the desire for power, to intimidate, to dominate or, on occasions merely for amusement. The victim is defenceless, with no possibility of response or of support. The aggressions need not be physical, these may even be the least frequent, as is the case in Secondary Schools (between 5% and 7%). Verbal aggressions are far more frequent. These include insults, threats, spreading rumours aimed at undermining esteem, etc. (over 30%) and even exclusion and ostracizing (around 20%). Less frequent are attacks on personal property (7%) or sexual harassment (2%) (AA.VV, 2000).

Among factors which influence the development of such behaviours, the social model provided by adults in the school and family environments is of high relevance, and without doubt the major factor is having experienced bullying, whether personally or as an

onlooker, as Barudy (1998) reports. However, manifestations of bullying require an appropriate setting, and this is the class group. Within peer groups, interpersonal relations which make up the roles and status of the members are transcendental. Groups are structured according to specific affective and relational components which serve as basic elements in assigning certain behavioural norms (Roland & Galloway, 2002). If we see bullying as a group phenomenon, then the analysis of social relations among pupils is essential to our understanding of how far reaching it is.

These approaches suggest that the effects of victimization go beyond the specific situation and may even shape the perception of the behaviour by those not involved, insofar as when an individual is the victim of systematic aggression from another, he becomes not only the victim of the aggressor's attacks but of his whole social environment (Gifford-Smith & Brownell, 2003). Likewise, the aggressor is in a continual state of alert. Studies have confirmed that aggressor students have a greater social ascendancy and are therefore more highly considered by at least a considerable number of their peers, while victims are attributed aspects which, to some extent, favour situations of defencelessness, since they are excluded from games and activities. Earlier research has led us to highlight aspects such as social ascendancy and the level of social relations as relevant in the origins and development of bullying conducts (Cerezo, 2001b; Cerezo, Calvo & Sánchez, 2004).

The Ombudsman's Report (AA.VV. 2000) highlighted that bullying has been detected in more than 50% of educational institutions and in more than half of the students. Recent studies confirm that instances of bullying among schoolchildren occur at almost all schools; between 25 and 40% of students are involved (boys more than girls) and especially in the last years of Primary School and the first years of Secondary. It is worrying that adults are generally poorly informed and that victims suffer continual abuse, and hardly anyone is ever informed about their situation (Cerezo, 2005). Of course, bullies and onlookers ensure that the events are not made known to teachers or parents, while those suffering the attacks feel so defenceless, ashamed and afraid that they are hard pressed to confide in anyone, even if they knew who to turn to. They feel threatened by their group of classmates.

We are thus faced with a two-fold problem; on the one hand we have the aggressor, who is strengthened by the situation, and on the other hand, the victim, who spirals towards exclusion (Leary, Kowalski, Smith & Phillis, 2003). The behaviours are perceived so differently that we can put forward a psychological profile associated with each. It may be that the approach is over simplistic, given that the reasons for belonging to one side or another may vary from subject to subject; indeed, some subjects on occasions belong to both profiles--the so called bully-victims (Olweus, 1993) who respond to being bullied by bullying others (Salmivalli & Nieminen, 2002)--but the approach may be useful in finding a general categorization (Cerezo, 1997).

Thus, in our evaluation of bullying, we understand that we are not facing a phenomenon with similar characteristics for all involved; rather, we are dealing with at least two types of very different problem characteristics: the perpetrator of the aggression, or *bully*, and the receiver, i.e. the *victim* (although a student may, on occasions, play both roles). At the same time, we have to evaluate to what extent the rest of the group, the onlookers, accept, support or sanction such attitudes.

Assessment of bullying therefore presents two perspectives: an individual one, where much information is gathered about:

- a) Personal aspects of the subjects involved.
- b) Academic aspects.
- c) Levels of defencelessness/aggression and behavioural assessment
- d) Aspects relating to interpersonal relations.
- e) Assessment of the family environment.
- f) Assessment of the school environment.

And a group perspective which analyses the peer group as a whole and gathers information on:

- a) Detection of students directly involved and in a risk situation.
- b) Sociometric analysis of the group, the configuration of affinity groups and the place occupied by the students involved.

- c) How the group evaluates the students involved.
- d) The type, frequency and habitual venues of aggression.
- e) Perception of danger and/or safety within the school.

There are basically two types of questionnaires used in assessing bullying: those which seek to analyse the incidence of the problem in an anonymous or general way, with emphasis on repercussions of the phenomenon on each subject, taken as observer, victim or aggressor (Olweus, 1993), and those which take a more individual view of the problem, using personalized surveys or projective situations. Among the former, noteworthy for its widespread use in Europe is the Dan Olweus questionnaire, which uses Likert type scales and closed multiple choice questions. It collects information anonymously about the characteristics of the aggressions and their protagonists. Correction is a laborious task and, moreover, there is a lack which is crucial in this type of situations - the study of the socio-affective structure of the group. Other tools which seek to overcome the drawbacks mentioned are too specific and too reduced. They gather very limited information, although they are considered useful in pre-surveys. It is therefore necessary to set up further sessions to complete the information, as occurs with those prepared by Smith and Sharp (1994). The majority of these have been adapted. Perhaps the most significant in our country is Ortega's (1994) adaptation of the questionnaire by Olweus called "Questionnaire on threatening attitudes and social rejection among schoolchildren".

Recent studies carried out in our country have proposed the use of specific tools. Díaz-Aguado, Martínez and Martín (2004), and have drawn up a *Questionnaire on attitudes towards Diversity and Violence (CADV)*, made up of 71 elements related to: belief on diversity and violence, goodwill towards minority groups and towards cooperative work. This questionnaire is aimed at attitude assessment but it offers elements for analysing the socio-affective relations within the class group. It is moreover, appropriate for Secondary School students, and it can, therefore, be considered as a tool which provides additional information about bullying. From a perspective of projecting, Cristina del Barrio's team (Del Barrio, Almeida, Van der Meulen, Barrios, & Gutiérrez, 2003) designed a tool based on theoretical and methodological interests (*SCAN-bullying*), which takes the form of a comic strip that recounts a story of bullying through abuse of power in a primary school.

Through personal interviews, students were asked how they perceived the nature of the relationship, the emotional attributions and the solution strategies. As the authors indicate, the aim is methodological, for research, and as such is not very appropriate for application outside that context.

The Bull-S Test. Characteristics of the material.

The Bull-S Test is a questionnaire for collective application. It has been drawn up especially to measure aggressiveness among peers within school contexts. It centres on the analysis of the internal structure of the classroom and gathers information from a twin perspective: that of the students and that of their teachers (types A and P). Its methodological approach is from Sociometrics, defined as "the study of the organization and evolution of groups and of the positions which individuals occupy within them, without taking into account the internal structure of each individual" (Moreno, 1972).

Within this complex network, we find that students who are immersed in the aggression-victimization issue usually show distorted interpretations and are generally subjects who are not well esteemed, are rejected in most cases, or even ostracized. The group itself generates a social climate which favours this dynamic by covering up instances of abuse and by showing little concern for the victims (Cerezo, 1997; Gifford-Smith & Brownell, 2003; Sheridan, Buhs & Warnes, 2003).

The Bull-S test is made up of 15 items and is designed around three categories of information: the study of the internal structure of the classroom, through acceptance-rejection criteria, made up of four items obtained through *peer nomination*; bullying – from six items related to the characteristics associated with the subjects involved; and a third category, related to situational aspects, with a Likert format..

Type P (Teachers) seeks to ascertain to what extent teachers concur with students in their interpretation of bullying.

Technical Specifications

Name: BULL-S TEST. Measuring aggressiveness among school children.

Types: A (Students) and P (Teachers)

Author: Fuensanta Cerezo Ramírez

Administration: Type A, collective. Type P, individual

Duration: 25 to 30 minutes

Application: Type A ages 7 to 16 (Primary and Secondary). Type P for teachers.

Significance: Analysis of the socio-affective characteristics of the group. Detection of those involved and of situational aspects in aggression relations among peers

Measurement scales: Sociogram of the group. Individual sociometric position. Cut-off points for significant values of aggression and victimization variables. Frequencies and percentages in situational aspects.

Material: Copy of the questionnaires in versions A and P for annotation. Blackboard, class register. Data can be stored on CD-Rom for computerized handling.

Validity and Reliability of the test

Using variables related to Aggression and Victimization, the Cronbach alpha for $n = 322$ was .73 and it gave a similar score in for different age, sex and class groups (values were between .69 and .75). This value increased considerably when the items on aggressive behaviors were separated from those related to victimization behaviors. For the former, the estimated alpha value was .82 and for the latter .83

Factorial validation with Varimax rotation using analysis of main components accounted for 75.6% of the total variance and showed two polarized components. One of these grouped Cowardice, Victimization and Can't Stand Someone (with mean values of .86), while the other factor grouped: Physical strength, Provoking and Aggressiveness (with mean values of .84). By joining the two sociometric categories to bullying, the Cronbach alpha was .68 and the explained variance stood at 76.8% of the total, and had three components: the first, clearly associated to the victim grouped together Rejection, Cowardice, Victimization and Can't Stand Someone (explained mean variance .78); the second factor was associated to the bully

and groups together Physical Strength, Aggressiveness and Provocation (explained mean variance .85); and the third factor which contained only one item, Acceptance, that could be associated to those not involved, and with an explained variance of -.96. These values place the validity and reliability of the test within very acceptable limits.

Interpretative analysis of the Bull-S test.

The detailed analysis given below refers to Type - A. The elements have been grouped in their different categories.

CATEGORY I: Sociometric position. The first category groups together the items that investigate the socio-affective structure of the group. The items comprising this category are: 1. Chosen, 2. Rejected, 3. Being chosen (expectation) and 4. Being rejected (expectation). It provides information on three aspects or dimensions: The sociometric situation, the informal structure of the group and the level of cohesion of its members.

The sociometric situation or the social status of each student in the group evaluates the degree of acceptance of each member from a triple perspective:

- a) Each student's relationship to the whole class-group, which gives values which allow the student to be classified according to their degree of acceptance or rejection under the categories of: leader, isolated, rejected, etc. It also allows calculation of popularity and antipathy. In general, it informs on how much the student fits into the peer group.
- b) Social expectations. Three levels of acceptance are established on comparing the total choices made by the subject with the expected total: High sociability, when the total of the choices made exceeds the expectation; Low sociability, when more choices were expected than were made; and the balanced subject, when the total number of choices expected concurred with the number actually made.
- c) The analysis of these items broadens our knowledge of the influence of some factors, such as sex and age, in the choices or rejections of members, and also indicates the repercussion that a leader or star has in the group.

When interpreting the results, we will take into account the following:

1. Values HIGHER than the upper limit will be significantly positive. These students will then be popular or rejected, according to the variable we have used.
2. Values BELOW the lower limit will be significantly negative. These students will be isolated or non representative.
3. The values falling between the upper and lower limits will not be significant.

Concerning group structure, concatenation of the members of the group who, on the basis of attraction or rejection, form a sociometric network, reveals the existence of groups and sub-groups: circles of friends, couples, threesomes, stars, etc. Finally, it allows us to ascertain the Level of Cohesion or the degree to which the members feel motivated to remain within the group. The analysis of this dimension as a whole confirms that most of the subjects are well situated, i.e. their expectations concurred with their status and role within the group. However, those students immersed in the aggression-victimization situation usually show distortions in their social perception and generally enjoy little recognition, are rejected or isolated (Cerezo, 2001a).

CATEGORY II: *Bullying*: (Items 5-10). The second category informs on interpersonal aspects in the aggression-victimization relation. The items which make it up are: 5. Strong, 6. Coward, 7. Aggressive, 8. Victim, 9. Provokes, 10. Abhorrence. Its analysis informs us about the elements of the aggression-victimization relation among school children, and specifies: the incidence of the problem and the subjects directly involved, the repercussions or support received by the subjects from the rest of the group and the group's perception of them in conditions which favour the bullying dynamic.

As for the repercussions of the Bully-Victim dynamic within the group, the analysis encompasses the individual perspective of the subjects involved, highlighting the influence of the group as a whole on these types of conduct. It takes note of support given to the aggressor or *bully*, the degree of acceptance and the recognition of strength. It also discerns the incidence of markedly negative affect toward the victim, which leads to isolation of the victim and to a strong feeling of rejection, such as not being able to stand him or her.

From a group perspective, the analysis shows the network of interpersonal relationships, and so one can observe the forming of gangs or small subgroups around the *bully*.

The analysis of specific aspects of the bullying dynamic which are associated with the aggressor and the victim provide us with information on the subjects who, in the opinion of at least 25% of the group, either stand out or do not for each item. Studying these reveals the extent of abuse situations which are understood as a bipolar relation of aggressiveness and victimization among schoolchildren. Items 5, 7 and 9 mark those characteristics associated with the aggressor profile, while items 6, 8, and 10 correspond to those associated with the victim. On occasions we find subjects who score significantly in items 9 and 10. These are the so called bully-victims. Another aspect that we can highlight is the social representation that the group forms regarding the subjects involved in the bully-victim dynamic, with evaluations of how far the group justifies or approves such situation.

CATEGORY III: Situational Aspects. This is made up by items 11. Type, 12. Place, 13. Frequency, 14. Topography, and 15. Safety.

This category gathers specific elements of abuse situations, it specifies the form that these adopt, where they usually occur, how frequently they occur and the degree of seriousness attributed to them. Analysis can be performed at two levels: Individual, which gives information on the feelings of each individual within the group and how each values the problem, or at the Group level, by converting the individual scores into percentages. This will give information on the group's vision of the most common forms of aggression, their frequency and where the aggressions usually occur. We will also obtain the mean value assigned to bullying (seriousness ascribed) and the perceived level of safety at the school.

Proposals for generalization and use of the Bull-S test

When we consider how to intervene in abuse situations among school children, we need to establish certain basic elements in the programme, to provide knowledge about the specific situation at the school, and to favour a shared anti-aggression posture to oppose bullying. Teachers, parents and students must explicitly reflect the principles and norms of conduct in effect and which are to be followed equally by all the school community. All groups related to the school must be involved in the preparation of a guide to prevent and correct problems arising from coexistence, and which should include procedures and systems for preventing and responding to aggression situations. It should also clearly establish the principles of agreement in terms of objectives to be met by all involved.

Five consecutive levels are laid down in the intervention programme:

- Raising awareness of the problem in students, teachers and parents.
- A period of consultation and information gathering.
- Drawing up the programme by means of class meetings and general agreements.
- Communication of the plan to the whole community and acquiring commitment to observe it.
- Roll out, review and maintenance

The Bull-S test can serve as a tool in the information gathering stage and this contributes efficiently to the preparation of specific norms for intervention. An example outline is given in the annex.

The Bull-S test has been used in groups of school children from the different autonomous communities of Spain and has been translated into Basque, Catalan and Galician. The English version has been used as a tool for comparative analysis between Spanish and English students (Cerezo & Ato, 2005).

References

- AA.VV. (2000). *Violencia escolar: El maltrato entre iguales en la educación secundaria*. [Bullying in secondary education.] Oficina del Defensor del Pueblo. Madrid
- Barudy, J. (1998). *El dolor invisible. Una lectura ecosistémica del maltrato infantil*. [The invisible pain. An ecosystemic reading of bullying in childhood.] Barcelona: Paidós.
- Cerezo, F. (1997). *Conductas agresivas en la edad escolar*. [Aggressive behaviors during school age.] Madrid: Pirámide
- Cerezo, F. (2000). *El Test Bull-S. Instrumento para la evaluación de la agresividad entre escolares*. [The Bull-S Test. An instrument for evaluating aggressiveness among schoolchildren.] Albor-Cohs. Madrid
- Cerezo, F. (2001a). *La violencia en las aulas. Análisis y Propuestas de Intervención*. [Violence in the classroom. Analysis and Proposals for Intervention.] Madrid: Pirámide.
- Cerezo, F. (2001b). Variables de personalidad asociadas a la dinámica bullying. (Agresores versus víctimas) en niños y niñas de 10 a 15 años. [Personality variables associated with the bullying dynamic (bullies vs. victims) in boys and girls from 10 to 15 years of age.] *Anales de Psicología*, 17 (1), 37-44.
- Cerezo, F. (2002). El bullying y su relación con las actitudes de socialización en una muestra de adolescentes. [Bullying and its relationship to socialization attitudes in a sample of adolescents.] *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*, 5 (1). www.aufop.org/publica/reifp/02v5ni.asp
- Cerezo, F. (2005). La violencia en la escuela en España. [Violence at school in Spain.] Presentation given at the IX *Seminario Internacional sobre Biología y Sociología de la Violencia*. Centro Reina Sofía para el Estudios de la Violencia. Valencia. Conference proceedings (203-209).
- Cerezo, F & Ato, M. (2005) Bullying in Spanish and English pupils. A sociometric perspective using the Bull-S Questionnaire. *Educational Psychology*, 25(4), 353-368.
- Cerezo, F.; Calvo, A. & Sánchez, C. (2004). Bullying y estatus social en el grupo-aula en una muestra de escolares. [Bullying and social status in the class group in a sample of schoolchildren.] Talk presented at the IV *Congreso Internacional de Psicología y Educación*. Almería, March 30-April 2, 2004. Conference proceedings.
- Del Barrio, C. Almeida, A, Van der Meulen, K.; Barrios, A. & Gutiérrez, H. (2003). Representaciones acerca del maltrato entre iguales, atribuciones emocionales y percepción de estrategias de cambio a partir de un instrumento narrativo: SCAN-

- Bullying. [Representations about bullying, emotional attributions and perception of change strategies based on a narrative instrument: SCAN-bullying.] *Infancia y Aprendizaje*, 26 (1), 63-78.
- Díaz-Aguado, M. J.; Martínez, R. y Martín, G. (2004). *La violencia entre iguales en la escuela y en el ocio. Estudios comparativos e instrumentos de evaluación.* [Violence among peers at school and during leisure time.] Instituto de la Juventud. Madrid
- Gifford-Smith, M.E. & Brownell, C.A. (2003). Childhood peer relationships: social acceptance, friendships, and peer networks. *Journal of School Psychology*, 41, 235-284.
- Leary, M. R.; Kowalski, R. M.; Smith, L. & Phillis, S. (2003). Teasing, rejection and violence: Case studies of school shootings. *Aggressive Behavior*, 29 (3) 202-214.
- Moreno, J. L. (1972). *Fundamentos de Sociometría.* [Fundamentals of Sociometry.] Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Olweus, D. (1993): *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do.* Oxford. Blackwell. Translation: *Conductas de acoso y amenaza entre escolares.* Madrid. Morata 1998.
- Ortega, R. (1994). Violencia interpersonal en los centros educativos de enseñanza secundaria. Un estudio sobre el maltrato y la intimidación entre compañeros. [Interpersonal violence at secondary education schools. A study on abuse and intimidation among classmates.] *Revista de Educación*, 304, 55-67
- Roland, E. & Galloway, D. (2002). Classroom influences on bullying. *Educational Research*, 44, 299-312
- Salmivalli, C. & Nieminen, E. (2002). Proactive and reactive aggression among school bullies, victims, and bully-victims. *Aggressive Behavior*, 28, 30-44.
- Sheridan, S.M.; Buhs, E.S. & Warnes, E.D. (2003). Childhood peer relationships in context. *Journal of School Psychology*, 41, 285-292.
- Smith, P. K. & Sharp, S. (1994). *Practical Approaches to Bullying.* London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Sutton, J. & Smith, P.K. (1999). Bullying as a group process: An adaptation of the participant role approach. *Aggressive Behavior*, 25, 97-111

ANNEX.

Example of a report using the Bull-S.

School: Located in the outskirts of a town with over 50,000 inhabitants

Class: 6th year Primary

Date: March 2005

Analysis of the study of socio-affective relationships among the group of schoolchildren.

1. Structure and cohesion level of the group.

The group was made up of 30 11- and 12-year-old students (20 boys and 10 girls).

1 popular student, number 17 (boy), and 4 isolated students were observed. Rejected students were numbers 15 and 19 (boys) and number 1 (girl). Number 5 (boy) showed a tendency to be rejected.

Level of cohesion was 37.5, indicating a low predisposition towards group membership feelings, and hence, disconnection between the members.

2. Incidence of Bullying:

- Presence and characteristics. 2 aggressor students were detected (numbers 15 and 10, males), one victim (number 12), and one bully-victim (number 28).
- Level of Safety. The majority of the group feel safe within the school, although 11.11% confess to feeling Hardly or Not At All safe at school, while 22.22% felt Reasonably Safe. In other words, a third of the students felt some risk to their safety at the school. Importance attributed by the students to aggressions was: Hardly or Not At All Serious: 33.4%; Fairly Serious: 41%; Quite Serious: 18.6 % and Very Serious: 4%.
- Frequency of aggressions. Percentages show frequency of aggressions as perceived by students:
Everyday: 77.8%; Once or twice a week: 15%; Seldom: 7.5%; Never: 3.5%
- Most common types of aggression. In first place, students indicated *insults and threats* (78%); next, *rejection* (56%); then, *Other types* (41%), which included petty theft and deliberate damage to another's possessions, and, fourthly, *physical* (45%).

- Places where aggressions usually occur. First, the playground (74%); next, the classroom (30%), then Other places (29.6%) including the toilets, changing rooms and the school entrance, and finally, the corridors (37%).

3. Students at risk

a) Subjects bullied.

- One student, number 12, a boy of 11, showed a marked tendency to being a victim, and was perceived as such by 71% of his classmates. 52% could not stand him, while 23% considered him a coward. Curiously, he is only chosen by number 28, an aggressor, who may be using him as a support element of his own actions. The sociometric analysis points to the victim being isolated, is not sociable, scores very low in expectations of popularity and is also strongly rejected. The subject himself recognized he was a victim of abuse and that his classmates could not stand him. For him, the main form of aggression was insults and threats, followed by rejection, which occurred every day in the playground and in the classroom.

b) Subjects active in bullying.

- Subject number 15, a boy of 12, was considered strong (34%), aggressive (63%) and provocative (75%), an opinion which he shared in the case of strength, but not as an aggressor. Sociometrically, he appears as isolated and rejected, he offers low acceptance expectations and high rejection expectations. These data may be indicative of a reactive-aggressor. His affinity group is limited to subject number 3, who is considered one of the strongest by the majority of the group and who, in turn, relates to numbers 4 and 15, who are similarly perceived. This circumstance leads us to think that a subgroup of strong aggressors exists within the group.
- Subject number 10 was a boy of 12 who stood out as aggressive (34%) and provocative (23%). For the acceptance variable, he appears as isolated and with a certain tendency to be rejected. His affinity group was made up exclusively of subject number 15. Again the idea of the existence of a small network of relations formed around aggression and provocation is confirmed.

c) Bully-victim students

- Subject number 28, a boy of 11, was considered by his classmates and by himself as a victim (52%), someone others couldn't stand (41%) and a coward (45%), along with a certain tendency towards aggression and provocation, which places him between both types of behaviour: aggression and victimization. His affinity group was made up of subject number 12 (remember we are dealing here with a victim). As for his sociometric position, he was isolated and rejected. His tendency towards aggressiveness may be part of a response strategy to conflictive situations with his classmates, since his integration within the group was low.

4. Proposals for intervention. After analysis of the results of the evaluation and discussions with the teachers and students of the group, we move on to drawing up the intervention programme. First we define the responsibilities of the teachers, e.g. increased alertness in the recreational areas and especially inside the classroom. Moreover, since the image that the student has of himself influences his social behaviour, the results of the sociometric analysis mean that it is advisable to carry out actions to develop self-concept and social skills. Here the teachers must assume a great responsibility, since their own attitude will serve as a model for the rest of the group. It is important that the strategies and techniques employed are directed at changing the attitudes of victims and bullies as well as the attitude of the group towards these individuals. Commitment and collaboration are also necessary between the school and the families.

The programme is four-tiered, with each level containing strategies considered most appropriate and effective. The levels are:

4.1. Institutional. The School must consider it a priority to improve the educational climate within its classrooms. To do so it will generate and foster strategies such as:

- Regular staff meetings in which any situations detected will be analysed and educational intervention strategies proposed.
- The overseeing of communication with students involved and their families.

- Programming of specific activities such as round tables, film forum, etc., with participation of students, teachers, parents and experts, in order to assess, discuss, share ideas and to put forward educational intervention strategies.
- The encouragement of teacher participation in extramural fun activities to move beyond a simple teacher/student relationship and to foster communication and personal relations.
- Requesting the teachers to be more alert in the common spaces of the school.
- Promoting communication with the families.
- Being receptive towards any initiative which may favour coexistence within the school community.

4.2. The class group.

Given that the results of the questionnaire have revealed that the level of cohesion within the group is low and that there are quite a few isolated subjects, our proposal will aim at enhancing group feeling and at mitigating the bullying dynamic.

Before drawing up a definite plan we will investigate within the group as to what can be done to integrate isolated subjects, bullies and victims. The silence must be broken, as well as the acceptance of the conflictive situation and support for the bully.

The techniques we propose for inclusion in homeroom sessions are drawn up along the lines of Discussion Groups, Role-play or dramatization, Conflict Resolution and Techniques for cooperative learning.

4.3. At-risk students.

A specific programme is drawn up for each student involved in bullying: bullies, victims and bully-victims or those with a certain tendency towards aggressiveness.

As the evaluation showed, there are two students in the group who clearly suffer mistreatment from some of their peers (numbers 12 and 28), and number 28 can be considered a bully-victim. Similarly, the presence of two aggressors was detected (numbers 10 and 15). Before starting to work with these students, we will evaluate more precisely the characteristics of their situation at an academic, personal and family level. This information can be elicited from the homeroom teacher and, if necessary, with the help of the school

counsellor. A series of interviews with teachers, students and parents will be required. In general the following aspects will need to be taken into account:

1) Aspects to be worked on with the victims: In the preliminary interviews we will work on expressing feelings and we will investigate the possible reasons which the victims put forward to explain the situations. Specific strategies include: improving self-concept, training in conflict solving skills; expressing feelings; study and concentration strategies and strategies for developing positive attributional styles.

2) Aspects to be worked on with the aggressors. When working with these students we need to be very clear that our primary aim is that they stop bullying, while at the same time they should feel comfortable at school. The strategies, therefore, need to be focused on three points:

- Aggressive behaviour has no place in the pro-social code of conduct.
- The need to adopt appropriate behavioural models.
- A change in attitudes and behaviour.

In the preliminary interviews we will try to establish the reasons for the behaviour with special attention to those elements which might clarify their attitude to aggression.

The intervention strategies will address the following aspects: Assertiveness training; self-observation, self-inspection and self-regulation; problem solving; relaxation and study techniques.

3) Aspects to be worked on with the bully-victim. Aspects from the above models plus specific tasks to improve self-concept and training in social skills.

4) Joint work programme for the students involved. In order to consolidate a change in attitudes the subjects need to collaborate in the search for solutions to the problem and to involve themselves in improving relationships. This is the aim of this programme. Strategies employed are based on the mediation model, i.e. raising awareness of one's own feelings and those of the adversary, so that bonds of respect and communication can come into existence. Joint working sessions with the counsellor will be required. In these sessions

places and times will be established, as well as revisions of the plan and evaluation of results.