INVESTIGATING THE PREVALENCE AND IMPACT OF PEER ABUSE (BULLYING) ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF JAMAICA’S CHILDREN

Study commissioned by Child Development Agency
Conducted by PSearch Associates Co. Limited
Funded by: UNICEF Jamaica

July 2015
abstract

This study is aimed at identifying and assessing the intervening variables that contribute to bullying, while also developing profiles of both the bully and victims. Purpose-built qualitative and quantitative instruments were employed in a mixed methods study approach that sampled students and teachers from primary and secondary level schools across the island, as well as private and public stakeholder organisations. The research findings show that just over 60-65% of students have been bullied at some point in their lives, with almost all stakeholders agreeing that due to its prevalence and potential impact an immediate and effective response is necessary. Key recommendations include the development of a response initiative driven by inputs from stakeholder consultations to reduce bullying incidents within the education system, community spaces, residential child care facilities, and familial environments.
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Introduction

The insidious and pervasive problem of bullying has become a critical global issue which on the local level causes human suffering and negative ramifications for human resources, productivity, and economic growth, particularly in underdeveloped countries. The attention currently being directed at the bullying problem both locally and internationally varies among countries, as does a particular country’s cultural attitudes and reactions to bullying. However, an increase in the amount of attention and resources being marshalled to deal with the problem, particularly as it pertains to children and teenagers, might indicate a “tipping point” with regard to focusing global attention on addressing the problem of bullying in a collective way.

The Kandersteg Declaration against Bullying in Children and Youth (2007) estimates that 200 million children and youth are being abused by their peers. According to Currie et al. (2008), of the 202,056 children who participated in the Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC) 2005/06 Survey, a worldwide survey of the health behaviour of youth in approximately 40 countries, 12.6% (24,919) reported being victimized more than two or three times per month; 10.7% (21,192) reported bullying others two or three times per month; and 3.6% (7,136) reported that they were both victimized and bullied others (cited by the Kandersteg Declaration against Bullying in Children and Youth). Bullying is prevalent among youth but prevalence rates differ significantly across countries, likely due to cultural factors (Currie, et al., 2012).

INTERNATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF BULLYING

Experts agree that generally, behaviour that is considered to be bullying, involves four key elements: aggression or hostility; repetition of the negative behaviour; intention to harm; and a power imbalance between the parties. (Olweus, 1997; Dupage County Regional Office of Education et al., 2011; UNESCO 2011; Long and Alexander, 2010; CDC, 2014). However, some experts also make reference to behaviours that are not to be considered as bullying as part of their definitions. These include mutual arguments and disagreements; single episodes of social rejection or dislike; single episodes of acts of nastiness or spite; random acts of aggression or intimidation; and the expression of ideas or beliefs as long as the expression is not lewd, profane, or intended to intimidate or harass another. (KidSpot Australia, n.d.; Dupage County Regional Office of Education, 2011).

TYPES OF BULLYING

Bullying is characterized by a number of harmful behaviours that have been categorized in four ways (CDC, 2014, Stopbullying.gov; Storey et al., 2013; Olweus Bullying Prevention Programme, n.d.). These include verbal (e.g. name-calling, mocking, threatening), physical (e.g. kicking, spitting on, damaging or stealing another person’s property), social (e.g. ignoring, spreading gossip or rumours, making others feel foolish), and technological (e.g. using email, text messaging, social media, and any other electronic means to threaten or hurt someone’s feelings, single out, embarrass or make someone look bad, or reveal secrets about someone). These have also been characterised by UNICEF (2007) and Long and Alexander (2010) as being direct, indirect or through use of technology (also referred to as ‘Cyber Bullying’).

REASONS CHILDREN ARE BULLIED

According to Stopbullying.gov (n.d.), children who are at risk of being bullied include those who are perceived as different from their peers; perceived as weak or unable to defend
themselves; depressed, anxious, or have low self esteem; less popular than others and have few friends; and those who do not get along well with others, seen as annoying or provoking, or antagonize others for attention. Forms of bullying including racial, sexual, cyber and homophobic bullying have also been identified across the world.

**EFFECTS OF BULLYING**

Many bullies develop mental health challenges including attention-deficit disorder, depression, oppositional-conduct disorder, and if highly aggressive, may acquire personality defects such as an affinity toward physical aggression. In addition, they are more likely to become excessive drinkers and substance abusers as compared to victims or bully-victims. Under-achievement in school (in the short-term) and in the workplace (in the long-term); more criminal convictions and traffic violations; spousal and child abuse are other significant effects. (Smokowski and Kopaz, 2005; CDC, 2012; Olweus Bullying Prevention Program, n.d.)

Besides evidence of physical injury (bruises, cuts), torn clothing and damaged property, studies have shown that victims of bullying are highly likely to develop mental disorders that are categorized as internalized in the short-term. These include anxiety, depression, eating disorders, feelings of abandonment and loneliness, and suicidal ideation. At school, a victim’s academic performance tends to decline. In addition, since bullying often times occurs on the school’s premises, victims are reluctant or afraid to attend school resulting in chronic absenteeism/truancy and the development of psychosomatic symptoms such as headaches and stomach-aches, as they prepare for school in the mornings. At night, they may have difficulty sleeping and nightmares. (Smokowski and Kopaz, 2005; Gastic, 2008; CDC, 2012; Gini and Pozzoli, 2013; UNICEF, 2007; Olweus Bullying Prevention Program, n.d.)

The bystander also is impacted by the experience of witnessing bullying. Feelings of anger and helplessness; nightmares about being the next target; guilt for not taking action; and fear of certain areas in school are some of these effects. (UNICEF, 2007; Olweus Bullying Prevention Programme, n.d.)

**STUDY OBJECTIVES**

With this being the first national study of this nature to be conducted in Jamaica, and particularly with the intent to further the cause of protecting the rights of all of Jamaica’s children, the overall objective of this study is to identify and assess the intervening variables that contribute to bullying within the school environment, develop profiles of both the bully and victims, and use the information garnered to develop an integrated response mechanism to bring awareness to the issue at a national level with a view to contribute to the vast reduction in incidences of bullying within the education system, community spaces, residential institutions and familial environments.

In order to sufficiently achieve those broader goals, however, this study seeks to identify characteristics of Jamaican bullies and victims, determine what constitutes bullying, the extent of its occurrence in schools, and examine the types of action taken in responding to bullying by bullies, victims of bullying and witnesses to the abuse. The type and manifestation of the impact of bullying on perpetrators, victims, and witnesses are also to be investigated, while seeking to identify underlying causative factors that contribute to the practice, as well as the actual and/or potential role of school professionals, parents and community members in addressing the issue.
methodology

Data Collection Instruments
The researchers employed a mixed methods approach and utilised purpose-built quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments. They focused on the study objectives, and local issues determined via a number of consultations with key government and private stakeholder organisations and qualitative investigations. They were also guided by core themes reflected in instruments administered in similar studies across the world; and were finalised through pre-testing activities among administrators and students from non-sampled schools and observed interviews.

CONCEPT DEFINITION
Due to cultural norms that somewhat mystify the concept of bullying locally and could have skewed the responses of research participants, the researchers were careful to qualitatively define bullying to be “when one student is troubled, attacked, or made fun of repeatedly by another student(s)”. Additionally, the surveys administered indicated that bullying occurs if a child or children are made fun of or called hurtful names, has lies told on them, are ignored or excluded on purpose, hit, shoved around or locked inside a room, or have similarly hurtful things done to them. The researchers were careful to differentiate teasing done in a playful way and fights or arguments between children of equal strengths or power from the concept of bullying.

Participant Selection
With the main focus being on students, 3000 boys and girls were targeted from a total school population comprising 40,172 students (margin of error: +/-3%). Their selection was based on alternating grade-levels within each participating school, which became dependent on the availability of students. Teachers were also targeted from the same sample schools.

Data Collection
The data collection process commenced in March 2014 with a series of pre-survey focus group discussions (including the pre-testing of the survey instrument); while qualitative data was collected before and after the survey by way of a number of focus group sessions with school, community and professional stakeholder groups across the island.

The purpose-built quantitative survey instrument was administered among 1,867 children from 70 public schools, and 174 teachers, administrative staff, and other representative staff at 61 of 70 schools involved in the survey. Schools were selected from, and proportionate to, the total number of schools within each of the Ministry of Education’s six (6) “regions” – these also having been stratified by school type. Schools at the secondary/high level were least compliant; and other related factors, such as the limited data collection period available, also impacted participation levels.

Nonetheless, the quantitative (survey) data was collected in June 2014. There was only one (1) full week available for targeted interviews to be conducted, before schools closed for summer holidays. Prevailing concerns/constraints at the school-level also included the facts that: some students were sitting examinations and/or were not at school because of the examinations/end-year scenarios. Based on the very short turnaround time, emphasis was placed on: quality, quantity-attainment, logistics, and time management.
Statistical Analysis

Collation, editing, coding of questionnaires, as well as data entry were conducted concurrent with data collection; thus, allowing time for follow-up actions if/as required (i.e. prior to schools’ unavailability). Data entry and analyses were done using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS); including variable and value labelling. Capturing/analysing open-ended responses on the questionnaires and conducting a final “layered review of completed questionnaires” were conducted separately.

findings

Qualitative Data

The general perception of respondents was that bullying is nothing new, but something that is becoming more prevalent – “getting out of control now”. Though several definitions of bullying were given by research participants, common elements included the exertion of aggression or hostility, a power imbalance between victim and perpetrator, and more specific manifestations such as punching, pushing, [making] threats, belittling others, verbal intimidation and teasing/jerking. Actions defined as bullying were described by some as emotional and verbal abuse, but also as a means of communicating a cry for help.

Children who tend to be bullied more than others were described as children who are different in behaviour, physically, or in speech. They are typically shy, loners, sheltered at home, have disabilities, or thought to display homosexual tendencies. On the other hand, however, bullies are seen as individuals who lack love and attention and seek both by displaying aggressive behaviours as well as persons who used to get bullied so they bully others. Respondents theorised that their aggressive behaviours may be a result of living in violent communities or an aggressive household. They are described as insecure, troublemakers, physically bigger/stronger, themselves victims of abuse, from inner city communities, or academic underachievers.

Causative factors are thought to include negative experiences with other siblings and parents at home, community violence, genetic dispositions, as well as the content delivered across various media platforms. It was also highlighted that bullying may just be a part of regular development at the high school level as forms of “ragging”, though generally accepted, often times fall within the definition of bullying. In the same way, bullying is predominantly believed to have not only physical but also psychosocial effects on victims. While others see it as a debilitating practice others regard is as a way to ‘build up’ or strengthen the mettle of those who are thought to be weaker. Nonetheless, the majority of research participants see bullying as a precursor to violence and even death; asserting that gang violence, ‘donmanship’, incarceration, and even murder may be the fate of bullies if no interventions are applied.

Though various organisations deliver support initiatives for children and youth, only a few give attention to or have some focus on bullying. While there has been work done with guidance counsellors and teachers in the form of training on how to deal with children with behavioural issues, and guidance counsellors have discussed the issue of bullying in schools with students in class. Some students feel that teachers play a part in perpetuating bullying by either not doing enough in response to such reports, or by being bullies themselves. Some parents and students employ a ‘fight fire with fire’ approach to dealing with bullying and reported it as an effective response in ending the undesirable behaviour.
Quantitative Data

The largest proportion of children attended schools in “Other Major Towns”, (41.3%), while 33.4% went to schools in “Rural” areas, and another 4.9% in “Remote rural” locations. Those respondents at school in the Kingston Metropolitan Area (KMA) accounted for 20.3% of the sample. There were more female (57.7%) than male (42.3%) students; however, this differential was far more pronounced when figures reported for class teachers were analyzed, viz. 82.4% were said to be female. In somewhat similar vein, 80.7% of students reported living with their “mother”, while 43.7% had fathers present in their homes. Overall, 45.7% lived with both parents.

Just less than one-half of the children surveyed (49.8%) were attending “Primary” school; with another 16.2% and 7.8% attending “All-Age” and “Primary and Junior High” schools, respectively. Although each school Grade was included in this survey, the majority of students (54.8%) were found to be in Grades 4 to 6 inclusive.

Findings indicated a high 64.9% of students reported having “ever” been bullied; further, 70% of these said they were bullied within the school-year just ending. 66.9% of females reported ever being bullied, in comparison to 62.9 males. Similarly, more females (71.4%) reported being “bullied this year”, when compared to 67.9% of males. The highest reports of bullying were mainly found amongst the lower grade levels.
Thomas: 92.1%, St. Mary: 85.7%). However, such trends did not necessarily hold for the 2013-14 school year as the incidence reported in St. Thomas fell to 77.6% and St. Mary to 72.7%. There were similar disparities when the findings were analysed relative to geographic regions. The highest reports within the last year were made within the parishes of St. Elizabeth (86.3%), Portland (77.6%), St. Thomas (77.2%), and Kingston (76.2%). The lowest reported prevalence in 2013-14 was found in the parishes of Hanover (41.2%), Manchester (48.5%), and St. Ann (52.3%)².

Further to the prevalence of reported incidents of bullying, when responses to questions of “duration” were looked at, Kingston, St. Andrew and the KMA more generally, also seemed to present with high levels indicating longer/ongoing periods. 44.5% of 710 girls reported being bullied for less than a month, while the experience was described as “ongoing” by 34.9%. Of the 486 boys that were victims of bullying 46.9% reported being subjected to same less than a month, and 32.5% endured the abuse for an ongoing period.

Incidents of bullying were mainly perpetrated by only 1 boy (36.3%), a group of boys (18.1%), only 1 girl (17.3%), or a group of girls (11.6%). The most prevalent ways in which children reported being bullied included being teased or called names (57.6%), hit, kicked, and shoved (31.5%), having lies told on them (28.6%), and being excluded or ignored (13.7%). It is noteworthy that some children reported experiencing more than one forms of bullying.

Anger and sadness were the most prevalent emotions experienced by children who have been victims of bullying. They expressed confusion regarding why they were bullied, assumed that it was just because they were not liked, theorised that it was because they act differently, and thought that it was because they are small or weak. Students who were bullied recounted their experiences in respect of e.g. impact, coping, attempts at interventions, and sharing related details with adults. 43.4% reported feeling unhappy in situations that reminded them of being bullied, while 22.3% fought back when faced with such experiences. Nonetheless, although 38.8% tried to

---

² See Appendix 2 for additional details
avoid being bullied, 76.5% indicated that they “never” skipped school because of being bullied.

While 58.8% of those bullied said they still enjoy going to school despite the abuse from their peers, 26.9% fear going to school while 5.2% hate it altogether. The ‘ripple effect’ of being bullied was evidenced by the fact that 24.7% of bullied respondents indicated that they fear going to spaces other than areas at school where they have been bullied; including to church and the community playgrounds. 15.1% do not like going to other spaces, and 6.6% hate the idea.

Though the focus of the study was on the experiences of students, it became evident that incidences of bullying occur in various spaces. Playgrounds at schools and in communities were reported as the most likely place for children to be bullied, followed by their classrooms and school bathrooms. It is also noteworthy that 1 in 4 children who have been bullied face their abusers while travelling to and/or from school.

The response mechanism employed by bullied children typically involved making a report to an adult including a teacher (59%), parent/guardian (51.3%), school principal (24.8%), or the guidance counsellor (23.5%). Some also confide in family members such as an uncle/aunt (12.4%) or an older sibling (11.3%). Though just over 75% of those bullied reported it to an adult only 33.8% of those found making the report put an end to the abuse; the remaining 66.2% said it either stopped the abuse for a while or made no difference.

As a result, most bully victims seemed to cope by conducting singular/multiple acts of avoiding the situation (38.8%), ignoring it (35.5%), and/or reporting it (29.7%). Still others fought back (22.3%), tried to make fun of it (11.7%), or simply found it hard to cope any at all (5.6%). Where students did not share the fact of bullying with an adult, it was reportedly because they felt nothing would come of it — and that the bullying scenarios would not change.

Chart 7: Where are you mostly bullied?

Though the focus of the study was on the experiences of students, it became evident that incidences of bullying occur in various spaces. Playgrounds at schools and in communities were reported as the most likely place for children to be bullied, followed by their classrooms and school bathrooms. It is also noteworthy that 1 in 4 children who have been bullied face

Chart 8: Have you ever bullied or joined in?

It was also important to ask all students (not only those who had reported being bullied) about their own participation in bullying activities — vicariously or playing a more active role. An extremely high proportion of students (93.4%) said they had observed bullying at their school. The main action taken amongst those that observed it, was to “tell a teacher”, with 50.5% saying that was their follow-up action. Nonetheless, a large majority (62.3%) “felt sorry for the person being bullied”
and/or “wanted to help” (35.5%).

In comparison, somewhat fewer reported actually taking part in such scenarios as a bully (38.2% had joined in; with most (24.8%) of them saying “sometimes”). The actions to which these children owned-up were mainly “tease and call the person mean names” (56.8% reported doing this), but physical actions (hitting/kicking/shoving) were also reported by 31.1% of the students overall. The number of children who have both witnessed others being bullied and/or participated in bullying others was particularly high outside of the KMA 93.4% of children attest to having observed it, and just under 60% reported participating in the act. It is noteworthy also that those who have been bullied were somewhat more likely to report that they “sometimes” joined in to bully someone else, while 56.1% of those bullied said they have never joined to do it to other children.

School staff indicating they knew of bullying occurring in their schools, described those being bullied as having especially different physical and/or behavioural and/or personality features/traits than those who were the bullies. Some of these descriptors could also be classified as psycho-social. The staff also used the word “different” relatively often, to describe those being bullied. Interestingly, although home background/parents featured quite prominently in describing bullies, it was hardly mentioned when doing the same for those who were the victims.

The main reported intervention actions taken by schools towards solutions to bullying were: calling in parents/guardians, issuing reprimands, and providing counselling. Unfortunately, however, many of staff members felt that bullies never outgrow their related behaviours. Bullying was also regarded by staff as being different in some way(s) from other types of aggressive behaviour, though no details of the perceived difference was given.

![Chart 9: Frequency of reports received by teachers](image-url)
conclusions

The study’s main objectives focused on the identification and assessment of intervening variables that contribute to bullying, to develop profiles for bullies and victims, and determine an effective response plan to treat with issue and its consequences. Hence, by intent, the study, did not seek to deliberately explore issues including determining the root of bullying, investigating the home/family situations of reported perpetrators, and the social relationships between bullies and their victims. Nonetheless, the research process did unearth instances of reprisal bullying, elucidate the cyclical nature of the bullying phenomenon, and identify the perceived importance of the family and community structure in perpetuating or cauterising incidences of peer abuse.

The accounts of students both as onlookers and as victims, as well as the accounts of teachers and school administrators indicate that the high incidences of bullying is a matter of great concern, though not new in their manifestations. Defining and identifying the issue poses a direct challenge to accepted norms as it is seen by some to be a “foreign” ideal being imposed on the local landscape. The perspectives of students and teachers were sometimes contradictory regarding the prevalence of peer abuse, the spaces in which children tend to be most vulnerable to bullies, the impact of the occurrences on both victims and perpetrators, and the effectiveness of interventions applied. Nonetheless, there was a general consensus among study participants that if left unchecked, continued peer abuse is likely to result in further moral decay that will only worsen the current realities for our children, while also exacerbating Jamaica’s crime problem. Tolerance for those that are considered to be different or weaker for one reason or another is shown to be low, requiring all child rights proponents to act in the best interest of Jamaica’s children.
recommendations

The response mechanism suggested by research participants (see Appendix 1 attached) should include and impact the highest office of the Government, while still being implemented using all media options available and with intervention programs to be delivered at the community level. As a result of the data gathered throughout this process, the following recommendations are being proffered:

1. Raise the awareness of the Jamaican populace regarding the definition of, the prevalence, and impact of bullying specific to the Jamaican context through targeted community interventions and the use of varied media options.

2. Develop/strengthen the capacity of existing entities that have a part to play in the protection and development of children regarding responsiveness and strategic anti-bullying actions.

3. Review existing governance structures to determine where there may be need for the development and operationalisation of formal policies to appropriately address this issue nationally.

4. Establish a working group to examine the research results and develop a strategic response framework that complements the existing Vision 2030 National Development Plan aimed at ensuring a nurturing and respectful environment for all children.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Key Issues</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Target Groups</th>
<th>Expected Results</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness-Raising</strong></td>
<td>Substantially increase local awareness of concepts, issues related to bullying concepts, issues incl. e.g.</td>
<td>Limited awareness of incidence, extent, seriousness and long-term impact of bullying</td>
<td>Mass-media campaign focussing populace on issues and impact as of national concern</td>
<td>Parents, Students, Teachers, Communities</td>
<td>Increased awareness of/popular discussion around and understanding of the key issues</td>
<td>Task-Force incl. CDA, Min of Youth, sectors dealing with Youth &amp; Child Development, Commissioned Communications Planners e.g. as partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the act of bullying</td>
<td>Limited current actions to reduce or eliminate bullying</td>
<td>Regional small-group sessions e.g. workshops, seminars, of diverse but targeted representation</td>
<td>Child/Adolescent, Education, Health, Justice and Social sectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• enabling persons to identify signs of bullying.</td>
<td>Danger exists of accepting bullying as a societal norm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• making known resulting health-related issues (physical, mental)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• promoting positive alternatives to deal with associated bullying risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Capacity incl. for developing and implementing responsive Interventions / Programmes</strong></td>
<td>Increase confidence amongst key constituents regarding whether/not to address the issue they already know to exist, by becoming more aware of its extensiveness</td>
<td>There has been little/no attention given development or enactment of specific approaches to bullying incl. identification/diagnosis, management, M&amp;E</td>
<td>Develop N=2 to 3 targeted/focussed core programmes – to be implemented island wide via the primary &amp; secondary school systems – such implementation supported by all key sectors incl. Child/Adolescent, Education, Health, Justice, and Social</td>
<td>Existing service providers already interfacing with the issue and/or those at risk as victim or perpetrator</td>
<td>Strategic approach to reduced incidence and incidents’ management</td>
<td>Task Force with members incl. CDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Key Issues</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Target Groups</td>
<td>Expected Results</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without structure, there has been no institutionalization amongst key entities re: how to address bullying, and neither sensitization nor capacity-building have been made available.</td>
<td>Although needed, there are no specific programmes aimed at reducing bullying risks and/or impacts e.g. education, behaviour change.</td>
<td>Develop and implement responsive intervention programmes appropriate to the reduction of bullying amongst those at risk as victims and/or perpetrators.</td>
<td>Key entities: CDA, CSOCA, Guidance Counsellors, Deans of Discipline, School Psychologists, Mental Health Professionals.</td>
<td>Reduce the cycle of bullying and attendant impacts; instead promoting healthy and nurturing environments for children through multi-agency collaboration.</td>
<td>Task Force with members incl. CDA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obtain buy-in and technical support from key players.</td>
<td>Stakeholder support groups.</td>
<td>Resultant changes amongst victims and perpetrators incl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobilize resources for agreed interventions.</td>
<td>Education &amp; Health Practitioners.</td>
<td>Behaviour modification/ change practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obtain buy-in and technical support from key players.</td>
<td>Clubs, societies and support groups incl. anti-bullying clubs in schools, assisting perpetrators to channel their energies into positive forms of Behaviour Modification Programmes.</td>
<td>Minimized health risks associated with bullying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clubs, societies and support groups incl. anti-bullying clubs in schools, assisting perpetrators to channel their energies into positive forms of Behaviour Modification Programmes.</td>
<td>Clubs, societies and support groups incl. anti-bullying clubs in schools, assisting perpetrators to channel their energies into positive forms of Behaviour Modification Programmes.</td>
<td>Improved self-esteem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clubs, societies and support groups incl. anti-bullying clubs in schools, assisting perpetrators to channel their energies into positive forms of Behaviour Modification Programmes.</td>
<td>Clubs, societies and support groups incl. anti-bullying clubs in schools, assisting perpetrators to channel their energies into positive forms of Behaviour Modification Programmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Structured monitoring and evaluation framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Key Issues</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Target Groups</th>
<th>Expected Results</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Governance Structures</td>
<td>Increase the extent to which bullying issues are recognized and can be appropriately addressed nationally</td>
<td>There is very little/no formal structure according to/within which intervention policies can be developed and operationalized</td>
<td>Develop National Anti-Bullying Policy via the appropriate framework(s)</td>
<td>National leadership</td>
<td>Proactive and structured approach to dealing with bullying</td>
<td>CDA with Task Force (e.g. ABITAC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current deficits in formal structures also decrease opportunity and likelihood of national focus on the issues</td>
<td>Identify/engage champions with national, political and popular influence to drive the cause across multiple agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Legislators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2: Prevalence of Bullying

Students’ personal descriptors of being bullied: by Geo-descriptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Ever been bullied (%)</th>
<th>Bullied this year (2013/14) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrew</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ann</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trelawny</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Elizabeth</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Location</th>
<th>Ever been bullied (%)</th>
<th>Bullied this year (2013/14) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Metropolitan Area (KMA)</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Main Town (OMT)</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote Rural</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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