The University of San Francisco
USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center

Doctoral Dissertations | Theses, Dissertations, Capstones and Projects

2008

Student perspectives on the benefits of cooperative learning skills taught in fifth grade classrooms in the Archdiocese of San Francisco and the impact of bullying behaviors schoolwide

Julie Alexander

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.usfca.edu/diss

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation
Alexander, Julie, "Student perspectives on the benefits of cooperative learning skills taught in fifth grade classrooms in the Archdiocese of San Francisco and the impact of bullying behaviors schoolwide" (2008). *Doctoral Dissertations*. 134.
https://repository.usfca.edu/diss/134

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, Capstones and Projects at USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. For more information, please contact repository@usfca.edu.

The University of San Francisco

STUDENT PERSPECTIVES ON THE BENEFITS OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING SKILLS TAUGHT IN FIFTH GRADE CLASSROOMS IN THE ARCHDIOCESE OF SAN FRANCISCO AND THE IMPACT OF BULLYING BEHAVIORS SCHOOLWIDE

A Dissertation Presented
to
The Faculty of the School of Education
Department of Leadership Studies
Catholic Educational Leadership Program

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Julie Alexander
San Francisco
May 2008

This dissertation, written under the direction of the candidate's dissertation committee and approved by the members of the committee, has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education. The content and research methodologies presented in this work represent the work of the candidate alone.

Julie Alexander	5/8/08
Candidate	Date

Dissertation Committee

Virginia Shimabukuro	5/8/08
Chairperson	
Br. Raymond J. Vercruysse, CFC	5/8/08
Yvonne Bui	5/8/08

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES……... iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS……. v

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION…….. 1
Statement of the Problem……. 1
Purpose of the Study……. 4
Background and Need…….. 5
Bullying…… 5
The Bully…….. 6
The Bullied…… 9
The Bystander……... 10
The School Climate…….. 13
The Catholic School Climate…… 15
Cooperative Learning……... 17
Cooperative Learning Methods……. 18
David and Roger Johnson……. 19
Learning Together and Alone……... 20
Academic and Constructive Controversy…….. 21
Teaching students to be Peacemakers…… 22
Robert E. Slavin……. 24
Student Teams-Achievement Divisions……. 24
Teams-Games-Tournaments…….. 25
Team Assisted Individualization…… 25
Yael Sharan and Shlomo Sharan…… 26
Group Investigation…… 26
Spencer Kagan…… 26
Cooperative Learning Structures…… 28
Elliot Aronson……. 29
Jigsaw…….. 30
Elizabeth Cohen…….. 30
Complex Instruction…… 30
Theoretical Framework……... 32
Research Questions……. 34
Limitations…….. 35
Significance……. 37
Definition of Terms……. 38

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE…… 40
Overview…….. 40
Studies on Bullying…….. 40
Summary…….. 48
Studies on Cooperative Learning……. 49
Academic Achievement…… 50
Critical Thinking and Problem Solving…… 52

Social Competence and Relationships…… 54
Motivation……... 58
Psychological Health……... 60
Self-Esteem……. 62
Reduction of Problem Behaviors…… 62
Summary……. 63
Theoretical Framework…… 64
Behavioral Perspective…… 64
Behavioral Learning Theory…… 64
Social Learning Theory……... 67
Cognitive Developmental Perspective…… 78
Process of Cognitive Development……. 70
Social Development Theory…… 75
Social Interdependence Perspectives…….. 75
Kurt Lewin…….. 79
Morton Deutsch…….. 80
Summary……. 85
Final Summary…… 86

CHAPRTER THREE: METHODOLOGY…… 88
Restatement of the Problem…….. 88
Research Design…… 88
Population…….. 89
St. Alena's School…….. 90
St. Blane's School…….. 90
St. Christopher's School…… 91
Classroom Observations…… 92
Schoolwide Observations…….. 92
Teacher Interviews…… 92
Student Focus Groups…… 93
Validity…….. 94
Qualifications of the Researcher…… 94
Data Collection…….. 95
Data Analysis……. 96

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS…….. 99
Restatement of Purpose……. 99
Research Question One……. 99
Name-Calling……. 101
Cruel Criticism……... 101
Physical Contact……. 102
Taking, Damaging or Destroying Clothes or Property Belonging to the Bullied Child…… 104
Excluding…… 105
Research Question Two…….. 107
St. Alena's School……... 109

St. Blane's School……. 110
St. Christopher's…… 110
Research Question Three…….. 111
Research Question Four…… 115
Name-Calling and Cruel Criticism…… 116
Physical Contact…… 118
Taking, Damaging or Destroying Clothes or Property Belonging to the Bullied Child…….. 120

Excluding……..… 121
Research Question Five……. 123
Summary……... 129

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS……..... 131
Overview……. 131
Summary of Study…….. 131
Conclusions and Implications……..... 132
Recommendations for Future Research…….. 145
Recommendations for Future Practice…… 147
Final Thoughts…… 148

REFERENCES…… 149

APPENDIXES……. 163
Appendix A: Consent Form to Superintendent…….. 164
Appendix B: Superintendent Consent Response…… 166
Appendix C: Teacher Cover Letter and Teacher Questionnaire……. 168
Appendix D: Institutional Review Board Acceptance Letter……. 172
Appendix E: Consent Form for Principals…….. 175
Appendix F: Consent Form for Teachers…… 178
Appendix G: Teacher Interview Questions……. 181
Appendix H: Parental Consent Cover Letter and Consent Form…..... 183
Appendix I: Cooperative Learning In-Class Observational Checklist…… 187
Appendix J: Bullying Schoolwide Observation Checklist…….. 194
Appendix K: Bullying and Cooperative Learning Occurrence Charts…… 196
Appendix L: Focus Group Interview Questions…….. 199

LIST OF TABLES

1 Three Markers of Bullying……. 7
2 Seven Roles of the Bystander……. 12
3 Stages of Group Investigation: Teacher's Roles and Students' Roles….. 27
4 Effect Sizes of Cooperative Learning Methods and Achievement……. 51
5 Stages of Cognitive Development……... 71
6 Cooperative, Competitive, and Individualistic Interactions and Outcomes…… 82
7 Occurrences of Bullying Behaviors…… 100
8 Occurrences of Cooperative Learning Skills…….. 108
9 Total Occurrences of Bullying Behaviors……... 133
10 Total Occurrences of Cooperative Learning Skills……. 136

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the amazing elementary school teachers that welcomed me into their classrooms for two weeks of instruction. These homeroom teachers, along with the other teaching staff, shared their expertise and experience with me in regards to cooperative learning and interpersonal skills instruction, as well as, any bullying behaviors occurs in their schools through classroom and schoolwide observations and interviews. I would also like to thank the students who enthusiastically welcomed me into their schools and spoke with me very honestly about their experiences.

I also had a wonderful dissertation committee: Dr. Gini Shimabukuro, Br. Ray Vercruysse C.F.C., and Dr. Yvonne Bui. These three educators have been invaluable to me as teachers, mentors, and friends throughout my years at USF. They have shown me leadership that I will take with me into the profession of education.

As the chair of the committee, Gini guided me through each step of the dissertation process with patience and grace. She provided me the time, the confidence, and the security I need to finish my dissertation. Gini was my instructor in several classes leading up to the dissertation writing and research stage of my education. The instruction in these coursed gave the foundation I needed to successfully complete my dissertation.

Br. Ray gave me emotional support and encouragement through my years at USF. He was always there to listen and assist me in making sound decisions for Catholic education. Yvonne gave an analytical look at my writing and plan for research and offered suggestions that made my research stronger and more replicable. I am grateful for these professors' insight and encouragement.

Finally, I would like to thank my friends and family who were with me each step along the journey. My parents, Phil Rhynes and Beth Allison, who have been my primary educators and who have believed in me from birth. My husband, Steve, who has given me the confidence to achieve more than I believed I could. My son, Peyton, who has brought joy and love into my life that is far greater than I could have ever imagined. I would also like to thank Rose, our west coast granny, for the numerous hours of childcare and all of her spiritual guidance.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

In the past decade, violence in schools at all levels has dramatically increased, witnessed by the multitude of school shootings from the 2000 shooting in the first grade at Buell Elementary School in Mount Morris Township, Michigan to the Virginia Tech shooting in 2007. The majority of shootings have occurred in public high schools and middle schools in Caucasian, middle class non-urban areas, such as small towns and suburbs. There have been two school shootings, however, that occurred in private schools: Saint Pius X High School in Ottawa, Ontario and an Amish school in Pennsylvania (Infoplease Database, 2007). When shootings, such as that at Colorado's Columbine High School in 1999, were analyzed by the United States Secret Service and the United States Department of Education, the findings indicated that three quarters of the student shooters felt threatened, attacked, injured, or bullied by others (Crawford, 2002). School shootings have caused the United States to re-examine how children are being treated at school. Although the media attention given to school shootings is high the actual likelihood of being shot at school due to interpersonal violence is low.

However, the prevalence of bullying behaviors, such as non-fatal physical aggression, verbal taunting, and emotional abuse is very high (Orpinas, Horne, & Staniszewski, 2003). Bullying, which may be defined as repeated acts of aggression or harm by individuals who have more power than their victims, has a staggering effect on a student's success, both academically and socially, not only in school but also throughout life (Limber & Nation, 1998). The bystanders, as defined by Salmivalli (1999), are

students who watch a bullying situation as an active and involved participant. These repeated acts of aggression occurring among the bully, the bullied, and the bystander in schools constitute this bullying cycle.

Students who have been targeted by bullies have difficulty concentrating on their studies, and their academic performance tends to be marginal to poor (Ballard, Tucky, & Remley, 1999). Approximately 160,000 students stay home from school each day because they are afraid of being bullied (Vail, 1999). Nansel et al. (2001) discovered that youths who were bullied manifested many psychological conditions ranging from depression to low self-esteem. Other studies found that these feelings of isolation and low self-esteem lasted into adulthood (Clarke & Kiselica, 1997).

The literature reflects a growing body of research on bullying and the persons being bullied, but it has now been documented that it is the bystander who supports this cycle of bullying in which the bully, who has more power, repeatedly harms victims. O'Connell, Pepler, and Craig (1999) asserted that peers actively and passively reinforce a bully's aggressive behavior through attention and engagement. Bullying has become a group phenomenon that includes not only the bully and the victim, but also the bystander, the children who watch the bullying as an active participant rather than as a passive witness. To successfully educate students and to end this cycle of violence, intervention should be directed at both participants and witnesses (Salmivalli, 1999). Thus, common conflict resolution strategies or mediations might not be effective in combating this predicament because it does not include the bystander.

Crawford (2002) determined that much of the research in the United States has investigated aggression and bullying. Bullying behaviors, however, happen on a

continuum, from teasing and name-calling to threatening and social ridicule. Crawford claimed that bystanders tend to go along with harassing behaviors because they are afraid to defy their peers.

The need for this research can be heard on most play yards and classrooms throughout the nation, not to mention newspapers, magazines, and news broadcasts. Thirty-eight fatal school shootings occurred in this country during the past 10 years. Holmes (2002) revealed that bullying was to blame for many of these shootings. Newman (2004) described the perpetrators as children whose attempts at social integration have failed and the shootings are their attempt to adjust their social standing and image. Shooters told the Secret Service investigators that alienation and persecution drove them to violence (Dedman, 2000). Bullying and other risk factors, such as conduct disorders, emotional problems, and home life, may have contributed to the assailants' fatal outbursts. Through research Carney, Hazler, and Higgins (2002) found that bullying, along with the above-mentioned factors, created a school environment full of fear and intimidation. Cobia and Carney (2002) further found that the hostile school environments created by bullying contravened safe environments that were conducive to learning.

Research (Crawford, 2002; Limber & Nation, 1998) has shown that cooperative learning strategies are the most effective means of diffusing the bullying cycle and creating a safer learning environment. Johnson et al. (1998) defines cooperative learning as teaching strategies in which small teams, each with students of different levels of ability, use a variety of learning activities to improve their understanding of a subject, that are taught in the elementary grades.

Cooperative learning has been found to promote self-esteem and mutual respect for others (Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 1986; Lyman & Foyle, 1988). It increases the development of students' oral communication skills and promotes positive race relationships (Cohen, 1998). Through the use of cooperative learning, McCracken (2005) discovered that personality conflicts, the lack of tolerance for peers of diverse backgrounds, and bullying were reduced. However, many teachers are not incorporating cooperative learning into the curriculum for the purpose of alleviating bullying. Evidence of positive outcomes attributed to cooperative learning are outlined in the cooperative learning section in Chapter Two. According to Choi (2006) using cooperative learning to build relationship skills among students could decrease the bullying cycle in schools.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was (a) to investigate the impact of cooperative learning skills specifically positive interdependence and interpersonal skills on the bullying behaviors, such as name calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to the bullied child; and excluding of fifth-grade students within three Catholic elementary school classrooms in the Archdiocese of San Francisco, (b) to explore how three fifth grade teachers within the Archdiocese of San Francisco incorporated the instruction of interpersonal skills into cooperative learning strategies, and (c) to examine the perception of fifth grade teachers and students within three schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco on bullying behaviors, such as name calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to the bullied child; and excluding.

Background and Need

The need for this study is illustrated through the writing of researchers who examined the issues of the bully, the bullied, and the bystander. These roles are then addressed through the school climate and the Catholic school climate investigating how these three roles are detrimental to the climate established by the school administration, teachers, and Church documents. The need for cooperative learning skills to be applied to the curriculum to offset the effects of the bully, the bullied, and the bystander, the major researchers in this field, and the prominent methods of cooperative learning are then discussed. Finally, overviews of all the theories that provide a framework for this research are outlined.

Bullying

Bullying is not a new phenomenon. According to the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence (2004), many adults have experienced bullying in their childhoods. The fact that some children are frequently and systematically attacked is described in literary works (MacDougall, 1993; O'Moore & Hillery, 1989). Although many have been aware of the bullying problem, little research in this area was done until the early 1970s when Olweus (1978) conducted the first systematic study on the phenomenon of bullying. In his research, Olweus studied the bully and the victim finding that it was a single student who was the bully in most situations and the occurrence of bullying decreased in higher grades. It was only later that the bystander was considered a part of the bullying cycle (Salmivalli, 1999).

Three forms of bullying are evident in the literature: verbal, physical, and relational (Bolton & Graeve, 2005; Coloroso, 2003). Verbal bullying consists of name

calling, swearing, and hate speech. Verbal abuse is the most common form of bullying by both girls and boys, accounting for 70% of reported incidents. Physical bullying, such as hitting, kicking, spitting, and tearing clothes, is the most visible form of bullying, but accounts for less than one-third of the bullying incidents reported by children. Boys tend to use physical bullying more than girls. According to Coloroso (2003), "Relational bullying is the systematic diminishment of a bullied child's sense of self through ignoring, isolating, excluding, or shunning" (p. 17). Coloroso determined that this type of bullying is the most difficult to detect, and girls seem to be particularly skilled at it.

Not only are there three types of bullying, but there are also three distinct elements that must be present for bullying to occur: an imbalance of power, an intent to harm, and a threat of further aggression. Table 1 elaborates each of these elements. If these three are not present, an incident is not considered bullying. Coloroso (2003) pointed out that bullying is not about anger, but rather about contempt. Contempt is a powerful feeling of dislike toward someone considered worthless, inferior, or undeserving of respect. This contempt allows children to harm others without feeling empathy, compassion, or shame. Coloroso stated that bullying is arrogance in action.

The Bully

A bully is not defined by gender, ethnicity, religion, or socio-economic class. Bullies come in all shapes and sizes. It is their actions, not their appearance, that sets them apart (Bolton & Graeve, 2005; Coloroso, 2003). Bullies tend to be strong, confident, and aggressive. They show little empathy and feel a need to dominate others (Bolton & Graeve, 2005; Byrne, 1993). Although a child's innate temperament is a small factor in bullying, Bronfenbrenner (1979), a social scientist, claimed that

Table 1

Three Markers of Bullying

Marker	Description
Imbalance of power	The bully can be older, bigger, stronger, more verbally adept, higher up the social ladder, of a different race, or of the opposite sex. Sheer number of kids banded together to bully can create this imbalance. Bullying is not sibling rivalry, nor is it fighting that involves two equally matched kids who have a conflict.
Intent to harm	The bully means to inflict emotional and/or physical pain, expects the action to hurt, and takes pleasure in witnessing the hurt. This is no accident or mistake, no slip of the tongue, no playful teasing, no misplaced foot, no inadvertent exclusion, no "Oops, I didn't mean it."
Threat of further aggression	Both the bully and the bullied know that the bullying can and probably will occur again. This is not meant to be a onetime event.

Note. From *The Bully, the Bullied, and the Bystander: From Preschool to High School - How Parents and Teachers Can Help Break the Cycle of Violence* by Coloroso, 2003, pp.13-14.

"environmental factors", such as home life, school life, and the community and culture, including the media, permit and encourage bullying behaviors. Bullying is considered to be a learned behavior of the familial environment (Espelage, Bosworth, & Simon, 2000; Floyd, 1985; Rigby, 1994). Olweus (1993) described the characteristics of a bully's primary caregiver, usually the mother, in the following manner. She will have a negative basic attitude, with a lack of warmth and involvement. The caretaker will be tolerant without setting clear limits for behaviors toward peers, siblings, and adults. This environment of too little love and too much freedom are conditions that contribute to the development of aggressive behaviors.

Coloroso (2003) described seven types of bullies: the confident bully, the social bully, the fully armored bully, the hyperactive bully, the bullied bully, the bunch of bullies, and the gang of bullies. Teachers and peers often admire the confident bully, due to his or her powerful personality. However, this does not mean that he or she will have many friends. Bullies usually do not have the characteristics required for friendship: loyalty, mutual respect, and trust. The social bully has a true lack of empathy for others. This person, often a girl, uses systematic isolation to exclude others from social events. She can be popular, but others will not confide in her out of fear of becoming her next target.

Fully armored bullies look for opportunities to bully where no one can see or stop them. These bullies are cool, deceptive, and vindictive toward their targets but charming toward others. The fully armored bully tends to have a flat affect. The hyperactive bully sometimes has learning disabilities and may have trouble making friends. This is usually a child with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, and a teacher often finds it difficult to like this child. Bullied bullies are both targets and victims. They bully others to get relief from their own victimization. The bunch of bullies will bully another with a group of friends but would never consider bullying someone individually. The gang of bullies is not a group of friends but a strategic alliance in pursuit of power, control, and domination. This gang will lack empathy and remorse. Other research corroborates these findings (Bolton & Graeve, 2005; Byrne, 1993; Olweus, 1993; O'Moore & Hillery, 1989; Rigby, 1994).

A bully has an air of superiority that often masks a deep hurt and a feeling of inadequacy (Coloroso, 2003). It is this supposed superiority that "entitles" a bully to hurt

another or to hold another in contempt, when in fact it is an excuse to pull someone down so he or she can feel a sense of worth or power (Espelage, Bosworth, & Simon, 2000).

The Bullied

Just as the bully has no specific gender, ethnicity, religion, or socio-economic class nor does the victim or the bullied (Bolton & Graeve, 2005; Coloroso, 2003). A victim of bullying will often have a difficult time seeking help (Byrne, 1993; Marano, 1995). Bolton and Graeve (2005) alleged that such victims stay silent due to feelings of shame, hopelessness, fear of retaliation, and the fear that adults cannot protect them. For the above reasons, the research has concluded that boys are less likely to report bullying than girls, and younger children are more likely to tell an adult about bullying than older children because they still believe that adults can help their situations (Boulton & Underwood, 1992; Coloroso, 2003; Whitney & Smith, 1993; Zindi, 1994).

Coloroso (2003) offered several warning signs of a child being bullied. The child shows an abrupt lack of interest in school, does not want to attend school, or chooses a different route to school. The bullied child will often have a drop in grades, withdraw from school and family activities, and wish to be left alone. The child may be hungry after school due to missing lunch and claim that he or she lost his or her lunch money or was not hungry. The victim may have physical injuries that are inexplicable, may have torn or missing clothing, and may use derogatory language when referring to friends. The bullied could have stomachaches, headaches, panic attacks, and be unable to sleep.

Olweus (1993) indicated that a victim of bullying often exhibits distinct signs. The bullied is teased, picked on, involved in quarrels, has belongings taken, and has

injuries without a logical explanation. He goes on to explain that a student is being bullied or victimized when

> He or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more students. The student who is exposed to a negative action has difficulty defending him or herself and is somewhat helpless against the student or students who harass. (p. 54)

Because of this cycle of violence, Marr and Field (2001) coined the term "bullycide," which describes bullied children who choose to kill themselves rather than face one more day of being bullied. A study by Rigby and Slee (1999) found that bullying, especially in boys, was associated with elevated levels of suicidal ideation. According to Coloroso (2003), at least 16 children a year in the United Kingdom choose death over being bullied, and, in 1999, roughly one out of every 13 high school students in the United States attempted suicide in the previous 12 months due to bullying at school.

The Bystander

The third character in the cycle of bullying is the bystander who aids and abets the bully through acts of omission and commission (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, Osterman, & Kaukiainen, 1996). Coloroso (2003) stated that

> Actively engaging with the bully or cheering him on causes even more distress to the child who is bullied, encourages the antisocial behavior of the bully, and puts the bystander at risk of becoming desensitized to the cruelty or becoming full-fledged bullies themselves. When kids observe the aggressive antisocial activities of a bully, they are more likely to imitate those activities if they see the bully as a popular, strong, and daring role model. (p. 62)

Olweus (1993) further found that children behave more aggressively after having observed a role model acting aggressively. If the child sees this role model as being tough, fearless, and strong, he or she will be strongly influenced in a negative way. The

students who are influenced the most by such role models are those who feel insecure and dependent themselves.

Coloroso (2003) observed that the use of verbal, physical, and relational denigration of a child to elevate one's own status in a peer group is common among preteen boys and girls. The lack of negative consequences and the elevated status among peers contribute to the erosion of a bystander's inner control against antisocial activities. When a group of peers are involved, they become a bunch of bullies and have a decreased sense of individual responsibility.

Bolton and Graeves (2005) identified the bystander as a passive observer who believes that it is not his or her responsibility to get involved in an incident, does not wish to be known as a snitch, or is fearful of retaliation. Coloroso (2003), however, found that a bystander's self-confidence and self-respect eroded as he or she wrestled with fears about getting involved in observed bullying incidents and the abdication of his or her moral responsibility to assist a peer being victimized. Bolton and Graeves determined that some victims experience more pain from bystanders than from the bully because their so-called friends see what is happening and do nothing to stop it. This leaves the victim feeling betrayed, isolated, and with no one to trust.

According to Olweus (1993), a bystander can play seven different roles (Table 2). Except for the last group, "Defenders of the Target," who try to stop the bullying; the other bystanders are complicit in the victimization. Pepler and Craig (1995) revealed that most peers do not come to the aid of a targeted classmate. In studying the roles of peers in bullying, they found that peers were involved, in some way, in 85% of bullying

situations. Peers reinforced bullying situations in 81% of the episodes, were active participants in 48% of the episodes, and only intervened in 13% of the episodes.

Table 2

Seven Roles of the Bystander

Role	Description
Bully/Bullies	The students who start the bullying and take an active part.
Followers/Henchmen	The students who take an active part but do not start the bullying.
Supporters: Passive Bully/Bullies	The students who support the bullying but do not take an active part.
Passive Supporters: Possible Bully/Bullies	The students who like the bullying but do not display open support.
Disengaged Onlookers	The students who watch what happens; say, “It is none of my business”; don’t take a stand.
Possible Defenders	The students who dislike the bullying and think they ought to help out (but do not do it).
Defenders of the Target	The students who dislike the bullying and help or try to help the one who is exposed – the target.

Note. From *The Bully, the Bullied, and the Bystander: From Preschool to High School - How Parents and Teachers Can Help Break the Cycle of Violence* by Coloroso, 2003, pp.65-66.

Children do not intervene for many reasons; a few are valid, but most are simply excuses. Coloroso (2003) identified the following four excuses to be the most common. The bystander is: (a) afraid of getting hurt, (b) afraid of becoming the new target of the bully, (c) afraid of doing something that will only make the situation worse, and (d) uncertain about what to do.

The School Climate

The environment of hostility and fear impacts the overall climate of a school (Cobia & Carney, 2002), but there can be more than one climate at each school. Moos (1979) contended that every classroom contains its own climate. The teachers and their methods of teaching determined the climates in their respective classrooms. According to Moos, the bullying cycle is considered a subclimate of a school's institutional climate. Each person involved in the cycle, including the bully, the bullied, and bystanders, perceive that climate differently. This claim was supported by Salmivalli (1999), in that every student plays a role in a bullying situation, meaning that students involvement in bullying situations take on different participant roles, such as the bully, the bullied, and the bystander. However, Olweus (1993) pointed out that while all students play a role in bullying situations the bullies and the victims are the two key positions.

These perspectives on bullying suggested an importance of restructuring classroom dynamics (Choi, 2006). For example, when the overall atmosphere of a school is restructured to be more cooperative students have the opportunity to accomplish tasks in a mutual and an independent manner. According to Doll, Zucker, and Brehm (2004), the classroom characteristics that create environments that promote academic, emotional, and social success for students are typified by three relationships: (a) teacher-student, (b) peer, and (c) home-school. The quality of these relationships greatly impacts social success and academic achievement and deters bullying. This study will be limited to the observations and interviews that will provide information regarding the first two relationships.

In schools that had purchased and implemented bullying intervention programs, Miller (2006) found many cases in which school administrators decided that the programs were unsuccessful because of a lack of support and commitment by teachers who felt that these programs were just one more burden on their curricula, duties, and responsibilities. However Panitz (1998) claimed that teachers could successfully create positive classroom climates through well-integrated instructional strategies, such as cooperative learning. Using cooperative learning strategies in a classroom creates an atmosphere in which learners feel respected and connected to one another. Cohen and Willis (1985) stated that these cooperative learning techniques incorporated students' social experiences as the groundwork for learning activities. As a result, students opened up to one another and share their difficulties with other students and family.

According to Johnson and Johnson (1985), cooperative learning has proved useful to students by promoting their active interaction with one another on a regular basis. Students are guided through a process to understand and to resolve their differences with one another, and they learn how to solve social problems independently. Cooperative learning is the instructional method of choice for preventing and alleviating social problems in dominant children, such as bullying and antisocial behaviors (Johnson, Johnson, & Stanne, 2000) because cooperative learning experiences and cooperative learning attitudes can lead dominant children to adopt prosocial behaviors (Choi, 2006). For example, in classrooms that employ cooperative learning strategies, fewer students can exert their power to offend other classmates who appear to be less powerful. In a cooperative school climate, power in the classroom will be more evenly distributed

among the students, and this cooperative atmosphere itself has the function of controlling children's power in their social relationships.

The Catholic School Climate

Bullying and its behaviors of dominance were not intended for the Catholic school climate as evidenced in Church documents. For example, The Congregation for Catholic Education (1988) declared that the uniqueness of a Catholic school comes from its climate. This climate is described in the following:

> From the first moment that a student sets foot in a Catholic school, he or she ought to have the impression of entering a new environment, one illuminated by the light of faith, and having its own unique characteristics…an environment permeated with the Gospel spirit of love and freedom. (¶ 24)

The Congregation continued that the responsibility for the formation of this climate lies with the teachers, both as individuals and as a community. In this environment, students will witness friendly and harmonious relationships every day, and they will come to appreciate the Catholic school environment. The students will begin to view the school environment as an extension of their home. This "school home"(¶ 27) will have the atmosphere of a pleasant and happy family. In this home, the environment will be humanly and spiritually rich. The elementary school should create the warm intimacy of family life that promotes a common spirit of trust and spontaneity.

The Second Vatican Council (1965) introduced a new dimension for the school, which called for its transition from an institution to a community. This community encompasses everyone in a school: administrators, teachers, staff, students, and parents. The role of community in a Catholic school is central to the Church's mission, which stated that, "the educational philosophy is one in which faith, culture, and life are brought into harmony" (¶ 34).

The Congregation for Catholic Education (1988) claimed that Catholic school communities must work collaboratively with educators, students, and families. For this to occur, an open channel of communication between all concerned should exist. According to the Congregation for Catholic Education, collaboration assists in the formation of interpersonal skills, such as respect, obedience, gratitude, helpfulness, and service.

In *To Teach As Jesus Did,* The National Conference of Catholic Bishops (1972) confirmed that "Community is at the heart of Christian education, not simply a concept to be taught but a reality to be lived" (p. 7). Using collaboration within a classroom, through group activities and class meetings, will build the climate for which Catholic schools are known (Congregation for Catholic Education, 1988). The Church documents use the broader term, collaboration, for what educators consider being cooperation. The use of the two terms are explained by Dillenbourgh, Baker, Blaye, and O'Malley (1995) in the following:

> Cooperation and collaboration do not differ in terms of whether or not the task is distributed, but by virtue of the way in which it is divided; in cooperation the task is split (hierarchically) into independent subtasks; in collaboration cognitive processes may be (heterarchically) divided into intertwined layers. In cooperation, coordination is only required when assembling partial results, while collaboration is a coordinated, synchronous activity that is the result of a continued attempt to construct and maintain a shared conception of a problem. (p. 190)

Although the documents have encouraged Catholic schools to have a uniqueness in climate, a transition from institution to community, and the use of collaboration within these communities, this effort has not always been successful. This is indicated in the response from Maureen Huntington (personal communication, May 8, 2007),

Superintendent of Catholic Schools for the Archdiocese of San Francisco, that bullying was occurring in some Catholic schools within the Archdiocese.

Cooperative Learning

The first documented use of cooperative learning occurred over 3,000 years ago when students of the Talmud paired up to engage in lively debates (Johnson et al., 1986). Others credit Triplett's (1898) study on competition as the beginning of research in this field and the first study in the field of social psychology. He concluded that children and adults learn better in cooperative situations than they do independently. Dewey (1966), however, is acknowledged as the educator and philosopher who developed cooperative school communities in social settings. He formulated several ideas about cooperation and motivation that will be described later in this chapter.

Lewin, Lippet, and Caucasion (1939) studied the effects of the social climate in the 1930s and 1940s. Two of Lewin's graduate assistants, Ronald Lippitt and Ralph Caucasion, conducted a series of experiments that investigated how students work together. World War II interrupted this work, and scholars did not resume formal research of children's behaviors in learning groups until the 1970s (Slavin, 1990). Lewin's graduate student, Morton Deutsch (1949), expanded the early research on cooperation and competition by analyzing group processes. He found that cooperative groups applied more coordinated effort, better communication skills, division of labor, and acceptance of other's ideas than competitive groups. These ideas will be expanded later in this review through the research pertaining to Learning Together and Alone (Johnson & Johnson, 1991) and Group Investigation (Sharan & Sharan, 1992).

Beginning in the 1960s and still ongoing is the work of Johnson and Johnson (1989), whose research has examined the use of cooperation, competition, and individualistic learning in-group processing. Research by the Johnsons will be expounded in the following chapter. Other prominent researchers in this field are Slavin (1990), Kagan (1994), Sharan and Sharan (1992), Cohen (1998), and Aronson (2000). An overview of each researcher and his or her method will be given in the following section.

Cooperative Learning Methods

There are numerous methods of cooperative learning in the research. This overview, however, will describe the 10 methods that occurred most frequently in the literature. It will begin with three methods by Johnson and Johnson: Learning Together and Alone (1991), Academic and Constructive Controversy (1995), and Teaching Students to be Peacemakers (2000). Although the Johnsons are the most published authors in the field of cooperative learning and have created myriad methods, most of their publications can be narrowed down to these three methods. The methods created by the Johnsons are conceptual approaches to cooperative learning. The conceptual approach uses methods that are based on research that tests theory, which generalizes to various situations. For implementation, the teachers engage in the following process: First, the teachers learn to conceptualize essential components of cooperative learning, which are positive interdependence, promotive interaction, individual and group accountability, interpersonal and small group skills, and group processing. Next, teachers apply the components to their unique teaching situations, circumstance, students, and instructional needs.

Direct approaches to cooperative learning will then be reviewed. The direct approach differs from the conceptual approach in that teachers are taught specific cooperative learning lessons, how to use specific cooperative learning curriculum, or how to use a specific cooperative learning strategy. Thus, the direct approach is materials and procedures-based. Direct approaches include the following methods: Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (Slavin, 1994), Teams Games Tournament (Slavin, 1994), Team Assisted Individualization (Slavin, 1985), Group Investigation (Sharan & Sharan, 1992), Cooperative Learning Structures (Kagan, 1994), Jigsaw (Aronson, 2000), and Complex Instruction (Cohen, 1998). Since this researcher did not observe one particular method of cooperative learning but a variety of methods, the researcher provided an overview of the most common methods in the literature.

David and Roger Johnson

Johnson and Johnson (1989, 1991, 1994, 1995, 2000) conducted extensive research that revealed that cooperative learning effectively enhances student achievement, productivity, levels of caring, commitment, student relationships with other students, psychological wellbeing, social competence, and self-esteem. Johnson and Johnson (1998) found that cooperative learning enhanced students' self-esteem and motivated them to participate in the learning process. The attributes of cooperative learning that promote these gains are positive interdependence, promotive interaction, individual and group accountability, interpersonal and small group skills, and group processing (Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 1993).

Johnson et al. (1986) were the first to train students in the skills of peer interaction while working together in groups. By identifying the interactions that allowed groups to

work well together and reflecting on the individual contributions that made groups successful, students learned how to engage in positive helping relationships. Three methods that incorporate these interactions will be reviewed below.

Learning together and alone. Johnson and Johnson (1991) began investigating the method of Learning Together and Alone in the 1960s. This method provided a framework for applying cooperative learning in any subject or grade-level. Its application is so wide because the method is a conceptual approach to cooperative learning. The method is based on three goal structures: cooperative, competitive, and individualistic. In the ideal classroom all three-goal structures are used, but they are not used equally. In this method, the teacher identifies the learning goal, which is the desired future state of demonstrating competence in the subject area being studied. Then, the teacher determines the goal structure, the specific type of social interdependence students' employ as they strive to accomplish the learning goal. Johnson and Johnson (1991) explained social interdependence in the following:

> Social interdependence exists when each individual's outcomes are affected by the actions of others…there are two types of social interdependence: competitive and cooperative. Interdependence may be differentiated from dependence and independence. Social dependence exists when the outcomes of Person A are affected by Person B's actions, but the reverse is not true…Social independence exists when individuals' outcomes are unaffected by each other's actions. (p. 3)

How teachers structure interdependence among students' learning goals determines the way students interact with one another and, therefore, largely determines the cognitive and affective outcomes of instruction.

When a lesson is structured cooperatively, students work together to accomplish shared goals (Johnson & Johnson, 1991). This goal structure uses small groups so that individuals work together to maximize their own and each other's productivity and

development. In this situation, individuals perceive that they can reach their goal only when other group members reach their goals (Deutsch, 1962). When the lesson is structured competitively, individuals work against each other to achieve a goal that only one or a few can obtain. In this competitive environment, students work faster and more accurately than their peers. However, in this learning situation, the goal of each participant is structured in a way that there is a negative correlation with his or her goal attainment. This means that when one student achieves his or her goal all other students in the competition fail to achieve their goals.

Finally, in an individualistic learning situation, individuals work alone to accomplish a goal that is independent from the goals of other students. These individual goals are assigned, evaluated on a fixed set of standards, and rewarded on efforts compared to a preset criterion of excellence. In this situation, individual goal attainment has no influence on whether others achieve their goals. The outcomes are personally beneficial and ignore the goal achievement of others.

Through the research into the method of Learning Together and Alone, the Johnsons (1991) discovered the importance of high-quality peer relationships and student-to-student interaction patterns. Because this research favored cooperation, Johnson and Johnson began to explore the relations occurring among the students in a group in more depth creating a new method of cooperative learning, Academic and Constructive Controversy (1995). This new method of cooperative learning is summarized below.

Academic and constructive controversy. Johnson and Johnson (1995) explored how students in cooperative groups dealt with controversies among group members.

Research into the Academic and Constructive Controversy teaching technique began in the 1970s. Johnson and Johnson claimed that controversy emerged when one person's ideas, information, conclusions, and opinions were incompatible with those of another, and the two sought an agreement. The investigators found that controversies were inherent in academic content and in cooperative groupings and that academic controversy is the instructional use of intellectual conflict to promote problem solving, decision-making, and reasoning. The research validated academic controversy and demonstrated positive outcomes in the areas of students' achievement, interpersonal relationships, and psychological health (Johnson & Johnson 1989, 1995).

Teaching students to be peacemakers. Research has endorsed that cooperative groups experience conflicts and aid in teaching students how to manage conflicts constructively (Johnson & Johnson, 1994, 1995). This motivated Johnson and Johnson (2000) to create their program, Teaching Students to be Peacemakers, which they researched between 1988 and 2000. During these 12 years of research, the Johnsons conducted 17 studies on the effectiveness of conflict resolution training in 18 different schools in the United States and Canada. The settings of the studies were in suburban, urban, and rural communities with the populations ranging from kindergarten to ninth grade students.

The findings from the 12 years of research indicated that students learned conflict resolution procedures, retained this knowledge throughout the school year, and applied the procedures to actual conflicts. The students were able to transfer these conflict resolution procedures to non-classroom settings, and, when given the opportunity, they were able to engage in problem solving rather that win-lose negotiations. More

interestingly, Johnson and Johnson's (2000) study of peacemakers revealed that schools avoided conflicts too often and needed to allow conflicts to occur between students. "The problem facing schools is not how to reduce the occurrence of conflicts, but rather how to increase the occurrence of conflicts while ensuring that they will be managed in constructive and healthy ways" (p. 14). The findings showed that students encountered more difficulty in constructively solving conflicts when they were from different cultural, ethnic, social, or linguistic backgrounds.

The peacemakers program, researched by Johnson and Johnson (2000), was based on the assumption that all students can regulate their behavior and resolve interpersonal conflicts constructively. Self-regulation, in this study, referred to the students' ability to act in socially approved ways in the absence of external monitoring by others. It was based on the following five criteria:

1. All students in the school know how to negotiate integrative agreements to their conflicts and how to mediate schoolmates' conflicts.

2. All students have the skills to use the negotiation and mediation procedures effectively.

3. The norms, values, and culture of the school promote and support the use of negotiation and mediation procedures.

4. Peer mediators are available to support and enhance students' efforts to negotiate.

5. The responsibility for peer mediation is rotated throughout the entire student body so that every student gains experience as a mediator. (p. 4)

This program requires extensive student and teacher training in conflict resolution skills, the average time for training in the 12-year study was 15 days. The teachers and students were first trained with conflict resolution skills that had been validated by previous research. Then, the students and teachers applied the learned skills in their

unique school settings, making this program a conceptual approach. The review of literature will now explore direct approach methods of cooperative learning.

Robert E. Slavin

Slavin (1985, 1987, 1990, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997) conducted numerous studies of cooperative learning and, from his findings, created the following methods: Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (1990, 1994), Teams-Games-Tournaments (1990, 1994), and Team Assisted Individualization (1985). Slavin (1987) found that cooperative learning was based on *group contingency* so that group rewards were given on the basis of members' behaviors. His motivational perspective was grounded in the idea that outcomes that depend on another's behavior could motivate other students within a group to perform behaviors that rewarded the group. He determined that when students valued the group they would encourage each other to achieve. Basing his findings on group rewards and behaviors, he developed methods of cooperative learning using learning teams. In these teams, students worked together and were responsible for teammates' learning as well as their own, emphasizing team goals and team success (Slavin, 1990). According to Slavin and his research on group contingencies, the following three criteria are critical to the effective implementation of cooperative learning: team rewards, individual accountability, and equal opportunities for success. Each of these criteria can be found in the three methods reviewed below.

Student teams-achievement divisions. In Slavin's (1990) method of Student Teams-Achievement Divisions, students work together in teams of four that consist of mixed ability, gender, and ethnicity. After the teacher's instruction, the team works together to ensure that every member has mastered the content. Team members are then

assessed by individual quizzes. Scores are given based on improvement over previous quiz averages. The points are summed for the team, and prizes are awarded if scores meet criteria. This method stresses inter-group competition to learn predetermined knowledge.

Teams-games-tournaments. In Slavin's (1990) method of Teams-Games-Tournaments, the teaching and learning process mirrors Student Teams-Achievement Divisions, but the assessment is different. Instead of quizzes and averages, teams compete in tournaments that contribute points to team scores. There is a "bumping procedure" in which assignments are changed weekly depending on performance to keep the process fair. Team members are grouped in a mixture of high, medium, and low achievers. Team members check each other's answers and help with problems. Students are tested individually at the end of each unit, and teams are rewarded if they exceed a certain score. The highest scoring teams are publicly recognized in a weekly class newsletter.

Team assisted individualization. This method of cooperative learning by Slavin (1990) shared the same group structures mentioned in the two previous methods, in which groups of four are formed based on mixed learning abilities. This method is a combination of cooperative learning and individualized instruction. Teammates work together to check answers and help members with problems. At the end of the unit, team members take individual tests and rewards are given to teams based on improvement of team scores. The teacher spends most of his or her time presenting lessons to small groups of students who are working at the same ability level. This method is primarily

used to teach math skills in grades three to six and cooperative interaction is held to a minimum.

Yael Sharan and Shlomo Sharan

Sharan and Sharan (1992) developed their method of Group Investigation primarily in Israel. Although the method originated in Israel, it has been researched in several countries, including the United States. Group Investigation is a direct approach to cooperative learning, but it differs from Slavin's (1990) three methods, Student Teams-Achievement Divisions, Teams-Games-Tournaments, and Team-Assisted Individualization, because it allows students to take an active part in establishing their learning goals. Group Investigation is outlined below.

Group investigation. Sharan and Sharan's (1992) Group Investigation is a cooperative learning method that integrated interaction and communication in the classroom with the process of academic inquiry. It enabled the classroom to become a social system in which cooperation among students occurs in small groups. Here, students take an active role in the formation of learning goals by planning what will be studied about a problem that initiates genuine inquiry. Small groups are then formed based on students' common interest in a subtopic and they cooperate in carrying out their plan to solve the problem. The stages of Group Investigation and the roles of the teacher and students are highlighted in Table 3.

Spencer Kagan

Like Group Investigation, Kagan (1985) developed the method of Co-op Co-op, which also aimed at giving students control over what they learned through cooperative

Table 3

Stages of Group Investigation: Teacher's Roles and Students' Roles

Stages of Group Investigation	Teacher's Role	Students' Role
I. Class determines sub-topics and organizes into research groups	Leader of exploratory discussions that determine subtopics; facilitator of awareness of interesting aspects of general topic	Generate questions of interest; sort them into categories; join research group of choice
II. Groups plan their investigation: what they will study and how they will go about it	Helps groups formulate their plans; helps maintain cooperative group norms; helps find source materials	Plan what to study; choose resources; assign roles and divide the study task among themselves
III. Groups carry out the investigation	Helps with study skills; continues to help maintain cooperative group norms	Seeks answers to their questions; locate information from a variety of sources; integrate and summarize their findings
IV. Groups plan their presentations	Organizes plans for presentations and coordinates them with the steering committee	Determine main idea of their findings; plan how to transmit it to the class
V. Groups make their presentations	Coordinates presentations; conducts discussions of feedback	Presents; give feedback to classmates about their presentations
VI. Teacher and student evaluate Group Investigation individually, in groups, and class wide	Evaluates learning of new information, higher level thinking, and cooperative behavior	Refines awareness of performance as investigators and as group members

Note. From *Expanding Cooperative Learning Through Group Investigation* by Sharan and Sharan, 1992, p. 95.

groups. Through research into this method, Kagan moved away from the direct approach to cooperative learning and into the structures approach. Kagan's (1994) structures to cooperative learning are described below.

Cooperative learning structures. Kagan (1994) used "structures" (p. 5:1) as a method of cooperative learning. Structures are a content-free way of organizing the interaction of students in a classroom. A teacher enters appropriate content into a chosen structure, which creates the learning activity. There are six categories of structure: teambuilding, classbuilding, communication building, information sharing, mastery, and thinking skills. Teambuilding is the first structure to be used because it allows each group to form connections. It creates enthusiasm, trust, and mutual support, which lead to more efficient academic work. This structure is a must if there are racial or other tensions among students. Classbuilding provides networking among students in the class and creates a positive context in which teams can learn. Although most of class time is spent within teams, it is important that the students see themselves as a part of the larger class team. This structure is a way to improve the overall classroom climate.

Communication building consists of several structures, such as communication regulators (p. 13:1) that equalize communication among team members and help promote positive communication patterns, decision makers (p. 13:5), which help to resolve conflicts, and proactive prioritizing (p. 13:6), which is used to further evaluative thinking. Each of these structures aid in the development of communication skills among students in a group and the whole class.

Information sharing determines how students will share information with one another. Information sharing can be promoted among group members, such as

Roundrobin where students in the group take turn sharing answers or Rallyrobin where students within in a team form pairs and take turns with their partner sharing ideas (p. 12:1), or information can be shared among teams, as in team interviews. Mastery structures increase the efficiency of students' recall of basic facts. This structure includes flashcard games, numbered heads together where the students in a group number off, the teacher poses a question, the heads within a group come together to discuss the question, and then the teacher calls on a number to give the answer to the posed question, and pair checks where a team breaks into pairs to do work, when the work is complete the pairs change papers with the other pair in the group to check their work (p. l0:2).

Thinking skills structures are designed to have students create and exchange novel ideas to non-rote-type questions, such as "Are there ways to apply the laws of supply and demand to make our classroom a happier more efficient environment?" (p. 11:1). Within these categories, there are numerous structures. The use of so many structures allows a teacher to choose the best one for a given outcome.

Elliot Aronson

Aronson, Blaney, Stephan, Sikes, and Snapp (1978) first used the Jigsaw method with his colleagues in 1971 in a recently desegregated fifth grade public school classroom in Austin, Texas. In this environment, he saw the need for a switch from the traditional competitive atmosphere to one that was cooperative. After eight weeks of implementing Jigsaw and observing and interviewing students, Aronson found that Jigsaw students expressed less prejudice and negative stereotyping, were more self-confident, and reported liking school better than children in traditional classrooms. Slavin (1985) later developed another form of Jigsaw known as Jigsaw II. Kagan (1994), then, took the

Jigsaw method and converted it to fit into his different structures. An overview of the original Jigsaw developed by Aronson is given below.

Jigsaw. Aronson (2000) created the Jigsaw method of cooperative learning in which each student is in charge of one piece of the learning. A group of five to six students are given a topic to study. Each group member studies a different aspect of the topic. For example, if the students are studying World War II, each student studies a different element that contributed to the war. One subtopic might be the development of the atomic bomb. Those studying the atomic bomb would meet, after individual research, in an "expert group" to review their data before returning to their original group to share their learning. The students, then, teach their subtopic areas to members of their groups to ensure that they will be ready to take a test on the material. By this process, each student in each group educates the entire group. Each group must work together as a team to accomplish a common goal.

Elizabeth Cohen

A professor at Stanford University, Cohen (1998) developed her method of cooperative learning, Complex Instruction, in 1979. This method is most beneficial to students who are acquiring the English language because it was developed with a linguistic component for the heterogeneous classroom, in addition to cognitive and academic components. In 1990, over 200 schools in California reported using this method, and it began spreading to schools in other states in 1991. Although Cohen designed this method for elementary schools, its principles and guidelines can be used with any age group.

Complex instruction. Cohen's (1998) Complex Instruction evolved over 20 years of research (1991, 1994). The goal of this instruction is to provide academic access and success to all students. There are three major components. First, multiple-ability curricula are designed to foster higher-order thinking skills through groups organized around a central topic. In this type of curriculum, tasks are open-ended and require students to work together to solve problems. Second, special instructional strategies allow students to use cooperative norms and specific roles to manage their own groups. Because the students manage themselves in cooperative groups, the teacher is free to observe individual groups more carefully, provide specific feedback to individual groups, and treat participation problems individually among group members. Third, equal access to learning is ensured by teaching teachers to recognize and treat status problems, which refer to students who are social isolates and students who are seen to be lacking in academic skills and, therefore, learn less due to their inactivity within the group. Research showed (Cohen, 1998; Sharan & Sharan, 1992; Slavin, 1995) that the more students communicate and work together, the more they learn. The goal of Complex Instruction is that all students have equal participation within the group thereby allowing each group member equal access to learning.

The major researchers in the field of cooperative learning (Aronson, 2000; Cohen; 1998; Johnson & Johnson, 1998; Kagan, 1994; Sharan & Sharan, 1992; Slavin, 1990) each created their own methods of cooperative learning, ranging from simple structures to very complex learning groups. Although their methods differ, each follow the guidelines established by Johnson and Johnson (1989), which consists of positive interdependence, promotive interaction, individual accountability, small group

interpersonal skills, and group processing. Each of these components is necessary for a method to be classified as a cooperative learning technique. The next section will examine the empirical research into these methods.

Theoretical Framework

Several theories have served foundational to cooperative learning: behavioral, cognitive developmental, and social interdependence theories. Therefore, a theoretical framework based on these theories and their connection to social dominance theory, a theory resulting from research into bullying behaviors, was compiled to form a theoretical framework for this study. An overview of these theories is given below. Chapter Two provides a more in-depth examination of the theories related to cooperative learning.

The research on bullying (Sidanius & Pratto, 2001) has resulted in the development of the social dominance theory. In this theory, dominant people use both prosocial and coercive strategies to obtain their wants. For example, dominant people use coercive strategies when desiring to establish high power status at the initiation of a new group. Once this dominance has been established, dominant people then begin using prosocial behaviors because they believe their power cannot be threatened. The basic assumption behind this theory is that competition is the basic philosophy for human behavior, much like the behavior in the animal world (Choi, 2006). This theory directly relates to the foundational theory of cooperative learning, embodied in Deutsch's (1962) theory of social interdependence, which investigates two types of interdependence: positive (cooperative) and negative (competition).

The research on cooperative learning has been shaped by behavioral, cognitive development, and social interdependence theories. The behavioral approach is based on the works of Skinner (1968) and Bandura (1977). Although these researchers addressed many variables in group interactions, their principle interest was the impact of rewards and reinforcements on learning in a group (Johnson & Johnson, 1998). "The behavioral-social perspective presupposes that cooperative efforts are fueled by extrinsic motivation to achieve group rewards" (Johnson et al., 1986, p. 3).

The cognitive development theory derives from the works of Piaget (1950) and Vygotsky (1978). Piaget examined how individuals work together. When individuals work in a cooperative environment, socio-cognitive conflict occurs that creates cognitive disequilibrium, which in turn stimulates perspective-taking ability and cognitive development (Johnson & Johnson, 1998). Vygotsky based his work on the premise that knowledge is social and constructed from cooperative efforts to learn, understand, and solve problems.

The most important theory underlying the concept of cooperation is social interdependence. This theory is rooted in the work of Koffka (1935), one of the founders of the Gestalt School of Psychology. "Koffka's theory proposed that groups were dynamic wholes in which the interdependence among members could vary" (Johnson et al., 1986, p. 5). Later, Lewin (1946), Koffka's colleague, advanced this theory. His interpretation of social interdependence was founded on the belief that a common goal creates a "dynamic whole" that develops interdependence within a group. When the structure of a group changes, an intrinsic state of tension arises inside group members motivating them to accomplish a desired common goal. Other researchers, such as

Mahler (1979), advanced Lewin's theory. These researchers acknowledged that the drive toward a common goal motivates cooperative and competitive behavior.

With the development of these fundamental theories, Deutsch (1949) expanded the theory of social interdependence by creating his theory for cooperation and competition. According to Deutsch, social interdependence exists when individuals of a group share a common goal, and an individual's outcomes are affected by the actions of others. Researchers like Johnson and Johnson (1989), Kagan (1994), and Gibbs (1995) then applied this work to the field of education. Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec (1998) applied Deutsch's theory to the classroom setting in their research on cooperative learning. In the educational venue, social interdependence is structured in ways that individual students interact, and the outcomes of these interactions have consequences and rewards for other group members. Positive interdependence is seen as cooperation that results in promotive interaction as each group member encourages the efforts and learning of other members of the group.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed in this study.

1. In what ways do bullying behaviors (name calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to the bullied child; and excluding) occur among fifth-grade students within three schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco?
2. In what ways do fifth-grade students within three schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco use cooperative learning skills related to positive interdependence and interpersonal behaviors in the classroom?

3. How have fifth grade teachers within three schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco incorporated the instruction of interpersonal skills into the teaching of cooperative learning strategies?
4. What are the perceptions of fifth grade teachers within three schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco regarding bullying behaviors (name calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to the bullied child; and excluding) of their students?
5. What is the relationship between cooperative learning (positive interdependence and interpersonal skills) and bullying behaviors (name calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to the bullied child; and excluding) among fifth-grade students within three schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco?

Limitations

The scope and generalizability of this study were limited by factors both in and out of the control of the researcher. The methodology for this study was qualitative. This form of research uses less quantifiable techniques to gather and analyze data with the findings not being generalizable to other situations, locations, time periods, or people. However, qualitative research lends itself to thicker description, which in the case of this study involved the experiences of children.

The population of this study was limited to three fifth grade classrooms within the Archdiocese of San Francisco. This limited the study to those students in attendance at these three schools. This sample may only be a select sample of the general population

due to being a Catholic school. Students attending other schools in the areas observed might give a more generalizable sample of the population.

The researcher collected data from these three schools during the months of November and December. The observations were for 10 consecutive days at each research site. The observer may not have seen the full effects of cooperative learning in each fifth grade classroom due to the limited time and duration of the study. However, the researcher perceived it was more effective to see how cooperative learning strategies were introduced to the students during the first half of the school year.

Data for this study were based on teachers' perceptions of their use of cooperative learning strategies, which may not have been the reality. In actuality, two of the homeroom teachers employed cooperative learning techniques in accordance to the guidelines give by Johnson et al. (1998) while the third teacher did not follow those guidelines completely. The science teacher at this school was a shining example of a cooperative learning teacher.

During observations of students both in the classroom and schoolwide, the researcher may have inadvertently missed occurrences of cooperative learning and bullying behaviors. It was difficult to observe the number of students in each classroom during cooperative activities that were spread over different areas and not miss behaviors when moving from one group to the next. When on the play yards, the students played in various areas and again the research was not able to observe all groups of children at once. Another challenge was that students' behaviors might have been modified during observations due to presence of the researcher.

At St. Alena's School only 25 of the 33 students returned their consent forms. Therefore, some students who may have been excellent interview candidates could not be place into the random drawings because consent from parents was not received. Once focus group interview participants were selected, the researcher could not be sure of the truthfulness of answers given or the motives behind given answers. Focus group interviews were conducted on the fifth and tenth day of observations at each school site. The first focus group interview may have contaminated subsequent observations at each site. Students from focus group interviews may have been more aware of the researchers agenda.

Significance

Twenty-six fatal school shootings at the K-12 level occurred in this country from 1996 to 2007. Holmes (2002) found that classmates bullied perpetrators in many of these shootings. Bullying and other risk factors, such as conduct disorder, emotional problems, and dysfunctional home life, may have contributed to the fatal outburst displayed by the assailants. Carney, Hazler, and Higgins (2002) claimed that bullying, along with the above-mentioned factors, create a school environment full of fear and intimidation. Cobia and Carney (2002) further stated that safe environments conducive to learning are not being achieved in many schools throughout the United States because of the hostility created by bullying.

This research examined how the use of cooperative learning skills taught in fifth grade classrooms attempted to build the needed relationships between students, and, therefore, may have assisted in combating the bullying cycle that affects the climate of Catholic schools. This study may further assist teachers in becoming aware of creating

classroom climates that foster cooperative skills among students, an essential element of Catholic education (Congregation for Catholic Education, 1988). Teachers and school climate are critical to the academic and social success of students in the Catholic school. Hopefully, the voices of students that are heard through this research will illuminate curriculum that may counteract the bullying cycle.

This study documented how students worked in cooperative groups in the classroom and if learning from these groups was transferred to other areas of the school, such as play yards, eating areas, hallways, and bathrooms. Through the use of focus group interviews, this study documented the perspectives of students in relationship to cooperative learning skills positive interdependence and interpersonal skills, and the following bullying behaviors: name-calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to a bullied child; and excluding. Teachers and administrators may increase their appreciation for cooperative learning in the classroom and how this learning may counteract bullying. Teachers and administrators may gain insight into the thinking of children in bullying situations at their schools.

Additionally, this study hopefully contributed to the literature on cooperative learning and bullying. Specifically, it added to the gap in the literature pertaining to these two variables by providing description and analysis of how the use of cooperative learning may help combat the bullying cycle in Catholic elementary schools. This study has given a voice to the students who are far too often not heard. The following chapter, Review of Literature, presents an overview of empirical studies focusing of bullying and cooperative learning.

Definition of Terms

Bullying	"Repeated acts of aggression or harm by individuals who have more power than their victims. More power meaning advantages in strength, confidence, status, or aggressiveness" (Bolton & Graeve, 2005, p. 9).
Bystander	A student who watches a bullying situation as an active and involved participant in the social architecture of school violence rather than as a passive witness (Salmivalli, 1999).
Collaboration	A situation in which two or more people learn or attempt to learn something together (Dillenbourg, 1999).
Cooperative Learning	An arrangement in which students work in mixed-ability groups and are rewarded on the group's success (Woolfolk, 2001).
Cruel Criticism	The use of words, phrases, body movements, and gestures to make a person feel less about themselves.
Excluding	Not letting another student or group of students into a group. Rejecting others who wish to be included in an activity.
Positive Interdependence	"An arrangement in which students are linked together so one cannot succeed unless all group members succeed" (Johnson, et al., 1986, p. 8).
Promotive Interaction	Students work together to reach group goal by giving and receiving help, exchanging resources and information, and giving and receiving feedback (Johnson & Johnson, 1989).
Physical Contact	Hitting, kicking, pushing, or making contact with another child that causes that child to feel discomfort (Bolton & Graeve, 2005).
Name-calling	Calling a student a name other than their given name.
Social Interdependence	Students' efforts to achieve, to develop positive relationships, to adjust psychologically, and to show social competence (Johnson, et al., 1998).
Victim	"Someone who is chronically and repeatedly bullied"(Bolton & Graeve, 2005, p. 23). In this document victim and bullied are used interchangeably.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Overview

This study investigated the impact of cooperative learning skills, positive interdependence and interpersonal skills, on the bullying behaviors of name calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to the bullied child; and excluding; of fifth-grade students in Catholic elementary schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco. It explored the perspectives of fifth grade teachers and students on the above-mentioned bullying behaviors. The literature review for this study presented empirical research on bullying. It, then, examined three studies that linked cooperative learning and bullying behaviors. Next, the review summarized three meta-analyses on cooperative learning that are described according to categories of learning derived from each meta-analysis. Lastly, the literature review explored the major theories that have been foundational to cooperative learning, that is, behavioral, cognitive developmental, and social interdependence theories, forming the theoretical framework for this study. All of these topics provided the foundation for this study.

Studies on Bullying

Although bullying has been a recognized problem since 1960, little research was conducted in this area until the early 1970s (Olweus, 1993). Research began in Sweden and quickly spread to other Scandinavian countries. It was not until late 1982, when a newspaper reported that three 10- to 14-year-old boys from Norway had committed suicide as a consequence of severe bullying by peers, that school authorities became

involved in the research process. It was not until the late 1980s that research into bullying among schoolchildren began in the United States (Hoover & Hazler, 1991).

Dan Olweus was one of the first researchers in the field of bullying. He has conducted studies that have been foundational for subsequent researchers. All of his studies used a self-reporting methodology that involved giving students questionnaires that were anonymously completed. Three of his studies will be examined for this research. The first longitudinal study on bullying conducted by Olweus (1993) began in the early 1970s with 900 boys from Greater Stockholm, Sweden, and concluded in the early 1990s. Olweus then began three other large-scale studies to help elucidate the bully/victim problem. The first was a large-scale study in Norway, and the second, a parallel study in Sweden to permit comparisons of data collected, and the final study, the Bergen study. The details of each study are found in the following.

In the Norway study (Olweus, 1993), questionnaires were sent to children in Grades 1 through 4 and 5 through 9, ending with a sample of 130,000 students. Teachers administered questionnaires that the students completed anonymously. These questionnaires were different from the Greater Stockholm study because it provided a definition of bullying, referred to a specific time period, and included questions about others' reactions to bullying.

All primary and junior high school in Norway were invited to participate in the study. Approximately 85 percent of the school participated, and from that a representative sample of 880 schools was selected. Valid data was obtained from 715 schools for a population of approximately 130,000 students from across Norway comprised of one fourth of the student population from the ages of 8 to 16.

Olweus (1993) nationwide survey campaign obtained that 84,000 students were involved in bully victim problems “now and then”. Approximately 52,000 students were victims, 41,000 students bullied others on a regular basis, and 9,000 students were both victims and bullies. The findings from this study determined that bullying in schools is a problem that affects a very large number of students.

During the same academic year, Olweus (1993) conducted parallel study with the same questionnaire from the Norway study with approximately 170,00 students in grades 3 to 9 in three cities in Sweden. These cities were Goteborg, Malmo, and Vasteras. Each of these cities had populations ranging from 420,00 to 120,000. The purpose of this study was to allow comparison of data collected from the three largest cities in Norway: Oslo, Bergen, and Trondheim that participated in the Norway study. The finding of this study was the view of bullying being a big city problem was a myth. Students who bullied or were bullied in cities with a population ranging from 450,000 to 150,000 was approximately the same or somewhat lower that statistics from cities and town with a population below 150,000. This study also determined that parents and teacher from the three large cities in Sweden had more conversations with students about the bully and victim problem. This endorsed a greater awareness of these problems in the cities that in smaller towns.

Olweus’s (1993) third study, the Bergen study, collected data giving more detailed information on mechanisms involved in the bully and victim problems and collected information from 2,500 students over a two-year period. This population was formed of boys and girls in grades 4 through 7 from 28 primary and 14 junior high schools in the city of Bergen, Norway. Data was further collected from 300-400 teachers

and administrators and 1,000 parents at determined points in time over a two and half year period. The study in Norway determined that a single student bullied 35% to 40% of victimized students. It further claimed that the percentage of bullies decreased in the higher grades. The average percentage of students bullied in Grades 2 through 6 was twice as high as that in Grades 7 through 9. Children in Grades 2 and 3 reported that older students bullied them.

The overall finding from the combination of Olweus (1993) studies is that one out of seven students are bullied in school and this bullying tends to be more prevalent in the lower grades and decreases as the students get older. The studies also determined that bullying is now taking on more serious forms and is more prevalent than 10 to 15 years ago. Boys are more exposed to bullying than girls with boys being more physical and direct than girls. Girls tend to be more indirect in their bullying techniques with excluding being the most prominent type. The studies also formulated that, "parents of students who are bullied and, in particular, who bully others, are relatively unaware of the problem and talk with their children about it only a limited extent" (Olweus, 1993, p. 21).

Findings from Olweus' (1993) studies that were of particular importance to this study were that class size did not matter when analyzing bullying at school. Olweus concluded, "The size of the class or school appears to be of negligible importance for the relative frequency or level of bullying/victim problems in the class or the school" (p. 25). His studies also determined that the greater number of teachers who supervised students during break periods lowered the occurrence of bullying behaviors during breaks, lunch, and recess.

Following the Scandinavian studies, Stephenson and Smith (1987) conducted research in England reporting that 7% of their sample were victims, 10% were bullies, and 6% were both. Whitney and Smith (1993) later found that 10% of students were bullied at least once a week. In the United States, Perry, Kusel, and Perry (1988) determined the rate of victimization among peers to be approximately 10% in the study they conducted in junior high schools. Finally, in a Canadian study, Ziegler and Rosenstein-Manner (1991) observed that 8% of students bullied other students weekly or more often.

In Australia, Rigby (1997) observed that verbal bullying was the most commonly reported form among boys and girls in elementary schools. Boys and girls experienced this equally. Unlike physical bullying, which became less frequent with age, the incidence of verbal bullying remained constant. Owens (1996) and Tulloch (1995) discovered that, more often than not, boys are physically bullied whereas girls are the victims of indirect bullying, such as exclusion.

Rigby (1997) concluded that safety did not exist in schools for most of the children susceptible to bullying. Various researchers have noted that much more bullying occurs at school than on the way to or from school (Olweus, 1978; Ziegler & Rosenstein-Manner, 1991). Most bullying on school premises occurs on the playground, followed by the hallways, classrooms, lunchrooms, and washrooms (Yates & Smith, 1989; Whitney & Smith, 1993).

Hoover, Oliver, and Hazler (1992) found that the five most frequently cited reasons that boys were bullied were due to: not fitting in, physical weakness, short-

temperedness, association with friends, and clothing. Girls were bullied because of: not fitting in, facial appearance, crying/emotional behaviors, overweight, and good grades.

Ziegler and Rosenstein-Manner (1991) established that students bullied others to feel powerful and to gain attention. Rigby (1997) determined that social pressure was an important component of bullying. In his research, students reported bullying because others were doing it. Students perceived that the teacher was primarily responsible for the control of bullying. Other researchers, however, have vindicated the teacher, claiming that the teacher does not control bullying because he or she is unaware that bullying is happening. This is especially true for verbal and indirect bullying, which are less obvious and often go undetected (Pepler, Craig, Ziegler, & Charach, 1994). Rigby continued that most children believed that students and teachers should work together to stop the bully/victim problem. Nevertheless, most students do nothing to stop bullying when they see it happening.

In response to the Rigby (1997) study on what children can tell us about bullying, he was obtained by the Attorney-General's Department of Australia to conduct a meta-evaluation (2002) on methods and approaches that reduced bullying in elementary schools. This meta-evaluation included 12 studies conducted in Switzerland, the United States, Canada, England, Finland, Norway, Spain, Belgium, and Australia. The programs evaluated comprised a variety of components that involved different levels, such as the school, the classroom, the individual students, and the parents. Rigby discovered that studies using specific techniques rather than generalized programs reported positively on the use of curriculum content, including lessons on anger management, impulse control, and encouragement of empathetic feelings in reducing observed aggressive behavior.

Two studies reviewed by Rigby (2002) that employed the cooperative learning approach as a teaching technique did not show consistently positive effects in the reduction of bullying behaviors, but did result in a decrease in the self-reporting of victims and self-reporting of bullies. Another outcome was that students participating in cooperative groups were perceived a victim less often than students who did not participate in cooperative learning.

The first of these was The Sheffield Cooperative Learning Study (Cowie, Smith, Boulton, & Laver; 1994), which evaluated the use of cooperative group work that would create positive change in the interpersonal relations among children, therefore reducing bullying. Rigby, Cox, and Black (1997) supported the theory that children who bully have uncooperative attitudes. For The Sheffield Study teachers from three schools wanting to participate in the study attended a two-day in-service in the following cooperative learning strategies: trust building exercises, problem-solving groups, role-playing, discussion groups, report back sessions, and debriefing. The teachers were then asked to adapt their learning and employ it as a teaching strategy. The population consisted of 16 classes of 149 students between the ages of 7 and 12 years of age for the two-year study. Some students participated for the first year only, some for the second year only, and some for both years. Students were assessed in individual interviews by pointing to pictures of other students and indicating if other children bullied them or if they bullied other children. The pictures were classified accordingly. The results did not indicate changes in the tendencies for children to bully others, but did indicate that students in the cooperative learning groups were perceived a victim less than the children who did not participate in cooperative learning groups.

The second study was the Seville Study conducted in Spain in 1995 with researchers from the University of Seville (Ortega & Lena; 2000). This program received direct help from former members of The Sheffield Study. This program was based on the premise that positive relationships between students could be promoted through the use of democratic management of interpersonal relations by the school authorities. Therefore, school rules were decided on by consensus, disputes were resolved through debate, conflicts settled with conflict resolution, and everyone was encouraged to take part fully in school life.

The program focused on helping students involved in bully/victim problems. This included peer support activities, conflict management, assertiveness, and empathy training. State funded schools within Seville participated in the study. The sample included 910 students ranging from 8 to 18 years of age. Anonymous questionnaires were developed specifically to assess the study, which focused on prevalence of children being bullied and bullying others and on students' attitudes towards bullying. The study concluded that reports of self-reported victims decreased and reports of self-reported bullies decreased. The researchers commented that these results reflected a greater awareness of visible forms of bullying.

Choi (2006) conducted a study for her dissertation under the direction of Johnson and Johnson that directly related the use of cooperative learning to deter bullying in elementary schools. Choi's study examined social interdependence, social dominance, children's bullying, victimization, and prosocial behaviors. The study included 10 teachers from 10 classrooms in a suburban area of Minnesota. These classrooms consisted of 217 elementary school participants in 3rd through 5th grade. The research

design for Choi's study was correlational where the participants were surveyed regarding cooperative learning experiences, social attitudes (cooperative, competitive, and individualistic), children's bullying, victimization, and prosocial behaviors in their classrooms. The 10 teachers filled out a survey for each child's bullying, victimization, and prosocial behaviors. The principal at each of the 10 schools rated the teacher on his or her use of cooperative learning in the classroom.

The study concluded that children who had more cooperative experiences showed more cooperative attitudes, therefore exhibiting fewer bullying behaviors and less victimization. "In terms of these results, we can say that one way to reduce school bully/victimization is to teach cooperative activities. Teaching these cooperative activities can lead to increased prosocial behaviors in children while decreasing bullying/victimization" (Choi, 2006, p.14).

Summary

Empirical studies conducted on the bullying problem began in Scandinavian countries and did not occur in the United States until the late 1980s. The results of these studies claimed that one perpetrator usually bullied the majority of students and bullying usually decreased in the higher grades. Younger students felt that teachers could be helpful when they were bullied, but older students indicated that teachers did nothing to stop bullying. However, it appears that the teachers are generally unaware of bullying among their students, and the use of cooperative learning to combat the bullying cycle. However, the two bullying studies with direct links to cooperative learning strategies showed ambiguous results. The final study in this section showed promising results for

cooperative learning activities having the ability to reduce bullying and victimization in elementary schools.

This section addressed foundational studies by Olweus (1993), additional studies that corroborated his results, and three studies with direct links between cooperative learning and bullying behaviors. The next section will demonstrate the various methods of cooperative learning, the research documenting these methods, and how this method of teaching and learning might help combat the problem of bullying in schools.

Studies on Cooperative Learning

According to Johnson et al. (2000), "Cooperative learning is one of the most widespread and fruitful areas of theory, research, and practice in education" (p. 1). Cuseo (1992) found cooperative learning to be "the most researched and empirically well-documented form of collaborative learning in terms of its positive impact on multiple outcome measures" (p. 3). These outcomes included increased academic achievement, critical thinking and problem solving, social competence, motivation, psychological health, self-esteem, and reduction of problem behaviors (Benard, 2005; Johnson et al., 2000; Millis, 2001; Panitz, 1999; Springer, Stanne, & Donovan, 1998).

Over the past 90 years, more than 525 experimental and 100 correlational studies have been conducted that show results to the above outcomes. These studies have been summarized in a meta-analysis published by Johnson and Johnson (1989). The results of this meta-analysis, along with additional research findings pertaining to these outcomes, including a meta-analysis by Springer et al. (1998) and Johnson et al. (2000), are discussed in the next section of this review under specific headings for the research findings.

Academic Achievement

Benard (2005) established that academic achievement was the most frequently studied outcome of cooperative learning experiments. Slavin (1996) determined that these experiments had been conducted on every major subject, at all levels, and in all types of schools in many countries. The majority of studies concluded that cooperative learning benefited students equally regardless of their gender or level of achievement. The findings were also positive across a variety of cooperative learning methods in comparison to competitive and individualistic learning. The meta-analysis by Johnson et al. (2000) examined eight methods of cooperative learning from 1970 to 1999 and concluded that all had a significant positive impact on student achievement when compared with competitive and individualistic learning. Among the methods already discussed, their analysis found that Learning Together and Alone (LT) had the greatest effect, followed by Academic and Constructive Controversy (AC), Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD), Teams-Games-Tournaments (TGT), Group Investigation (GI), Jigsaw (JS), Team Assisted Individualization (TAI), and Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC). Table 4 ranks each method by the size of the effect on achievement and cooperative learning versus competitive and individualized learning. Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition, included in the meta-analysis, was not included in the previous review of methods because its cooperative groups are based primarily on two members and do not fit into the cooperative groups of four or more students, which is the basis for this dissertation.

Similar to the findings by the Johnsons, Springer et al. (1998), in a meta-analysis of empirical research on cooperative learning at the higher education level, determined

that students at the college level who learned in small groups showed greater achievement than students who were instructed without cooperative or collaborative groupings.

Table 4

Effect Sizes of Cooperative Learning Methods on Achievement

Method	Coop v Comp	n	Method	Coop v Ind	n
LT	0.85	26	LT	1.04	57
AC	0.67	19	AC	0.91	11
STAD	0.51	15	GI	0.62	1
TGT	0.48	9	TGT	0.58	5
GI	0.37	2	TAI	0.33	8
JS	0.29	9	STAD	0.29	14
TAI	0.25	7	CIRC	0.18	1
CIRC	0.18	7	JS	0.13	5

Note. From *Cooperative Learning Methods: A Meta-Analysis* by Johnson, Johnson, and Stanne, 2000. p. 10.

An earlier meta-analysis by Johnson and Johnson (1989) that measured cooperation, competition, and individual learning from preschool through higher education in studies conducted from 1898 to 1989 indicated that cooperation produced higher productivity and achievement. For this review, the findings that are most pertinent are from studies that used a mixture of cooperative, competitive, and individualized learning with group versus individual measures for achievement. The results indicated that the pure use of cooperative learning demonstrated higher gains in achievement with a mean of .65 (n=164) for cooperation versus individualistic learning and a mean of .71 (n

= 96) for cooperative versus competitive learning. Students in cooperative groups spent 56% more time on task than those in traditional learning modes.

Additional studies by Madden and Slavin (1983) and Slavin and Karweit (1981) discovered that students in Student Teams-Achievement Divisions gained significantly more in mathematics than did those students in the control groups. Lotan and Benton (1990) evaluated the implementation of Complex Instruction, a method of cooperative learning, and found that learning gains on standardized reading and mathematics tests were significantly higher than those of the normed student population. Slavin (1990) found that students who participated in Teams-Games-Tournaments and Team Assisted Individualization learned mathematical computation more quickly and comprehensively than did those students in the control group.

Critical Thinking and Problem Solving

Slavin (1997) explained that critical thinking is the ability to make rational decisions about what to do or what to believe. To effectively teach this skill, a teacher must set a classroom tone that encourages the acceptance of divergent views and open discussions. Such a classroom environment is created by using cooperative learning (Aronson, 2000; Johnson & Johnson 1989, 1995; Sharan & Sharan, 1992; Slavin, 1990). This method fosters higher student performance (Bligh, 1972), and students' critical thinking skills increase as retention of information and interest in subject matter improve (Kulik & Kulik, 1979).

Slavin (1997) also explained that problem solving is the application of knowledge and skills to achieve certain goals. Problem solving is a skill that can be taught and learned (Bransford & Stern, 1993). Students who are successful problem solvers appear

to treat situations more playfully (Getzel & Jackson, 1962). This suggests a relaxed atmosphere, in which students are encouraged to try different solutions and are not criticized for making mistakes. Frederiksen (1984) found that the steps used by creative problem solvers share several similarities with cooperative learning in a group. A creative problem solver must reflect on a problem, consider all possibilities, feel his or her ideas will be accepted, analyze the characteristics of the problem, be taught cognitive skills for solving problems, and be given feedback not only on the correctness of his or her solution but also on the process by which the solution was obtained.

Johnson (1971) discovered that students in cooperative groups developed valuable problem-solving skills by formulating ideas, discussing them with group members, and receiving immediate feedback from group members. Peterson and Swing (1985) claimed that it was this immediate feedback that stimulated the critical thinking abilities of these groups. Yager, Johnson, and Johnson (1985) reasoned that students could verbalize answers, listen to others, and question what is heard because they work together in groups. This clarification and explanation of one's answers is an important part of the collaborative process and promotes critical thinking and problem-solving skills (Johnson, Johnson, Roy, & Zaidman, 1985). Damon and Phelps (1989) discovered gains in creativity, experimentation, and problem-solving skills when cooperative groups were used. In a study using achievement testing, Sharan, Gal, and Stok (1984) affirmed that students who used the Group Investigation method responded more accurately to questions that required analysis and the application of knowledge to new problems than students who did not use this method.

The meta-analysis by Johnson and Johnson (1989) indicated that cooperative learning methods encourage the development of metacognitive learning, a form of critical thinking, because they focus on the learning process, which includes the evaluation of a group's work by the group members, assessment and improvement of interpersonal skills that take place during cooperative activities, and efforts to correct each student's performance (Panitz, 1999). During cooperative learning, students act as mediators of their fellow students' thinking because the group discussions call for elaboration and analysis by peers (Pressels, 1992). Johnson and Johnson (1995) found that the Academic and Constructive Controversy approach to cooperative learning enhanced student metacognition. Other studies (Costa & O'Leary, 1992; Webb, 1992) have shown that students attain metacognitive skills at a higher level when working in cooperative groups.

Social Competence and Relationships

Due to the social aspects of cooperative learning, one would expect to find social outcomes (Benard, 2005), such as cooperation, altruism, and empathy (Aronson, 2000; Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Sharan & Sharan, 1992, Slavin, 1990). This review has already addressed the importance of communication in cooperative grouping, which is a key factor in building social competence (Johnson & Johnson, 1989). Through this interaction with peers, students also develop impulse control and relationship skills (Ladd, 1989). The collaborative process promotes familiarity: As students work in small groups, a teacher is better able to interact with each group or the students individually (Cooper et al., 1984).

The meta-analysis by Johnson and Johnson (1989) determined that cooperation produces greater social support than competitive and individualistic efforts. Seventy-two

percent of the findings supported cooperation with only one percent favoring competition. Their meta-analysis also found that positive attitudes toward cooperative work translated into teacher and student perceived caring of other group members. The results concluded that the longer cooperation was employed in a classroom the more positive the effects on social support.

Students, however, need to be trained in interpersonal skills before they can effectively work in cooperative groups (Johnson et al., 1986). By identifying behaviors that help the group members work together and by asking individuals to reflect on their contributions to the group's success or failure, students realize the need for positive, healthy, helping relationships in cooperative learning (Cohen & Cohen, 1991). Cooperative learning encourages student involvement in the learning process (Sharan & Sharan, 1992) and uses the students' social experiences to obtain this goal (Cohen & Willis, 1985). Sharan and Sharan (1992) showed that positive peer relations could be promoted by having students participate in the Group Investigation method. Warm-up exercises and team-building experiences throughout class time build social support (Kagan, 1994).

Classrooms are not socially neutral and instructional methods will affect student relationships (Sharan & Sharan, 1992). These relationships influence students' attitudes toward school and the way they prepare for and process learning (Schmuck & Schmuck, 1988). Today's schools are built on a system of competition and have an adult-child dyadic approach to teaching and learning, which de-emphasizes student-to-student relationships in the classroom (Johnson & Johnson, 1989; 1991). This is the exact opposite of the cooperative classroom in which students work together in heterogeneous

groups (Slavin, 1990). Hert-Lazarowitz, Sharan, and Steinberg, (1980) and Sharan (1990) showed that the helpful relations fostered through cooperative learning affect the students' relationships outside of the classroom, even when a teacher is not present to observe. This finding directly related to this dissertation because the researcher hoped to observe how cooperative learning affected students' relationships outside the classroom.

Johnson and Johnson (1989) reported that the development of primary relationships and socialization takes place with peers. When compared with the interaction between adults and peers, student interaction tends to be more frequent, varied, and intense throughout childhood and adolescence. Constructive relations with peers are a necessity. This research also emphasized that peer relationships contribute to students' social and cognitive development. Johnson and Johnson (1991) summarized the benefits of peer relationships:

1. In their interactions with peers, children and adolescents directly learn attitudes, values, and information unobtainable from adults.

2. Interactions with peers provides support, opportunities, and models for prosocial behavior.

3. Peers provide models of, expectations of, directions for, and reinforcements of learning to control impulses.

4. Children and adolescents learn to view situations and problems from perspectives other than their own through interaction with peers.

5. Relationships with other children and adolescents are powerful influences on the development of the values and the social sensitivity required for autonomy.

6. Children need close and intimate relationships with peers with whom they can share thoughts and feelings, aspirations and hopes, dreams and fantasies, and joys and pains.

7. It is through peer relationships that a frame of reference for perceiving oneself is developed.

8. Coalitions formed during childhood and adolescence provide help and assistance throughout adulthood.

9. The absence of any friendships during childhood and adolescence seems to increase the risk of mental disorders.

10. In both education and work settings, peers have a strong influence on productivity.

11. Student educational aspirations may be more influenced by peers than by any other social influence. (pp. 31-34)

According to Felder (1997), students within a collaborative learning environment made new friends more easily than students outside of such a setting. Cowie et al. (1994) agreed that cooperation is a trait that precipitates friendships and helps to maintain friendships during childhood and adolescence. Other studies (Gabelnick, MacGregor, Mathews, & Smith, 1990; Springer et al., 1998) determined that students valued cooperative learning experiences, in part, because of the friendships they made and feelings of belonging. Several studies (Aronson, 2000; Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Slavin, 1990) found that cooperative learning, regardless of the method, promotes interpersonal liking, attraction, trust, and a sense of belonging by both teachers and peers.

Positive race and ethnic relations are another benefit of cooperative learning. Benard (2005) stated, “What is so compelling about a developmental approach such as cooperative learning is that it achieves positive effects on a problem, in this case, race relations, without ever directly focusing instruction on the issue” (p. 118). Slavin (1990) concurred,

> Cooperative learning provides daily opportunities for intense interpersonal contact between students of different races. When the teacher assigns students of different ethnic groups to work together, he or she communicates unequivocal support for the idea that interracial or interethnic interaction is officially sanctioned. (p. 35)

Research studies (Hansell & Slavin, 1981; Slavin & Oickle, 1981) measured the effects of Student Teams-Achievement Divisions on friendships between African American and Caucasian students and found that cross-racial relations among junior high school students in the study were strong and long lasting. Slavin and Madden (1979) found that cooperation between students of different races on sport teams was the only school practice that was consistently associated with positive race relations. Sharan (1980) examined Student Teams-Achievement Divisions, Teams-Games-Tournaments, Jigsaw, Learning Together and Alone, and Group Investigation and found positive correlations between each of these methods and positive race relations among peers. Additional research into Group Investigation has claimed positive effects on interaction and relationships between students from different ethnic groups in heterogeneous classrooms (Cohen, 1994; Sharan & Shaulov, 1990; Sharan & Sharan, 1992).

Cooperative learning has also promoted the acceptance of gender differences (Benard, 2005). Bean (1996) speculated that cooperative learning is particularly effective in increasing the leadership skills of female students and familiarizing male students with receiving help from women during pressure situations. Johnson and Johnson (1991) gathered that cooperative learning helped female and minority students to enjoy mathematics and to take more advanced mathematics courses.

Motivation

Sharan (1990) and Sharan and Sharan (1992) found that students in a cooperative learning environment showed increased interest in their studies, displayed greater involvement in the learning process, and were more interested in the substance of what they studied than students who received whole-class instruction. This research identified

positive peer interaction and enhanced decision making as two aspects of cooperative learning that motivate students' academic achievement. In his review of cooperative learning, Sharan (1990) wrote, "Research studies on cooperative learning have asserted that this approach to classroom instruction enhances pupils' intrinsic motivation to learn more than the traditional whole-class approach to instruction" (p. 173). Panitz (n.d.) noted that, "Successful intrinsic motivation develops attitude, establishes inclusion, engenders competence, and enhances meaning with diverse students" (p. 1).

Over a two-year period, Sharan and Shaulov (1990) explored the motivation of students in 17 fifth- and sixth-grade classrooms that used Group Investigation and traditional whole-class instruction. The study was simple: Students could choose to continue working on their study project or to play outside for 20 minutes. Significant changes in the level of motivation occurred for the students using Group Investigation. For students using the whole-class method, neither an increase nor a decrease in motivation was observed. The students' motivation to learn by working on the study project was a significant factor leading to academic achievement.

Numerous studies have been done and much has been written about cooperative learning and its effects on motivation (Johnson et al., 1986; Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Slavin, 1987; 1995). Much of this research compares the traditional competitive grading system with the cooperative incentive structures of cooperative learning. Slavin (1995) described four perspectives of cooperative learning, one of which, the motivational perspective, focuses on the reward or goal structures under which students operate. Slavin's (1994) methods of cooperative learning, Student Teams-Achievements Divisions, Teams-Games-Tournaments, and Teams Assisted Individualization, are based

on group contingency in which rewards are commensurate with group members' behaviors. Because group members' outcomes depend on the behavior of other group members, students engage in behaviors that help the group win rewards. The traditional, competitive, grading system and informal reward system of the classroom, however, create peer norms that militate against academic efforts (Johnson & Johnson, 1989).

Psychological Health

Cooperative learning can help develop a social support system and caring relationships (Benard, 2005). Johnson and Johnson (1989) stated, "Caring and committed relationships tend to promote healthy socialization and psychological development while abusive and negative relationships tend to promote psychological pathology" (p. 13). Children, they noted, experience two kinds of relationships, vertical and horizontal. Children form vertical relationships first with individuals who have more knowledge and power than themselves, such as with parents and teachers. These relationships provide protection and security. Next, children form horizontal relationships with peers with whom they share equal social power. It is in these horizontal relationships that children form more elaborate interpersonal skills, master the complexities of cooperation and competition, and achieve intimacy in social relations. The Johnson's meta-analysis (1989) showed that the most important interdependent relationship for psychological health appeared to be relationships with peers.

Relationships with peers are an absolute necessity for healthy cognitive and social development and socialization. Parker and Asher (1987) analyzed more than 30 studies that revealed a positive correlation between social rejection in childhood and problems in later life. These problems included: dropping out of school, engaging in delinquent and

criminal behaviors, and acquiring psychological illnesses. They also discovered that the socially withdrawn, socially incompetent, and aggressive child has an increased chance of becoming a socially inept adult.

Research into the psychological health of students who participated in cooperative environments rather than competitive environments showed a decreased risk for psychological problems (Johnson & Johnson, 1989). Ames and Ames (1981) determined that competition causes individuals to evaluate their own ability. In such a teaching and learning style, mastery of content and a passive acceptance of information from an outside expert promotes a sense of helplessness (Panitz, 1999). The learning environment does not encourage students to seek help from others. Additional research into the competitive classroom atmosphere by Hertz-Lazarowitz, Sharan, and Steinberg (1980) showed that students disliked helpers because they believed that help-seeking indicated dependence and that this activity reflected adversely on their intelligence.

Kleiber and Roberts (1981) concluded that competition has produced irrational behaviors in students because they value winning over fairness. Johnson and Norem-Hebeisen (1977) found that competitive attitudes were significantly related to hypochondriasis, depression, hysteria, and paranoia. Later, James and Johnson (1988) confirmed the psychological maladjustments of the previous study by using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) pathology scale. A comparison of the three learning styles used in the classroom, cooperative, competitive, and individualistic, showed that the cooperative style of teaching and learning was best for psychological well- being (Johnson & Johnson, 1989).

Self-Esteem

Benard (2005) identified self-esteem as the most studied aspect of cooperation and psychological health, and Slavin (1990) concluded that the most important outcome of research into cooperative learning methods is its effect on student self-esteem. Johnson and Johnson (1989) revealed that cooperative learning enhanced students' self-esteem, which in turn motivated students to participate in the learning process. In the Johnsons' (1989) meta-analysis, the two researchers sought to determine the effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic styles of teaching and learning on students' self-esteem. To this end, they conducted four studies involving 821 middle-class, Caucasian, secondary school students in a Midwestern suburban community. The results of the studies indicated the following:

> Working jointly with peers to achieve common goals has significant and considerable impact on self-esteem. Cooperative experiences promote higher self-esteem than do competitive or individualistic experiences…Cooperativeness, furthermore, is related to basic self-acceptance, freedom from conditional acceptance, and to seeing oneself positively compared to one's peers. (p. 158)

Slavin (1990) argued that competition fosters a win-lose situation, in which only a few students reap rewards and recognition and mediocre and low-achieving students receive none. With cooperative learning, however, everyone benefits. In the cooperative learning environment, Kagan (1994) claimed that students help one another and in doing so build a supportive community that raises the performance of all group members. This in turn leads to higher self-esteem for all involved (Webb & Cullian, 1983).

Reduction of Problem Behaviors

Tobler and Stratton (1997) reasoned that programs focusing on group processing, peer interaction, and interpersonal competence were more effective at reducing substance

abuse in teens than other programs that did not have this focus. These characteristics make up the cooperative learning programs (Aronson, 2000; Cohen; 1998; Johnson & Johnson, 1998; Kagan, 1994; Sharan & Sharan, 1992; Slavin, 1990) reviewed in this chapter, especially Teaching Students to be Peacemakers (Johnson & Johnson, 2000). Tobler and Stratton also found that the process of the program was more important than its content and perceived that the results would be the same for school-based violence prevention programs. Benard (2005) wrote, "Using a developmental approach, such as cooperative learning means you are promoting positive development by meeting young people's basic developmental needs, such as safety and belonging, which, in turn, prevents negative or problem behaviors, such as bullying" (p. 119). However, the researcher found few studies in the literature connecting the two variables, cooperative learning and bullying.

Summary

There is a vast amount of literature on cooperative learning. However, 10 methods of cooperative learning emerged as most prominent in the literature. The empirical research conducted on the 10 methods revealed numerous outcomes for students: academic achievement, creative thinking and problem solving, social competence and relationships, motivation, self-esteem, psychological health, and reduction of problem behaviors.

These outcomes affirmed that cooperative learning is helpful in the development of students. This research demonstrated that the use of cooperative learning in classrooms is beneficial in creating healthy school environments in which students communicate openly, feel a sense of belonging, and trust their peers. This finding is

pertinent to this study since the researcher will be investigating the benefits of cooperative learning in bullying situations in Catholic elementary schools.

Theoretical Framework

The previous section of this review discussed the empirical research of cooperative learning. This section will introduce the three theoretical perspectives, behavioral, cognitive developmental, and social interdependence, that have guided the research of cooperation over the past century (Johnson et al., 1998), and will discuss the research of those who formulated these perspectives.

Behavioral Perspective

The theory of behavioral learning is based on the premise that actions followed by extrinsic rewards or group contingencies (Slavin, 1987) are repeated (Johnson et al., 1998). Skinner's (1968) theory on operant conditioning and Bandura's (1977) social learning theory of modeling and observational learning are the most relevant to the study of cooperation. Although both theories are rooted in the behavioral perspective, Skinner's theory operates on the environment, which makes it a behavioral learning theory, and Bandura's theory concerns the imitation of others' behaviors or modeling, which makes it a social learning theory. These theories, described below, assume that cooperative efforts stem from intrinsic motivation to achieve group rewards (Johnson et al., 1998).

Behavioral Learning Theory

As described by Slavin (1997), the behavioral learning theory is learning that emphasizes observable behaviors. He wrote, "Behavioral theories focus on the ways in which pleasurable or painful consequences of behavior change individuals' behavior over

time and ways in which individuals model their behavior on that of others" (p. 150). Skinner's (1968) theory of operant conditioning and group contingencies uses pleasant and unpleasant consequences to change behavior. These consequences can be "reinforcers" or "punishers", and the reinforcers can be primary or secondary. In education, secondary reinforcers are used, such as praise, grades, and stars. The reinforcers can be described as intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic behaviors are activities people engage in simply for the pleasures of the activity. Extrinsic reinforcers, such as praise and rewards, motivate people to engage in behaviors they might otherwise not engage in.

Both intrinsic and extrinsic reinforcers bind Skinner's theory to cooperation (Johnson et al., 1998). Sharan and Sharan (1992) determined that one of cooperative learning's salient characteristics is its emphasis on enhancing students' motivation to learn. Goodlad (1984) claimed that many educators and students have the impression that traditional instruction stifles motivation. Group Investigation, a method of cooperative learning, was designed so that critical features of the learning environment would stimulate and sustain students' interest to invest energy and time into studying different topics of personal interest (Sharan and Sharan, 1992).

Dewey (1943) formulated the following ideas of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in the classroom.

> If there is sufficient intrinsic interest in the material, there will be direct or spontaneous attention, which is excellent so far as it goes, but which merely of itself does not give power of thought or internal mental control. If there is not an inherent attracting power in the material then the teacher will attempt to surround the material with foreign attractiveness, making a bid or offering a bribe [reinforcement] for attention by making the lesson interesting…such attention is always for the sake of learning. True, reflective attention, on the other hand, always involves judging, reasoning, deliberation; it means that the child has a

> *question of his own* and is actively engaged in seeking and selecting relevant material with which to answer it…the stimulus to attention, is one's own; leading the child to realize a problem as his own, so that he is self-induced to attend to it in order to find out the answer. (pp. 147-149)

Dewey identified two features of intrinsic motivation: a) Students pursue a goal of their own choosing, and they actively pursue ways to reach the goal; and b) When students are motivated by their personal interests, they will engage in tasks or activities associated with that interest.

Research shows that schools use a range of external rewards and punishments to maintain students' attention, the foremost being the use of grades (Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Sharan & Sharan, 1992; Slavin, 1995). Goodlad (1984) found that it was the external reward or grading system that kept students in the learning process. Later research, however, proved that it is this grading system or external reward that has reduced rather than enhanced students' motivation to learn (Sharan & Sharan, 1992). Sharan and Sharan demonstrated that students must be given an opportunity to exercise a reasonable degree of choice in what is studied. They also found that questions students seek to answer must be related to the students' curiosity, experience, ideas, or feelings. The norms, expectations, and relationships among classroom peers must support the learning endeavor. They concluded that the current whole-class approach to teaching must be changed to enhance the intrinsic motivation to learn.

Johnson and Johnson (1989) collected data on intrinsic motivation and task persistence and how it pertains to students learning in cooperative, competitive, and individualistic environments. They discovered that the length of time that an individual stays on task largely depends on his or her intrinsic motivation to do so, the expectation that he or she will be successful, the incentives involved, his or her attitude toward the

task, and the continuing motivation to learn about the topic. In the cooperative learning situation, their research confirmed high intrinsic motivation with high probability of success based on the combined ability of the group members, and an incentive system that benefits the individual and the group.

In the competitive situation, Johnson and Johnson (1989) reported that motivation tends to be extrinsic with a low expectation for success unless one was a previous winner. The incentive system is based on superiority, and there is little intellectual curiosity in learning more about a topic. This situation leads to increased feelings of failure and incompetence by those who were not winners. In the individual situation, motivation is also extrinsic. There is a lack of curiosity in subject matter and expectations for success are based on self-interest. The lack of interdependence and interaction with peers make the learning task seem lonely to the students. Additional research into motivation was highlighted in the Motivation section of this review.

Social Learning Theory

Social learning theory is an outgrowth of behavioral learning theory (Slavin, 1997). Bandura's (1977) social learning theory accepted most principles of the behavioral learning theory, but concentrated on the effects of cues on behavior and on internal mental processes that emphasize the effects of thought and action. Bandura contended that Skinner's research ignored the modeling or the imitation of others' behaviors. He also believed that learning occurs vicariously, which is learning from others' successes and failures. Inspired by these observations, Bandura developed the social learning theory of modeling and observational learning.

Observational learning consists of four phases: attention, retention, production, and motivation. In the attention phase, a student pays attention to the model, which is usually a teacher (Bandura, 1986). In a cooperative grouping, the students model behaviors to one another (Johnson et al., 1986; Kagan, 1994; Sharan & Sharan, 1992; Slavin, 1990). Once a model gains attention, the retention phase begins. In this phase, behavior is modeled, and students are allowed to practice or rehearse the behavior. In the production phase, a student matches his or her behavior with the model's behavior. This could take the form of an assessment of student learning. In the motivation phase, a student begins to imitate the model, seeking reinforcement of the modeled behavior. Another important concept of social learning is self-regulated learning. Bandura (1977) believed that people observe their own behavior, judge it against their own standards, and reinforce or punish themselves.

Through his research, Bandura (1986) found that many behaviors could be learned through modeling. He also learned that it was not only prosocial behavior, such as moral behavior and making judgments but also antisocial behaviors, such as aggression, that are learned through modeling. Thus, teachers and parents should model appropriate behaviors and teachers should expose students to several models to dispel traditional stereotypes. It is in such instances and the use of peer relationships in cooperative learning that the importance of cooperative grouping becomes apparent in social learning theory (Johnson et al., 1986).

The importance of peer relationships was previously addressed in the sections on Social Competence and Relationships, Psychological Health, and Self-Esteem. The research to be discussed will explore these relationships and the use of modeling as they

relate to social learning theory and the development of prosocial or antisocial behaviors. Johnson et al. (1986) claimed that educators systematically fail to train students in the basic interpersonal skills necessary for effective interaction with peers. These peer relationships are a critical element in the development and socialization of children. In these relationships, students learn attitudes, values, and skills that are unobtainable from adults. Children will imitate each other's behaviors and identify with peers who they admire. Through the use of modeling, reinforcement, and direct learning, peers shape social behaviors, attitudes, and perspectives.

Johnson et al. (1986) claimed that interactions with peers provide support and the opportunity to model prosocial behavior. Without this peer interaction, many prosocial values and commitments could not be formed. If an adolescent engages in a problem behavior, such as illegal drugs or delinquency, this behavior reflects his or her perception of friends' attitudes toward such behaviors. Also, rejection by one's peers promotes antisocial behaviors that include aggressive, disruptive, or other negatively perceived behaviors. Johnson et al. reported that peers are models of expectations, directions, and reinforcements for learning impulse control. They also believed that peers who model aggressive behaviors, such as rough-and-tumble play, promote aggressive behaviors.

Bandura's (1977) social theory explained human behavior as a continuous reciprocal interaction among cognitive, behavioral, and environmental influences. Over the past 30 years, social learning has become increasingly more cognitive in its interpretation of human behavior (Slavin, 1997). The awareness and expectation of reinforcements or punishment can greatly affect the behaviors that people exhibit

(Ormond, 1999). Bandura's work has become linked to Lev Vygotsky, a cognitive developmental theorist, whose research will be discussed next.

Cognitive Developmental Perspective

Cognitive development theory is based on the premise that when individuals cooperate in the environment, sociocognitive conflict often occurs creating disequilibrium that stimulates the perspective-taking ability of cognitive development (Johnson et al., 1998). The principal theories for this perspective, as they pertain to cooperative learning, are Piaget's (1950) process of cognitive development and Vygotsky's (1978) social development theory. These theories and how the research connects them to cooperation are reviewed below.

Process of Cognitive Development

Piaget (1950) was interested in how organisms adapted to their environment, which he described as intelligence. He theorized that adaptation to one's environment, through behavior, was controlled by mental organization comprised of schemes. Individuals use schemes to represent the world and designate action, which involve adaptation. Adaptation is caused by a biological drive to balance schemes and the environment through equilibrium. Individuals use two processes to adapt to their environments, assimilation and accommodation. Assimilation is the process of transforming the environment into pre-existing cognitive structures. Accommodation is the process of changing cognitive structures to accept something new from the environment.

Piaget (1950) identified four stages of cognitive development, which are described in Table 5. Piaget was not adamant that a child be of a certain age at each stage.

Rather, he thought that it was more important that a child progress through the stages in sequential order than by a particular age. In fact, only 35% of high school graduates

Table 5

Stages of Cognitive Development

Age/Grade	Stage	Characteristics
Infancy	Sensorimotor	Intelligence is demonstrated through motor activity without the use of symbols. Knowledge is limited because it is based on physical interactions and experiences. Child exhibits magical thinking, is circularity in thinking, and has difficulty dealing with more that one or two causes.
5 to 7 Kindergarten to Grade 1	Pre-operational	Intelligence is demonstrated through the use of symbols, language use matures, and memory and imagination are developed. Child exhibits magical thinking, is circularity in thinking, and has difficulty dealing with more than one or two causes.
7 to 11 Grades 2 through 5	Concrete operational	Intelligence is demonstrated through logical and systematic manipulation of symbols and concrete objects. Operational thinking develops. Child begins to think rationally, to generalize, and becomes able to integrate several variables.
12 to adulthood Grade 6 on	Formal operational	Intelligence is demonstrated through the logical use of symbols related to abstract concepts. The person is capable of cognitive problem solving, can think abstractly and hypothetically, and integrates multiple factors to understand concepts.

Note. From *Tribes: A New Way of Learning and Being Together* by Gibbs, 1995, pp. 41-42.

achieve formal operations, and many people do not think at this level as adults (Huitt & Hummel, 2003).

Gibbs (1995) found that a child's development is unpredictable. A child is affected by his or her interactions with surrounding systems, such as family, school, community, and peer groups. These systems have their own cultural norms, languages, and beliefs. Larger societal systems include the government, the economy, mass media, and religion. Bronfenbrenner (1979) referred to the smaller systems as microsystems and macrosystems and the larger societal systems as mesosystems or exosystems. He wrote, "Human development is an ongoing transaction between each of us and the surrounding systems. It is one's conception of an ever-widening world and one's interactions with it, as well as a growing capacity to discover, sustain, or change it" (p. 9).

In the first two stages of cognitive development, Gibbs (1995) noted that a child's frame of thinking is "me" and "mine". It is an essential part of development for a child to progress from the "me" identification to a "we" identification with others. Gibbs explained:

> Persistent identification with our own bodies, objects, and ideas leads to misunderstandings, intolerance, conflict, nationalism, and war. It perpetuates the exclusion of those identified as different, or outsiders. Understanding human development from a systems perspective gives insight into pathology problems, alienation, violence, depression, alcohol/drug use…and helplessness. (p. 43)

Halverson and Waldrup (1974) justified Gibbs' view. Their study showed that preschool children who had the capacity to change a frustrating situation into one that was a positive situation tended to be active and competent as their schooling progressed. Conversely, children who remained passive, self-centered, and resigned to circumstances they viewed as beyond their control had more difficult lives.

Thus, Gibbs (1995) believed that an educational system should develop a child's human potential, in addition to motivating the student to get good grades, a diploma, a

job, or a college education. Teachers should use a wide variety of concrete experiences to help students learn, such as working in groups to experience another's perspective (Huitt & Hummel, 2003). Dewey (1966), too, believed that the primary task of education was to enable people to manipulate their environment and to gain the insight needed to make choices beyond their past experiences.

Piaget (1926) held that social-arbitrary knowledge, such as language, values, rules, morality, and symbol systems, could only be learned during interactions with others. Thus, providing activities should facilitate cognitive development or situations that engage learners and that require adaptation (Piaget, 1950). Cooperative grouping does this through active learning. Teachers are continually providing activities and situations to engage group members in the subject matter. Group processing and reflection in cooperative groupings, require the learner to adapt to new ways of thinking and divergent viewpoints (Johnson et al., 1993; Sharan & Sharan, 1992; Slavin, 1995). Slavin (1995) wrote, "Students will learn from one another because in their discussions of the content, cognitive conflicts will arise, inadequate reasoning will be exposed, disequilibration will occur, and higher-quality understanding will emerge" (p. 5). Webb (1992) also discovered that students gained most from those cooperative activities that provided elaborate explanations to others.

Group Investigation (Sharan & Sharan, 1992) allows the student to have a voice in his or her educational journey. Benard (2005) considered this voice to be a crucial element in a student's development.

> When youth are given the opportunity – especially in a small group context – to give voice to their realities – to discuss their experiences, beliefs, attitudes, and feelings – and are encouraged to critically question societal messages – those from the media and their own conditional thinking around these issues – we are

> empowering them to be critical thinkers and decision-makers around the important issues in their lives. Through this critical pedagogical practice of reflection and dialog we are also preparing them to be engaged citizens, without whom our nation will not remain a democracy. (p. 54)

Positive interdependence must be present for cooperative learning to work effectively (Johnson et al., 1986). It exists when one perceives that he or she will only succeed if the group itself succeeds (Johnson & Johnson, 1989). Positive interdependence among group members moves a student to "we" thinking and away from "me" thinking (Johnson & Johnson, 1998). Several research studies have been conducted on the impact of positive interdependence and achievement on cognitive development. The results are as follows:

1. Group membership is not enough to produce higher achievement; positive interdependence is also required (Hwong, Casswell, Johnson, & Johnson, 1993).
2. Some procedures involved in interdependence are complex, which requires more time for group members to reach a full level of productivity. As teamwork procedures become more complex, team members must pay more attention to teamwork procedures and less time to tasks. Once team members have mastered the teamwork procedures, however, they are better able to concentrate on the task and outperform students working individually (Johnson, & Johnson, 1995).
3. Positive interdependence motivates individuals to try harder and facilitates the development of new insights through promotive interaction. Also, students in cooperative groups use higher-level reasoning strategies more often than

students working alone or in competition (Gabbert, Johnson, & Johnson; 1986).

Slavin (1995) acknowledged that student interaction, rather than motivation, would increase achievement due to the processing of information. Lew, Mesch, Johnson, and Johnson (1986) determined that goal and reward interdependence appear to be additive, although positive goal interdependence was sufficient to produce higher achievement than individual or competitive learning. In his review of the research on cooperative learning, Slavin concluded that cooperative learning has its greatest effects on student learning when groups are rewarded based on the individual learning of their members. He also found that group goals and individual accountability would motivate students to engage in behaviors that increase achievement and avoid behaviors that decrease achievement.

Piaget's (1950) stages of cognitive development are similar to Vygotsky's (1978) cognitive perspective because both believed that children should work together on tasks. In Piaget's theory, however, cognitive development has an endpoint; Vygotsky believed that development is a process to be analyzed not a product to be obtained. He thought that cognitive development is too complex to be defined in stages. Vygotsky's research will be described in the next section of this review.

Social Development Theory

According to Vygotsky's (1978) theory, social interaction is fundamental to the development of cognition. He explained his theoretical framework as follows:

> Every function in the child's cultural development appears twice: first, on a social level, and later, on the individual level; first between people (interpsychological) and then inside the child (intraspychological). This applies equally to voluntary attention, to logical memory, and to the formation of

> concepts. All the higher functions originate as actual relationships between individuals. (p. 57)

His theory also posited that a child's development must depend on a zone of proximal development if cognitive development is to occur. This zone of development bridges the gap between what is known and what can be known and occurs when students engage in social behavior. Vygotsky claimed that the range of skills that could be developed with adult supervision and peer collaboration would exceed that which could be developed independently. This means that a student can perform a task under the guidance of an adult or in collaboration with peers that could not be achieved alone.

Vygotsky's (1978) theory is central to cooperative learning because it requires that students play an active role in their own education and the education of their peers (Johnson et al., 1993; Kagan, 1994; Slavin, 1995). In the social development theory, learning does not occur in a didactic relationship between teacher and student (Johnson & Johnson, 1989). Rather than dictating meaning to students for future recitation, a teacher collaborates with students to create meaning in ways that the students can make their own (Hausfather, 1996).

To implement this theory, the physical environment of a classroom is most important. Vygotsky (1978) recommended that desks or tables be clustered to allow peers to instruct each other, to be collaborative, and to have group interaction. This mirrors much of the research into cooperative learning (Aronson, 2000; Cohen, 1998; Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Kagan, 1994; Sharan & Sharan, 1992; Slavin, 1990). These researchers and Vygotsky also agreed that instruction should be designed to promote student interaction and collaboration. The classroom should be a community of learning (Benard, 2005; Gibbs, 1995).

Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development requires that students interact with others in a cooperative learning situation. In cooperative groupings, it is essential that students be at different developmental levels, some at higher levels with others at lower levels (Hausfather, 1996). With this mixed ability, students can achieve the highest academic gains (Cohen, 1994; Hooper & Hannafin; 1988; Slavin, 1995; Swing & Peterson, 1982). This research was presented in this chapter's section on Academic Achievement.

Scaffolding (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976) is a teaching method derived form Vygotsky's (1978) theory of social development. It refers to the help that more competent peers or adults provide to other students. As learning begins, extensive support is provided; the support diminishes as a lower-achieving child becomes more competent with the learning task. Scaffolding is applied more with one-on-one interactions but can be incorporated into group learning (Slavin, 1997).

Vygotsky's (1978) theory of social development has also been applied to Reciprocal Teaching (Palincsar & Brown, 1984), a method that is designed to assist lower-achieving students to develop reading comprehension skills. With this method, a teacher works with small groups of students, modeling questions students might ask as they read. When the teacher leaves the group, students are given the role of "teacher" to generate questions for each other. This encourages communication among students, a goal of cooperative learning methods previously reviewed, and goes beyond simple questions and answers (Hausfather, 1996). Palincsar and Brown (1984) concluded that Reciprocal Teaching has shown substantive gains in achievement over the traditional whole-class method of instruction.

Both Piaget (1950) and Vygotsky (1978) contributed to cognitive development theory and the practice of education. Although they had different ideas about age levels of development and zones of development differing in ability levels, they both believed that learning occurs when people work with others in groups and that the learning environment is crucial to learning. Both of these aspects are critical to cooperative learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1989). The last and most pertinent theory of cooperative learning is discussed in the final section of this review.

Social Interdependence Perspectives

The social interdependence theory is based on the premise that learning is structured so that learning outcomes are the consequences of individuals interacting with one another. Thus, one of the cooperative elements structured in the classroom is positive interdependence. The major theorists of this perspective are Lewin (1946), who advocated interdependence among members and common goals, and Deutsch (1949), who proposed that cooperative, competitive, and individualistic efforts are mediated by two variables, trust and conflict. The social interdependence theory is based on two assumptions. First, cooperative efforts are based on intrinsic motivation that is generated by interpersonal factors and joint aspirations to achieve a significant goal. Second, cooperative learning is based on relational concepts dealing with what is happening among individuals (Johnson et al., 1998). Lewin and Deutsch, the principal theorists of the social interdependence theory and research into cooperative learning will be discussed in the following sections.

Kurt Lewin

This social psychologist had a profound impact on experimental learning, action research, and group dynamics. His roots were in Gestalt theory, which is based on a coherent whole. This theory has its own laws and is a construct of the individual mind rather than reality. For Lewin (1946), individuals behaved according to the way they worked through the tension between their perceptions of self and their perceptions of the environment. Through his research in experimental learning, Lewin explored how individuals participate in life spaces, such as family, work, school, and church. Lewin's life spaces parallel the findings of Bronfenbrenner (1979) and Gibbs (1995), that to understand behavior one must consider social, organizational, and physical environments that influence people, previously discussed in the Process of Cognitive Development section of this review.

Lewin's (1946) research into group dynamics is crucial to the development of cooperative learning, since group dynamics, consisting of relationships among people participating in groups, is key to cooperative grouping (Johnson & Johnson, 1991; Kagan, 1994; Sharan & Sharan, 1992; Slavin, 1995). Lewin's group processing had two principles: interdependence of fate and task interdependence. In the former, groups coalesce, in a psychological sense, not because the members are alike but because the group exists when its members realize that their fate hinges on the fate of the whole group. This mirrors Slavin's (1995) group contingencies. In task interdependence, a group's task is structured in such a way that its members depend on each other for achievement.

This interdependence is similar to Johnson and Johnson's (1991) dimension of cooperative learning called positive interdependence. According to Lewin's (1946) theory, interdependence may be positive or negative. It is positive when a task is cooperative, that is, the group may only achieve if all of its members achieve. It is negative when a task is competitive, one person's success means that all others will fail. Lewin claimed that students enter the group with different dispositions, but when individuals in a group share a common objective, group members will work together to achieve that objective. The intrinsic state of tension motivates group members to achieve a common objective. Interdependence creates a dynamic whole, meaning that a change occurring in one member or subgroup impacts other group members. The two principles developed by Lewin, fate interdependence and task interdependence, provided the basis for Deutsch's (1949) research into the relationship of task and process.

Morton Deutsch

Deutsch (1949) was a graduate student of Lewin. He advanced Lewin's (1946) theory of social interdependence by formulating a theory of cooperation and competition, which has been the conceptual framework for cooperative learning for the past 45 years (Johnson & Johnson, 1989). Research into cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning has been covered extensively in this review. A brief recap of this work and how it pertains to Deutsch's theory will be discussed next.

Deutsch (1949) held that social interdependence exists when individuals share common goals and each individual's outcomes are affected by the actions of others. The actions of an individual are related to the actions of others in three possible ways:
1) cooperatively, in which the individuals actions may promote the success of others;

2) competitively, in which the individuals actions obstruct the success of others; and 3) individualistically in which the individuals actions may have no effect on others. Thus, the basic principle of Deutsch's social interdependence theory was that the type of structure employed, that is, cooperative, competitive, or individualistic, determines how individuals interact with each other and whether interdependence is achieved. These interactions and outcomes are listed in Table 6. When individuals promote or obstruct another's goal accomplishments, substitutability, cathexis, or inducibility result. Substitutability means that one person's actions substitute for the actions of another; cathexis indicates that a person invests psychological energy in objects and events is outside of oneself; and inducibility denotes that an individual is open to influence. Johnson and Johnson (1998) stated, "Essentially, in cooperative situations the actions of participants substitute for each other, participants positively cathect to each other's effective actions, and there is high inducibility among participants" (p. 4). In competitive and individualistic situations, these accomplishments are either negative or nonexistent, respectively.

Deutsch's (1949) theory of cooperation and competition addresses interaction patterns among individuals. As stated previously, interaction can occur in the following situations: cooperative, competitive, or individualistic (Table 6). Cooperative learning creates positive interdependence, which in turn creates promotive interaction, a required element of cooperative grouping. In promotive interaction, individuals encourage and facilitate each other's efforts to reach the group's goals (Johnson & Johnson, 1989). Promotive interaction resonates with Lewin's (1946) theory, as interaction creates task

interdependence. Promotive interaction's other attributes, which link it to the methods of

Table 6

Cooperative, Competitive, and Individualistic Interactions and Outcomes

Interdependence	Cooperative	Competitive	Individualistic
Interaction Pattern	Promotive	Oppositional	None
Outcomes			
Efforts to achieve	High effort to achieve	Low effort to achieve	Low effort to achieve
Relationships	Positive relationships	Negative relationships	No relationships
Psychological health	Psychological health	Psychological illness	Psychological pathology

Note. From *Cooperative Learning and Social Interdependence Theory: Cooperative Learning* by Johnson and Johnson, 1998, p. 4.

cooperative learning previously reviewed, are giving and receiving feedback, exchanging resources and information, giving and receiving feedback on task work and teamwork behaviors, challenging each other's reasoning, advocating increased efforts to achieve, mutually influencing each other's reasoning and behavior, encouraging interpersonal and small-group skills, and processing a group's effectiveness (Aronson, 2000; Cohen, 1998; Johnson & Johnson, 1998; Kagan, 1994; Sharan & Sharan, 1992; Slavin, 1995).

Johnson and Johnson (1989) conducted a meta-analysis of research on cooperation and competition as defined by Deutsch's (1949) social interdependence theory. The meta-analysis was discussed in the Cooperative Learning section of this review. Johnson and Johnson reviewed 95 years of research into diverse dependent variables, such as achievement, moral reasoning, motivation, social support, attitudes

towards diversity, prejudice, self-esteem, psychological health, and social competencies. Johnson and Johnson placed the numerous outcomes into three broad categories: efforts to achieve, positive relationships, and psychological health. This section will briefly review the findings of that meta-analysis and demonstrate how they directly relate to the social interdependence theory.

The first outcome from Johnson and Johnson's (1989) meta-analysis, efforts to achieve, had over 1,700 findings on social interdependence and productivity and achievement. The findings revealed that an average person in a cooperative situation performed at approximately two-thirds of a standard deviation above an average person learning in a competitive (effect size = 0.67) or individualistic situation (effect size = 0.64). Additional positive outcomes were willingness to tackle difficult tasks, long-term retention, creative thinking, positive attitudes toward tasks, time on task, and transfer of learning from one situation to another. The last outcome is especially important to the investigator's anticipated research because she will observe the transfer of cooperative learning skills to bullying behaviors outside of the classroom.

The next outcome correlated with social interdependence was positive relationships among peers. Johnson and Johnson (1989) determined that schools isolate students who are unattached to family or peers who come from diverse ethnic, historical, and cultural backgrounds. Because of this finding, schools have focused on the creation of learning communities, positive heterogeneous relationships among students, and positive relations among students who are lonely, isolated, alienated, or at-risk. The meta-analysis found over 180 studies that compared the impact of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic efforts with interpersonal attractions. Cooperative effort

promoted more liking among students (effect size = 0.66) when compared with competitive and individualistic experiences (effect size = 0.62).

Many studies in Johnson and Johnson's (1989) meta-analysis investigated relationships between Caucasian and minority students and between non-handicapped and handicapped students. Forty experimental studies compared cooperative, competitive, and individualistic situations in cross-ethnic relationships and more than 40 studies examined the "mainstreaming" of handicapped students. The results indicated far more positive relationships among diverse and heterogeneous students than among students learning in competitive and individualistic environments. These studies extended social interdependence theory into social judgment theory, which focuses on relationships among diverse individuals. Social judgment theory is based on the process of acceptance, that is, individuals promote mutual goal accomplishment because of perceived positive interdependence and promotive interaction, required elements of cooperative learning. These interactions result in frequent, accurate, and open communication among group members, which facilitates the understanding of group members' perspectives.

The last outcome to correlate with social interdependence in Johnson and Johnson's (1989) meta-analysis was psychological health. The Johnsons define psychological health as follows:

> Psychological health is the ability to develop, maintain, and appropriately modify interdependent relationships with others to succeed in achieving goals. To manage social interdependence, individuals must correctly perceive whether interdependence exists and whether it is positive or negative, be motivated accordingly, and act in ways consistent with normative expectations for appropriate behavior within the situation. (p. 12)

Four studies in this meta-analysis related directly to psychological health (James & Johnson, 1983; James & Johnson, 1988; Johnson & Norem-Heibeisen, 1977; Johnson, Johnson, & Krotee, 1986). These studies found that students who worked cooperatively with peers enjoyed greater psychological health than those who worked competitively or individualistically. The findings also demonstrated that cooperative attitudes were highly correlated with psychological health, and competitive and individualistic situations were related to poor psychological health. The indices of psychological health that correlated with cooperation were emotional maturity, well-adjusted social relationships, strong personal identity, the ability to cope with adversity, social competence, and basic trust in and optimism of people. These studies corroborate that cooperative experiences are absolutely necessary for healthy development.

Summary

The conceptual framework for cooperative learning, upon which the proposed study will be based, has emerged over the past 80 years through three different perspectives: behavioral, cognitive developmental, and social interdependence. The behavioral perspective is comprised of the behavioral learning theory that employs consequences to change behavior, and the social learning theory in that learning occurs from other's successes and failures. The next perspective, cognitive developmental, incorporated two theories related to cooperative learning: the process of cognitive development and social development theory. The process of cognitive development consists of four stages of learning that people evolve through from infancy to adulthood. Social development theory holds that interaction among people is fundamental to development and cognition. The final perspective which contributes most directly to

cooperative learning is social interdependence perspective. Lewin (1946) and Deutsch (1949) were the main contributors to this perspective. Lewin examined group dynamics and the interactions of people within groups. Deutsch analyzed how learning in cooperative, competitive, and individualistic situations affected learning.

The empirical research linked the three theoretical perspectives to the outcomes of cooperative learning, specifically in the areas of: academic achievement, creative thinking and problem solving, social competence and relationships, motivation, self-esteem, psychological health, and reduction of problem behaviors. Skinner's (1968) research supported the motivational outcome, while Bandura's (1986) work supported social competence and relationships, psychological health, and self-esteem. Research from Piaget (1950) linked the behavioral perspective to the elements of cooperative learning, mainly group processing and positive interdependence, while Vygotsky's (1978) work supported the achievement outcomes of cooperative learning. The social interdependence perspectives of Lewin (1946) and Deutsch (1949) directly correspond to the outcomes of achievement, social competence and relationships, and psychological health. All of the above findings are relevant to this study because the researcher will be observing and interviewing fifth grade students to determine if the use of cooperative learning has any benefits outside the classroom, specifically in bullying situations.

Final Summary

This chapter began with empirical studies on bullying behaviors from around the world, with only a few of those studies being from the United States. The Scandinavian researcher, Dan Olweus (1993), has conducted the majority of research. Three studies investigated both cooperative learning and bullying, two studies from Europe and one

from America by Choi (2006). The Choi study was conducted under the direction of Johnson and Johnson and found direct links between the use of cooperative learning and bullying behaviors.

The next section gave an overview of the massive amount of literature available on empirical studies conducted on cooperative learning outcomes. For this data, the researcher narrowed the literature down to three meta-analyses. Then, categories for reporting the results of the three meta-analyses were derived from results of each meta-analysis. Research from other authors that supported the findings of the meta-analyses was added to each section.

The chapter concluded with the major theories that are foundational to cooperative learning: behavioral, cognitive developmental, and social developmental theories. Each of these theories and their major researchers were discussed. The combination of these theories provided the theoretical framework for this research.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Restatement of the Problem

Over the past decade, violence in schools has increased. Crawford (2002) found that students, who have displayed violent behavior felt threatened, attacked, injured, or bullied by others. Bullying has had a corrosive effect on the success of students both academically and socially at school and throughout life. A bystander supports a bully's behavior and supports the bullying cycle. A bully's behavior is actively and passively reinforced by a bystander's attention and engagement (O'Connell, Pepler, & Craig, 1999).

Today, cooperative learning is used in classrooms to combat aggression in elementary school students (Choi, 2006). This strategy has been found to promote self-esteem and mutual respect for others (Lyman & Foyle, 1998). Using cooperative learning could decrease the bullying cycle in schools (Cowie et al., 1994; Ortega & Lena, 2000).

Research Design

This qualitative study used the grounded theory approach. According to Creswell (2003), grounded theory research involves multiple stages of data collection and refinement of that data into categories, a process that will sort out the similarities and differences in the collected information. This study incorporated the use of school documents, such as the parent student handbook, classroom observations, school wide observations, teacher interviews, and student focus group interviews to provide the data needed to analyze cooperative learning and bullying behaviors in fifth-grade classrooms.

Population

The children in this study were 60 fifth-grade students attending three Catholic elementary schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco. In the spring of 2007, the researcher received approval of the superintendent of schools (Appendixes A & B) to conduct this study in the Archdiocese of San Francisco. A questionnaire (Appendix C) was subsequently sent to all fifth-grade teachers in the counties of Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo. This questionnaire surveyed teachers about their training in cooperative learning, the extent to which they used cooperative learning in their classrooms, and their interest in participating in the research study. Three teachers were chosen based on the county in which they taught, the amount of cooperative learning training the teacher had received, and interest of the teacher in participating in the study. The sample was comprised of one classroom from San Francisco County and two from Marin County. Two teachers returning surveys from San Mateo County fit the criteria for participation, but changed their mind about interest in participation due to the length and time the researcher would be in their classrooms.

The researcher received approval from the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at the University of San Francisco to conduct this study (Appendix D). Permission to conduct the study was then solicited from the principals and fifth-grade teachers of the selected schools (Appendixes E & F). Before the researcher began student observations, a teacher interview (Appendix G) was conducted to obtain a lens in which the researcher would observe the students. Once permission was granted from the principal and teachers, permission for the children to participate in the study was sought from their parents (Appendix H). From a sample of approximately

60 fifth-grade students, six students per school for a total of 12 per site were randomly selected for focus groups. Following are profiles of the three schools observed for this study.

St. Alena's School

St. Alena's School, the first to be visited by the researcher, is located in the city and county of San Francisco surrounded by businesses and industry. By reputation, the school's population comes from families of great wealth and privilege. Many of its students live in upscale San Francisco neighborhoods or in exclusive sections of Marin County. Those who live outside of the city enrolled in this school because their parents work in nearby corporations.

With statues and prayers displayed around the school's entrance, there is no mistaking St. Alena's Catholic school environment. The school's faculty and staff were all friendly and welcoming. Mrs. Abbott, the fifth-grade teacher, taught in the Archdiocese of San Francisco for 14 years, this being her second year at St. Alena's. Of the 33 students in her classroom, 19 were girls and 14 were boys. Most of the students were Caucasian except for three Asian, two Latino, and two Middle Eastern students. Mrs. Abbott instructed the students in language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, and religion. Other teachers taught the students foreign language, art, computer, music, library, and physical education classes.

St. Blane's School

St. Blane's School, located in Marin County, was the second school to be visited by the researcher. Although Marin is an affluent county, only 10% of this school's population comes from wealthy families; the remaining 90% comes from lower socio-

economic classes. Of the three schools visited, St. Blane's Catholic identity and culture were the most apparent. Not only were statues and prayers displayed, but also prayers were broadcasted over the intercom system several times a day. Once a week, the fifth-grade class attended the Church's morning mass. Ms. Babb, a young enthusiastic teacher who began her teaching career the year before, was St. Blane's fifth-grade teacher. Her class consisted of 10 girls and 5 boys. Most of the class was Latino except for one Asian and four Caucasian students. Ms. Babb taught language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, and religion. Other instructors taught her students foreign language, art, computer, music, library, and physical education classes.

St. Christopher's School

St. Christopher's School is located in Marin County but located farther north than St. Blane's and in a more rural area, was the last school to be visited by the researcher. Most of its students were from wealthy families with approximately 10% coming from lower socio-economic classes. Most of the families lived near the school, allowing some children to walk to school. The school's Catholic culture was not as evident through the lived behaviors of the faculty and students as it was at the other two schools. For Mrs. Charles, the fifth-grade teacher, teaching was her second career. A woman in her forties, she began teaching at St. Christopher's the previous year. Mrs. Charles was the only teacher observed who was not Catholic. Her class consisted of six boys and seven girls, all of whom were Caucasian except for one African American. Mrs. Charles taught the class language arts and mathematics for half a day. For the remainder of the day, the students had other instructors for religion, computer, science, social studies, art, music, and physical education classes.

Classroom Observations

Once the three classrooms were selected, an observation schedule was developed. The researcher visited three schools for 10 consecutive school days, observing student behaviors in the classroom and other areas of the school for the entire school day. For these observations, the researcher's field notes corresponded to the cooperative learning checklist (Appendix I) of the two areas in which the research investigated cooperative learning and its influence on the following bullying behaviors: name calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to the bullied child; and excluding (Johnson et al., 1998).

Schoolwide Observations

In addition to classroom observations, the researcher observed fifth grade students in each school's hallways, play yards, and eating areas, the specific times of which varied at each school site due to class schedules. For these observations, the researcher recorded field notes according to the bullying checklist (Appendix J) that included the three main types of bullying: verbal, physical, and relational (Bolton & Graeve, 2005; Coloroso, 2003). The researcher observed each school from the beginning of the school day, morning assembly, until school was dismissed for 10 consecutive days for a total observation time of 180 hours.

Teacher Interviews

Teacher interviews (Appendix G) were conducted on the first day of observation at each school site. The interviews were approximately 20 minutes in length per interview. The researcher arrived at the school early to interview the teacher before school began. These interviews provided the researcher with an informed lens to view

the class and students during classroom and schoolwide observations. They informed the researcher on ways each teacher had incorporated cooperative learning and the instruction of interpersonal skills into the curriculum. The interviews allowed each teacher a time to share her perspective of the relationship between cooperative learning (positive interdependence and interpersonal skills) and bullying behaviors (name calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to the bullied child; and excluding) at each school.

Student Focus Groups

Student focus group interviews were conducted during the fifth and tenth day of observations during the fifth grade lunch period, which varied from 40 to 50 minutes depending on the research site. Students who were randomly selected were a mixture of white upper middle class, Latino middle class and lower socio-economic level students, with a few students from Middle Eastern, African American, and Asian decent. Three girls and three boys were randomly selected for each focus group interview at St. Alena's, St. Christopher's, and the first focus group at St. Blane's. The second focus group at St. Blane's contained five girls and one boy due to an absence and small number of boys in the class. All focus group interviews were recorded on a voice recorder. The focus groups provided the researcher with student perspectives on how well cooperative learning was working in their classrooms and in what ways bullying was occurring at their schools. Focus group interview questions, some of which were derived from Bolton and Graeve (2005), were used and are presented in Appendix L. The focus groups allowed the researcher to question individual students in depth and to clarify her observations during each five-day period.

Validity

The researcher validated this research by gathering information from several sources. Data was collected from three different fifth-grade classrooms in the Archdiocese of San Francisco. The researcher received consent from all students at St. Blane's and St. Christopher's, but only received consent from 25 of the 33 students at St. Alena's. The researcher used observations and field notes from each classroom and other school areas, such as the cafeteria, play yards, and hallways, and data from each school's six-student focus groups, which contained six different children in each group. The researcher transcribed teacher interviews and focus group data from each research site. The teacher interview transcriptions were given to each teacher for her to read and verify that the content was correct. This enriched and deepened the researcher's understanding of the interview data and added validity to the research. The researcher used thick description in the transcription of field notes and observations. The occurrence of each type of cooperative learning and bullying from both checklists (Appendix I & J) was placed into the occurrence charts (Appendix K) to aid the researcher in identifying which behaviors were most apparent at each site. The researcher's memos written at the end of each day's observation further enhanced the study's validity.

Qualifications of the Researcher

The researcher has 13 years classroom teaching experience, the last six in fifth grade classrooms of two Catholic elementary schools. It was during the researcher's time teaching fifth grade that the researcher discovered a rise in bullying behaviors among the researcher's students. Therefore, the researcher began to research bullying and identified cooperative learning as a possible strategy to reduce bullying behaviors. The researcher,

then, went to San Diego to be trained in cooperative learning by Dr. Spencer Kagan. This learning was brought back to the classroom and coupled with the researchers previous training in Tribes, a cooperative teaching technique. It was from these classroom discoveries and training that the researcher narrowed the topic studied to cooperative learning and bullying.

Teaching at the fifth grade level in Catholic schools allowed the researcher familiarity with Archdiocesan policies on bullying. The researcher was very familiar with the fifth grade curriculum and the basic schedule of a fifth grade classroom. This allowed the researcher the ability to grant more focus to the variables being observed in this study.

Data Collection

Initially, data was collected through classroom observations, which occurred in three fifth-grade classrooms in the Archdiocese of San Francisco. The researcher observed students in other areas of the school by following each fifth grade class to other areas of the school, such as the cafeteria, play yards, and hallways. During these observations, the researcher recorded data using field notes and observation check lists (Appendixes I & J). These occurrences of behaviors from these checklists were put into occurrence tables (Appendix K) to help identify a pattern of behavior in each classroom. After each day's observation, the researcher typed a summary of the field notes. At the end of each week, the researcher reviewed the summaries from the school to ascertain her comprehensiveness in her observations.

During the fifth grade lunch period on the fifth and tenth day of observations, the researcher conducted focus group interviews, recording each discussion on a voice

recorder that allowed the file to be uploaded onto the researcher's computer for transcription. Students were asked about the use of cooperative learning in their classrooms and if it has had any effect on bullying in their school. Each focus group was asked the same interview questions (Appendix L). After each focus group, the researcher transcribed the recorded interviews, which were then coded for emergent themes. Each focus group participant was required to say his or her name before each response to aid in the accurate transcription of interviews.

Data Analysis

To answer the first research question (In what ways do bullying behaviors (name calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, hitting, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to the bullied child; and excluding) occur among fifth-grade students within three schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco?), the researcher recorded field notes from schoolwide observations and typed summaries of these notes at the conclusion of each day's observation. The researcher incorporated information from the bullying observation checklist (Appendix J) to aid in the descriptions of these summaries. Data from the checklist was tallied into an occurrence chart, and the question was answered in a section for each observed bullying behavior.

To answer the second research question (In what ways do fifth-grade students in the Archdiocese of San Francisco use cooperative learning skills related to positive interdependence and interpersonal behaviors in the classroom?), the researcher recorded field notes from classroom observations and used the cooperative learning checklist (Appendix I) to give a thicker description to the end of the day summaries that the researcher prepared. The data from these checklists were tallied into an occurrence chart.

Then, the summaries were analyzed for similarities and differences between the three classrooms at the end of the 6-week research period. From the individual school summaries, the researcher determined what needed to be observed more closely. This procedure continued for the 6-week observation period.

To address the third research question (How have fifth grade teachers within three schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco incorporated the instruction of interpersonal skills into the teaching of cooperative learning strategies?), the researcher used information gathered during the teacher interviews (Appendix G) and from subsequent classroom observations. The information was then transcribed and coded into themes based on the research question. The researcher looked for themes that may or may not occur in more than one school.

To address the fourth research question (What are the perceptions of fifth grade teachers within three schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco regarding bullying behaviors (name calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to the bullied child; and excluding) of their students?), the researcher transcribed the teacher interview data and reported on emergent themes based on the research question. The data was then coded accordingly based on the research question. After all the information was coded, the researcher analyzed the data for common themes among the three research sites. This data was then compared to field notes to find validity of each teacher's perception.

For the last research question (What is the relationship between cooperative learning (positive interdependence and interpersonal skills) and bullying behaviors (name calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or

property belonging to the bullied child; and excluding) among fifth-grade students within three school in the Archdiocese of San Francisco?), the researcher analyzed the data recorded from both observations in the classroom and outside the classroom, teacher interviews, and focus group interviews with students. As before, this information was transcribed and coded according to emergent themes based on the research question. The researcher then analyzed the coded information.

Coding of the data followed the methods described by Patton (2002) and Roberts (2004). The researcher read all field notes, end of day summaries, and focus group transcripts searching for patterns that could be placed into thematic categories. After all categories were apparent, the information was then formed into topics. These topics were then taken back to all the data and abbreviations were made from the topics into codes. Codes were assigned to the data based on research questions. The codes were then alphabetized and put into categories according to each research question. This phase of organizing the data assisted in the efforts of the researcher to give meaning to the raw data during the interpretive phase in which commonalities were determined, conclusions were drawn, and significance was determined (Patton, 2002).

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Restatements of the Purpose

The purpose of studying three, Catholic, elementary school classrooms in the Archdiocese of San Francisco was (a) to investigate the effect of cooperative learning skills, specifically positive interdependence and interpersonal skills, on bullying behaviors of fifth grade students, such as name-calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to a bullied child; and excluding; (b) to explore how three fifth-grade teachers incorporated the instruction of interpersonal skills into cooperative learning strategies, and (c) to examine the perceptions of fifth-grade teachers and students on cooperative learning skills, such as positive interdependence and interpersonal skills, and their relationship to bullying behaviors, such as name-calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to the bullied child; and excluding. This chapter report the results related to the five research questions.

Research Question One

In what ways do bullying behaviors, such as name-calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging or destroying clothes or property belonging to a bullied child; and excluding; occur among fifth-grade students in three elementary schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco?

To answer this question, the researcher observed the students' behaviors recording them into fieldnotes, tabulated them each day on the bullying checklist (Appendix J), and then recorded them in the occurrence chart (Appendix K). This

allowed the researcher to understand which behaviors were the most prevalent at each school. The results of these observations are evident in Table 7. Each of these bullying behaviors will be described in detail in the following sections.

Table 7

Occurrences of Bullying Behaviors

Type of Bullying	St. Alena's n = 33	St. Blane's n = 15	St. Christopher's n = 13	Total
Name-calling	5	6	6	17
Cruel criticism	22	10	13	45
Physical contact	24	12	17	53
Taking of property	16	11	8	35
Excluding	18	8	7	33

Table 7 reveals that each bullying behavior was observed at each research site. The frequency of the behaviors, however, varied according to the type of behavior and the research site. Of all behaviors observed, physical contact occurred most frequently with a total of 53 observed occurrences over six weeks. Cruel criticism was observed a total of 45 times, while name-calling was only observed 17 times. These were notable results, particularly since teachers interviewed from St. Alena's and St. Blane's schools predicted that name-calling would be the most frequently observed bullying behavior in their schools. These teachers perceived that name-calling and cruel criticism were the same type of bullying. They are both forms of verbal bullying, but are separated into two categories by Bolton and Graeve (2005) and Coloroso (2003). At all three sites, the taking of property and excluding were observed consistently, totaling 35 times and 33 times respectively.

The frequency of each behavior was highest at St. Alena's School with the exception of name-calling. These frequencies may have been greater due to the larger class size at St. Alena's. This class contained 33 students while St. Blane's consisted of 15 and St. Christopher's consisted of 12. The largest variance in observed behaviors among the schools were with cruel criticism and exclusion. Each behavior listed in Table 7 will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

Name-Calling

Name-calling was prevalent at each school with five occurrences at St. Alena's and six occurrences at both St. Blane's and St. Christopher's. There was little difference in the gender of the name caller or the person being called a name. Most of this behavior occurred in the classrooms not taught by the homeroom teacher and on the play yards. For the most part, the name-calling was not malicious. The epithets appeared to be quick retorts to statements made by other students, for example, "copycat", "mean", "shrimp", "cheater", "devil", and "sandwich boy." Only the name "shrimp" was used derogatorily because it was directed at the classroom's smallest boy. This boy, Josh, however, was observed to be one of the bullies in his classroom.

Cruel Criticism

Based on the class sizes in the three schools (St. Alena's 33 students, St. Blane's 15 students, and St. Christopher's 12 students), cruel criticism occurred more frequently at St. Christopher's with 13 occurrences. Although this behavior occurred 22 times at St. Alena's, there was primarily one perpetrator, Glen. The only child of an affluent family, Glen appeared to have trouble getting along with other students, especially when a situation was not in his favor. He would ridicule other students for voicing incorrect

answers or for sneezing. When he was put into cooperative learning groups and his work or comments were not given first preference, he would mock the other students' work or roll his eyes at their behavior. Cruel criticism at St. Alena's was evident during physical education or during a game on the yard. In these situations, when students were frustrated with another student's performance, they would yell epithets like "You suck" and "I hate you."

At St. Christopher's, cruel criticism was more difficult to define. One student, Anthony, had been abused by his father, for which the latter was incarcerated. It appeared that Anthony had been given more liberties in school than other students due to this traumatizing event. His behavior appeared to be a cry for attention. That, however, was not what he received from his teacher. In class, Mrs. Charles seemed to ignore his overt "acting out" for attention. Anthony would deride other students and their work. He would blurt out inappropriate comments at almost everything said in class and would tell classmates to "Shut up" and "I'll kill you at recess."

Eye rolling was a form of cruel criticism common at all three schools. When students were put into groups and one was unhappy with the selection of another, there would be exasperated shrugs, eyes rolling, and even screams of "No!" Only at St. Blane's was this behavior stopped and its inappropriateness addressed.

Physical Contact

Physical contact was most apparent at St. Alena's and St. Christopher's Schools. As Owens (1996) and Tulloch (1995) established, this behavior was usually initiated between boys. The few hitting and kicking incidents between girls occurred predominantly at St. Christopher's.

The researcher observed two girls get into an argument that erupted into a physical fight. The girls, Jamie and Sara, were arguing over a ball. Jamie, the bullied child, was asking Sara, the bully, for the ball, but she would not give it up. Another girl, Kim, then approached the two and scratched Sara. Other children came over to diffuse the situation, but in the end Jamie retrieved the fourth-grade teacher who sent Kim and Sara to the office. Later, Kim told the researcher that she was upset because Sara was always picking on her friend. It was learned later that day that Kim's grandmother who had lived with her from birth had died the night before.

Anthony caused the other physical disturbances at St. Christopher's. He tended to be physical, especially when he was on the play yard. He preferred to be physical with a particular student, John, who was supposedly his best friend.

At St. Blane's School, most of the physical confrontations were caused by Josh on the yard. Virtually everyday, he became upset while playing basketball, arguing that the other boys were being unfair or perceiving that they were picking on him. In retaliation, he hit them, pushed them down, or threw the ball onto another play yard. No other physical contact was observed at this school.

St. Alena's boys were frequently involved in hitting, kicking, and pushing while in line. A hitting incident between Glen and Drew escalated into a fight. The two boys had been arguing over a ball at the end of recess when Drew threw the ball hitting Glen after the bell rang. The two proceeded to shove each other as they ran to catch up with the class, which had already entered the building. In the hall at his locker, Glen tried to hide his face behind his locker door to cover up that he was crying. Many of his classmates asked if he was all right. After the students went to art class, the next period,

the researcher asked each boy what had happened. From their comments, it was clear that they had already spoken with the teacher:

> Researcher: What happened after recess?
>
> Glen: We were coming in and I thought he hit my ball away on purpose so I pushed him, and he pushed me back. It wasn't on purpose though it was a mistake.
>
> Researcher: What happened with you and Glen after recess?
>
> Drew: It was an accident…He thought that I tripped him and was trying to start a fight with him.
>
> Researcher: So what did you do?
>
> Drew: I talked with him and said that I didn't mean to trip him, that it was an accident. (*Fieldnotes A*, 2007, pp. A-2-14 & 15)

Taking, Damaging or Destroying Clothes or Property Belonging to a Bullied Child

Taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to a bullied child was consistently observed at each school based on the class sizes with St. Alena's occurring 16 times, St. Blane's 11 times, and St. Christopher's eight times. For the most part, the objects that were taken were inconsequential, such as Kleenex tissues, pencils, and erasers. At St. Alena's and St. Christopher's, because the students sat at other students' desks during the day, taking other students' property could have precipitated problems. At St. Alena's, the students often sat in different desks for "math buddies." One day, Lisa became upset because Paul sat in her seat. He had a history of taking items from her desk in the past. To satisfy herself that her belongings were safe, Lisa approached Paul several times during the lesson, which caused distraction from their work. Riley, Lisa's friend, observed Paul taking a homemade Kleenex box made from tiny candy wrappers from Lisa's desk and told Lisa. The three of them were able to settle

the dispute through the application of positive interdependence skills. They talked through the issue and resumed their assignments. On another occasion, Drew removed class store money from Emma's desk while she was absent. Another student in their group told him to give it back because it was wrong, which he did after realizing that he was being observed by the researcher.

At St. Christopher's School, Anthony continually removed items from Alexis' desk, the girl he sat beside. Although Anthony always returned the items declaring that he was just joking, this behavior frustrated Alexis. On another occasion, when it was raining and the children had inside recess, Anthony ran in and out of the fifth-grade classroom and up and down the corridor with items that he had taken from the sixth-grade classroom. This appeared to be a game. Though some sixth-grade students chased him through the building, there were no repercussions from the teacher on duty.

Excluding

Excluding behavior was most apparent at St. Alena's School. Consistent with Owens' (1996) and Tulloch's (1995) research, girls did most of the excluding. On the researcher's first day of observations at St. Alena's during morning recess, a girl named Jane approached three other girls who were playing in the yard. One of the three pushed Jane away from the group and said, "You can't play with us, we are having a private conversation" (*Fieldnotes A*, 2007, p. A-1-11). Jane then went to the play structure and read alone for the remainder of the recess. Having observed that Jane was a bright, studious girl, the researcher spoke with the teacher about this incident at the end of the day. The teacher recounted that there were some problems involving Jane because many

of the other girls found her awkward. This pattern of exclusion continued periodically throughout the researcher's two-week observation period at St. Alena's.

Holly, a student who had joined the school at the beginning of the year, was consistently excluded. Although she began school in the United States, she had lived in the Netherlands for the past few years with her mother who was a clothing designer. Holly was extremely bright and spoke with others in a mature way. During recess, she wandered the yard alone trying to fit into one group or another. By the end of the observation period, she and Jane had become friends and walked the yard together.

At St. Christopher's School, the situation was different due to the way the students choose to play at recess. Many of the students preferred to play alone. However, when playing together, everyone allowed others to join their games on the yard, except for two girls, Alexis and Lilly, who always played together and excluded everyone else. It appeared that other students did not even try to join their group because they were so exclusive. Both girls had moved to the school during the previous year.

At St. Blane's School, Beth was the only student who experienced exclusion. She was a shy student who tried to fit into three different groups of girls. The members of two groups changed almost daily, and the two would often join to form one large group. These two groups would often include Beth. The other group contained two girls who played exclusively with each other. One of them was adamant about not letting Beth play with her. Beth's teacher explained that Beth's best friend moved to Oregon this year, and she has had trouble acclimating to another group ever since.

This section addressed Research Question One based upon the researcher's schoolwide observations. The next section will report on the observation and interview data related to the nine areas observed for cooperative learning (Appendix I).

Research Question Two

How do fifth-grade students in three elementary schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco use cooperative learning skills related to positive interdependence and interpersonal behaviors in the classroom?

In answering this research question, the researcher examined positive interdependence and interpersonal skills that included observations for the following behaviors: working toward a common goal, caring for one another, talking through issues, helping, encouraging, staying with a group, using eye contact, expressing support and acceptance toward ideas, asking for help, providing constructive feedback, and disagreeing without criticism. In observing these behaviors the researcher recorded field notes that were subsequently tallied onto the cooperative learning checklist (Appendix I), counted, and then recorded on the occurrence chart (Appendix K). The totals from this chart can
be found in Table 8.

The highest occurring cooperative learning skill was expressing support for ideas and asking for help, occurring 190 times over the three research sites, followed by staying with the group and using eye contact with 145 occurrences. Both skills are in the category of interpersonal skills for cooperative learning. Two interpersonal skills observed, providing constructive feedback and disagreeing without criticism, occurred less frequently at all research sites totaling 86 and 74 times respectively. The

Table 8

Occurrences of Cooperative Learning Skills

Cooperative Learning Skill	St. Alena's n = 33	St. Blane's n = 15	St. Christopher's n = 13	Total
Working for a common goal	25	35	35	95
Caring for one another	18	34	25	77
Talking through issues	20	40	34	94
Helping	31	35	38	104
Encouraging	17	24	26	67
Staying with the group and using eye contact	42	45	58	145
Expressing support for ideas and asking for help	30	54	53	190
Providing constructive feedback	25	33	28	86
Disagreeing without criticism	18	30	26	74

occurrences of the positive interdependence skills were more evenly distributed than the occurrences of the interpersonal skills. The positive interdependence skills occurred in the following sequence: helping at 104 times, working for a common goal at 95 times, talking through issues at 94 times, caring for one another at 77 times, and encouraging at 67 times. These results will be discussed in accordance with each research site in the following sections. Data collected from focus group interviews were incorporated into the following results.

St. Alena's School

During the study's two-week observation period, Mrs. Abbott and the foreign language teacher used cooperative learning activities that followed what the literature specifically described as necessary for an activity to be cooperative (Aronson, 2000; Johnson & Johnson, 1989) positive interdependence, promotive interaction, individual accountability, interpersonal skills, and group processing. On the first day of observation, the class went to the science laboratory where the students were grouped in rotating learning stations that pertained to different body systems. For this activity, the students were required to stay with a group. In these groups, some students gave presentations on the excretory and circulatory systems, which required the other group members to use eye contact. The group members were required to assemble a book, for which they had to ask each other for help.

At one station, the group members conducted two experiments during which they were encouraged to talk through issues, express support and acceptance of ideas, and possibly disagree without criticism. At the last station, the students assisted the teacher in dissecting a cow's liver. Throughout the dissection, the teacher would allow time for conversation that provided constructive feedback.

Throughout the remainder of the observation period, the class prepared for a field tip to Zeum, a local technical museum, at which they were to create a clay animation story in cooperative learning groups. To begin, the groups wrote a story, created a background and props, and then visited Zeum where they created their clay figures and recorded the animation with computers and digital cameras. Mrs. Abbott assigned roles for this project, and the students had to determine if the assignment met the school's student learning expectations. She even passed out a rubric when introducing the

assignment so that all of the students would have clear learning expectations for their group. All criteria (Appendix I) for positive interdependence and interpersonal skills (Johnson et. al, 1998) were observed numerous times during this process.

St. Blane's School

Because her class contained only 15 students, Ms. Babb had her students work in cooperative learning groups of two to three students for most activities. Students worked in groups to create questions for study review games, to answer textbook questions on a single sheet of paper for a group grade (Johnson & Johnson, 1994), and to act out vocabulary words for others. The largest cooperative learning project observed involved "Mysteries in History" in which groups of three students attempted to discover who kidnapped Charles Lindberg's baby through several days of activities. This activity and smaller activities all used positive interdependence and interpersonal skills.

St. Christopher's School

Throughout the two-week observation period at St. Christopher's School, Mrs. Charles had students sit in groups where they sometimes worked together on a worksheet, but this arrangement did not follow the guidelines for cooperative learning as cited by Johnson and Johnson (1994) because the groups' work had no clear learning goals. In Mr. Klein's science class, however, positive interdependence, promotive interaction, individual accountability, interpersonal skills, and group processing were observed daily. He assembled the students in cooperative groups of four to build bridges. Each group member had a specific role, in a group of four, with one student as the architect, one student as the supplier, one student as the builder, and the last student as the journal keeper. The members of the groups and the roles changed with each new bridge to be

built. After a bridge had been built, the students reflected on their learning, in both written and oral forms. For this to happen, Mr. Klein would have the groups discuss what aspects of the bridge build were successful and which aspects needed to change for the next build. After the group discussion time, Mr. Klein would call on one group to share their comments with the entire class.

The last step in the process was for each individual group member to journal about the building experience and draw his or her completed bridge. In the group-processing step of cooperative learning, Johnson et al. (1993) described this time for student reflection as essential to learning. Mr. Klein was observed using all five skills required for cooperative learning (positive interdependence, promotive interaction, individual accountability, interpersonal skills, and group processing) each day, especially positive interdependence and interpersonal skills (Johnson et. al, 1998).

In answering Research Question Two, this section presented the learning activities at each school that incorporated the use of cooperative learning techniques. The next section will address Research Question Three by showing how teachers incorporated interpersonal skills into their instruction.

Research Question Three

How have fifth-grade teachers in three elementary schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco incorporated the instruction of interpersonal skills into the teaching of cooperative learning strategies?

Through teacher interviews, all three teachers described their students as pleasant children with strong interpersonal skills. Mrs. Abbott from St. Alena's stated, "I also have to say that this is one of the nicest classes that I have taught" (*Interviews*, 2007, p.

1). Mrs. Charles from St. Christopher's declared, "This class, I don't really have to worry a lot about. They have natural strong interpersonal skills." She went on to say, "I don't even think it would occur to them to be mean to one another" (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 39). Ms. Babb from St. Blane's commented, "Everyone has their own little skill and you need to appreciate their talents that God gave them" (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 21). The researcher's observations validated these comments.

St. Alena's and St. Christopher's had schoolwide programs that fostered social skill development of their students. St. Alena's program, RISE (Respect, Include, Safety, and Effective Communication), was evident in student body chants and the principal's addresses at morning assemblies. The teachers voted on students who modeled these attributes each month. The students spoke about this program during the focus interviews:

> David: I think if anyone gets bullied they should go to the RISE leader [school counselor].
>
> Chris: What our school does is that we have a RISE teacher and program…If kids are being bullied or something, we talk to her and tell who is bullying us or who is being mean to us, and she brings us into her office downstairs, and she talks to us about it. One time in the RISE program with this boy in our class, he was criticizing a lot of kids behind their backs, and he just likes pushing and shoving everybody. She brought us into the room and she talked to us and she helped us, and it was really nice, and now me and him are like really good friends. (*Interviews*, 2007, pp. 7 & 16)

St. Christopher's schoolwide program was called The Toolbox Program, the premise of which is that each person possesses 12 social skill-building tools: breathing, listening, empathy, personal space, using your words, "garbage can", taking time, quiet/safe place, please and thank you, apology and forgiveness, patience, and courage. During her interview, Mrs. Charles explained how the program works:

> One of them is the garbage can tool which means when someone says something negative to you, you can just wad it up and throw it in the garbage can so you don't have to carry all that negative around with you. One of them is the empathy skill so I brought in all these different pairs of shoes, high heels, big work boots, and the kids tried on the shoes and they walked around in these different shoes. The idea is how do you feel when you are in someone else's shoes…One of the toolbox skills we just went over was personal space and so they took a piece of yarn and they made a circle with the yarn. Then they put their bodies in the yarn to see what their personal space was. (*Interviews*, 2007, pp. 39-40)

The students kept worksheets and other information pertaining to The Toolbox Program in binders.

St. Blane's did not have a schoolwide program that addressed social skill development, but Ms. Babb's classroom theme was "individual strengths." She posted pictures of such historical and contemporary "giants" as George Washington, Albert Einstein, Maya Angelou, Sally Ride, and Bill Gates around the perimeter of her room. In her interview, Ms. Babb explained this theme in greater detail:

> The theme of my room is that everyone has a different strength, and so like someone has sports strength or someone's is a poet or an author, and so I try to really emphasize that in this classroom that everyone has their own special skill. Maybe someone is really good at basketball, but then someone is really good at creative writing. And so we do the whole thing about that in the beginning of the year. We try picking out our certain characteristics and personalities that we each have, and what do we admire in a certain student, and they might, you know, write that down. So we do like those things as well so that not everyone is a math genius. Well, we are doing algebraic expressions right now and not all of you are going to get it right away, and I told them that that is fine, that I didn't get it until it took me two years to understand it. I always put my personal experiences in it so that they understand that no one is perfect. (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 21)

Interviews with the fifth-grade teachers from all three schools revealed how they used roles in their classrooms and in cooperative learning groups to teach interpersonal skills. At St. Alena's, the children sat in groups of five to six students. In these groups, the students were assigned roles, such as homework check-in person, secretary, supply person, and desk cleaner. Mrs. Abbott said, "They get the idea that they do

have to work together, so that the classroom can function in an orderly way and they have responsibilities in making the classroom function" (*Interviews,* 2007, p. 1). She went on to discuss the various roles that her students performed while working in cooperative groups:

> Sometimes it depends on what strategy we are learning and what we are using for cooperative learning. They are often given rubrics on their expectations…so that way they know exactly how to work together and what the responsibilities are, so that the group runs smoothly. (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 1)

At St. Blane's School, Ms. Babb assigned her students the roles of monitor, timekeeper, and recorder during cooperative groupings. The research of Johnson et al. (1998) asserted that these individual roles were essential for individual accountability in cooperative learning groups. Ms. Babb's assignments reflected that research. Classroom observations revealed these roles in action. The students exercised these roles in several small group activities and the previously mentioned "Mysteries in History" cooperative learning project. Even though the students seemed to understand each role, the teacher reviewed them before each activity.

Although the researcher did not observe roles in action or heard them discussed in the classroom at St. Christopher's, Mrs. Charles mentioned them in her interview:

> I would say that I am pretty clear with my expectations if we are doing a cooperative project. I will tell the children what each one's role is. For example, how to ask questions, like with writing we do peer conferencing so the idea is that they are trying to move their writing forward. So you want to be constructive and you don't want to say things like your writing is good or your writing is bad. (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 39)

Student roles, however, were evident in Mr. Klein's science class during the bridge building project. Although this teacher was not interviewed, he was observed when the researcher followed the fifth grade class to other classrooms where they were instructed

in different subjects, such as foreign language, art, computer, music, library, science, and physical education.

All three teachers reported that interpersonal skills were taught, for the most part, at the beginning of the school year with an emphasis on being polite and considerate, working together, taking turns, and being respectful of one another. The researcher's observations confirmed that each teacher reminded the students of these behaviors and that they were excellent role models of these interpersonal skills.

This section addressed how the three homeroom teachers in this study and the science teacher from St. Christopher's incorporated the instruction of interpersonal skills into their curricula. The following section will explain the perceptions of these three teachers on specific bullying behaviors.

Research Question Four

What are the perceptions of fifth-grade teachers in three elementary schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco about the bullying behaviors (name-calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to the bullied child; and excluding) of their students?

To answer this question, the researcher analyzed interview data from the three fifth-grade teachers and compared their perceptions to actual behaviors observed and recorded. The totals for these behaviors can be found in Table 7. Many of the teachers' perceptions coincided with the behaviors observed. This section will review each observed behavior and the perceptions of each teacher.

Name-Calling and Cruel Criticism

Name-calling was the least observed behavior with 17 total occurrences and cruel

criticism was one of the most frequently occurring behaviors with 45 total occurrences. However, these behaviors were observed on the most consistent level of all observed bullying behavior at the three schools (Table 7). Ms. Babb, the teacher at St. Blane's School, believed that name-calling was the most common form of bullying among her students, but she considered this behavior as part of cruel criticism. Thus the two behaviors have been combined here in her explanation. She explained her thinking in the following way:

> Cruel criticism, I would put this in the same category as name-calling…I see them as the same because put-downs are like name-calling, and they are usually cruel with name-calling. That usually happened the most, which is damaging. I told them in the beginning of the year that it does hurt. I remember in third grade someone saying something about me, and I just never got over it…[In my classroom] it is usually when one student is slow or not doing their work. (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 21)

Mrs. Abbott believed that these two behaviors were conjoined. She said:

> There is a little name-calling. Mostly, I'd say it's cruel criticism. If a child makes a mistake, if they are playing on the volleyball team, and they miss a shot. I think the children come down very hard on the other kids. (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 2)

Both of these teachers acknowledged that the students were deft at camouflaging this behavior so that teachers could not detect it. They concurred that name-calling and cruel criticism go on because students inform them after incidents have occurred or they hear about them later from parents. Ms. Babb shared a parent's concern that was raised at a parent-teacher conference:

> …physical appearance always comes up if a child is a little overweight. That is always an issue, which I didn't hear about until later. A parent brought it to my attention at parent-teacher conferences that her child was being called fat…People's physical appearances and people's intelligence is where most name-calling and cruel criticism come into play. (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 22)

This behavior, calling a girl fat, was observed by the researcher on her second day at St

Blane's. At lunch, some students were playing a game about whom each one would marry. Josh chimed in and said, "Who will I marry?" and someone yelled out, "Jill." Josh then approached Jill and said, "No offense, but you are too fat." Jill simply laughed off his comment (*Fieldnotes*, 2007, p. B-2-13). Later, the teacher informed the researcher that these were the two students mentioned in her interview who were involved in a name-calling issue about physical appearance.

The teachers from St. Alena's and St. Blane's Schools perceived that working in a Catholic school made these situations less frequent and easier to manage. Mrs. Abbott said, "We are a Catholic school so we do come down hard on it. I don't think there is as much as you would see in other schools" (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 1). Ms. Babb contended that it was the Catholic environment that made dealing with these situations easier. "I relate it all back to God because we are a Catholic school, and that is really great because we can always fall back to our religion and what our teachings are" (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 21).

Contrary to Mrs. Charles's, from St. Christopher's School, assertion that there was no name-calling or cruel criticism in her class, the researcher observed that it occurred a great deal: 6 instances of name-calling and 13 of cruel criticism in the two-week study period. Mrs. Charles was the only teacher who was not Catholic, and she volunteered nothing about teaching in a Catholic school during her interview or in the classroom, in contrast to the other two teachers in the study who were Catholic.

Physical Contact

The teachers' perceptions about physical contact varied at each research site. Despite Ms. Abbott's assertion that hitting was an infrequent occurrence at St. Alena's,

the researcher observed it to be the most prevalent of the bullying behaviors, occurring 24 times. As mentioned previously in this chapter, this behavior occurred mainly between boys (Olweus, 1993), as illustrated in the fight between Glen and Drew.

Ms. Babb concluded that hitting at St. Blane's school occurred only on the play yard. This perception was validated by schoolwide observations. She alleged:

> …it is normally outside at recess, and I only find out when they come and tell me or if I am on duty. So, I am not necessarily seeing it, but it is always having to do with games. (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 22)

This perception was corroborated by observations at recess. On two occasions, the same group of three boys got into a fight on the basketball court, hitting and pushing each other over possession of the ball. On the first occasion, Josh, Daniel, and Mario were shooting baskets with two balls; Josh kept throwing one ball against the other. Mario became so frustrated with this behavior that he pushed Josh down. Daniel came over to intervene and Josh, who was extremely frustrated, then pushed Daniel. At that point, the teacher came over and discussed the behavior with the three boys. She advised them:

> Do not intervene if it is Daniel and Mario sharing a basketball. They need to compromise between those two, and if you get involved, it should be to go get help, not to get in between the two of them. (*Fieldnotes*, 2007, B-4-9)

On the second occurrence, the researcher observed Daniel throw Josh's basketball from one yard into another yard. This interchange followed:

> Daniel: Josh, your ball is over there.
> Josh: I don't care.

Josh then ran and hid behind the cafeteria door. The researcher tried to speak with him because it appeared that he was crying:

> Researcher: What is wrong?
>
> Josh: Daniel is being mean to me. He keeps throwing my ball to the bottom yard,

> and I have to run after it. Daniel keeps making me run.
>
> Researcher: Is this bullying?
>
> Josh: Yes.
>
> Researcher: How does this make you feel?
>
> Josh: Bad.
>
> Researcher: What do you think should be done about it? (*Field notes*, 2007, B-6-10)

Josh mumbled an inaudible response. As Daniel and Josh lined up for lunch, an argument erupted, with Josh hitting Daniel in the arm. Asked what was going on, Chris told the researcher, "Kids are making fun of Josh because he wears glasses." By the time the two boys were seated next to each other for lunch, they were talking and patting each other on the back. This incident illustrated three bullying categories: cruel criticism, physical contact, and taking of property.

Mrs. Charles stated that physical contact was the only bullying behavior that she observed at St. Christopher's School, which she too believed only took place at recess. To illustrate her point, she informed the researcher that two girls had been hitting and kicking one another during recess:

> The girl who is getting kicked doesn't know what to do, and I don't know if she has told an adult. I mean that is the first thing that I suggested. You know, that she go talk to the person who is on yard duty first or tell the person that that is not okay. (*Interviews*, 2007, pp. 39-40)

She described another situation in which two boys, Anthony and John, were constantly nudging and putting their arms around each other. She believed that this behavior was playful and, thus, inconsequential. To the researcher, this behavior appeared to annoy John.

Taking, Damaging or Destroying Clothes or Property Belonging to a Bullied Child

Mrs. Abbott from St Alena's School was the only teacher interviewed who noticed the taking of property, and she described it as theft. She commented:

> There is report of theft. Desks missing a pencil sharpener, their favorite pencil is gone. I have to assume that sometimes that may be bullying or maybe a child is like, "Wow, that is really neat." I would like to think that…in a way that is bullying or not caring for that student. (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 2)

Observations verified this behavior, although most of the small items taken were only meaningful to their owners, except for the class store money that Drew took from Emma's desk.

Ms. Babb believed that stealing and damaging the property of others did not occur at St. Blane's School because the students were taught to respect one another's property. The researcher, however, recorded this behavior 11 times. For the most part, students took books and papers in the classroom and balls on the play yard. Mrs. Charles was also under the impression that this behavior was nonexistent at St. Christopher's School, but observations confirmed this behavior 14 times. Anthony was the principal culprit, usually taking items from the desk of the girl sitting next to him.

Excluding

Teachers from both St. Alena's and St. Blane's Schools believed that some excluding happened at their schools, on the yard, at lunch, and at recess. Mrs. Abbot expressed:

> I know it goes on. You might observe it more in the play yard, which is usually where I see it when I'm on duty. How people interact with one another when they are out there as opposed to when they are in the classroom [is different]. (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 2)

Ms. Babb claimed, "Excluding, I would say happens most at recess and at lunch"

(*Interviews*, 2007, p. 21). Although the teachers believed that this behavior occurred mostly outside of the classroom, they both acknowledged that it happened in class, as well. Mrs. Abbott claimed that the RISE program, which stressed inclusion, has tempered a lot of this behavior. She explained:

> There are sometimes when I tell them to get into groups, and they have to form their own groups or pick their own partner for a project, and it seems that they all figure out how to work together so that everyone is somewhat included. (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 1)

The researcher's observations of excluding proved to be distinctive from Mrs. Abbott's. Eighteen instances of exclusion bullying were observed, mainly among girls, with one exception, when Glen's ideas were ignored by his group in preparation for the Zeum field trip. For several days he tried, without luck, to interject his thought for the animation story. Finally, the teacher had to intervene to help the group finish on time. At the end, Maggie, the only girl in the group, listened to Glen but acted frustrated the entire time. Glen lost his patience and left the group for the day.

Ms. Babb had another way of handling exclusion in her classroom. She discussed the roles that she used for cooperative learning:

> That is why I try doing those roles inside [the classroom] when there are four people, well two with the shy students, or in this class I have a lot of English Language Learners (ELL). There are 10 out of 15 that when they go home speak another language. So if they don't understand what they are reading, then they also might become excluded because they don't understand the material that is there. That is when I might have them work in groups telling them not to just give them the answer, but try to explain how to find the answer. So, excluding inside the classroom and outside as well has to do with other things. (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 22)

Observations confirmed that excluding happened infrequently, only eight times, at St. Blane's. Exclusion that did occur was mainly between two girls, Beth and Katia, which was discussed earlier in this chapter. This behavior reflected the findings of Olweus

(1993), that girls are the primary bullies of exclusion.

Mrs. Charles believed that there was no exclusion at St. Christopher's. She said, "… they all include each other. This particular class is very inclusive" (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 39). The researcher concurred, noting only seven instances of exclusion over a 10-day period. Many of the students preferred to play alone. The teacher explained this behavior, "They are such a small class, and they are almost like siblings, and they really kind of need their own space I think" (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 39). It was also observed that two girls, Lilly and Alexis, did not overtly exclude others, but slyly tried to play only with each other. Alexis admitted as much in her interview:

> If I don't want to play with someone, so I just say okay you can play with me, and then if they just run away, I don't really care what they do. I won't like follow them and stuff because sometimes I just don't want to play with people. (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 50)

Although the teachers' perceptions of these behaviors varied, the researcher's interviews with Mrs. Abbott from St. Alena's and Ms. Babb from St. Blane's revealed that they knew that the behaviors occurred even though they were unseen. The researcher's observations at each site bore this out. In the next section, the study's findings will demonstrate the relationship between cooperative learning skills and bullying behaviors.

Research Question Five

What is the relationship between cooperative learning (positive interdependence and interpersonal skills) and bullying behaviors (name-calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to a bullied child; and excluding) among fifth-grade students in three elementary schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco?

To answer this question, the researcher conducted teacher and student focus group interviews. Asked if they observed a relationship between the two variables, the three fifth-grade teachers answered quite differently. This was not the case for the students. The researcher discovered during the first focus group interview that the students had difficulty formulating a response because they could not verbalize the use of interpersonal skills. Thus, in succeeding focus groups, students were asked to give examples of the interpersonal skills they used in cooperative learning. Although this worked in most cases, in some instances the researcher had to give the students examples, well aware that in doing so her words or ideas could skew the students' responses.

Mrs. Abbott believed that there was a relationship between cooperative learning and bullying. Cooperative learning, she felt, decreased bullying and prepared students to cope with difficult situations later in life. She explained:

> The relationship that I see is that if you promote cooperative learning, then you are putting down bullying…you are saying this is not how the real world works. You are going to be put in positions where you are going to have to work with people you might not necessarily like, but you have a goal because of whatever your job might be or the project whether it be playing sports now or in a job when they are older. It is very important. You have to put aside personal differences and try to get along, and that getting along means no name-calling, not being critical, destroying property and clothes, and that kind of thing. (*Interviews*, 2007, pp. 2-3)

Ms. Babb gave the most detailed answer to the question. Although she, too, thought that cooperative learning was desirable, she also believed that bullying was a part of growing up. In her opinion, cooperative learning affected how students dealt with situations, but did not cause the situations to stop occurring. Her detailed response follows:

> I think the way they handle it might be different. The interpersonal skills that we talked about at the beginning of the year, like how to share and how to listen to

> one another…respect everyone [by] listening to other people's opinions and know what the next step is after a name-calling incident or when a bullying action comes into play knowing what to do, but I don't necessarily think that it will stop the bullying. I think that how kids will handle the situation of being bullied is what is being affected by interpersonal skills. Bullying, I think it just happens to certain kids that you know need the attention or you know [are] striving for something that they are not getting at home or in the classroom. I don't think [bullying] will stop. I think that is part of growing up, but that sounds really bad. The bullying will go to some limit that they know that when they do it some of their actions will hurt the other person and the interpersonal skills of knowing that you are hurting this other person's feelings and so I think that aspect of bullying also gets affected. They know what the outcome is and they know that it is wrong because we have talked about it. If afterwards you feel really bad, you know you would not want that to be said to you. You know bullying and the knowledge of what bullying is in the class has also increased. So I guess that is also affecting the relationship between that they know it is wrong and how to handle the situation after being bullied is being affected by cooperative learning. (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 23)

A student from St. Christopher's School shared Ms. Babb's views. He too thought that some children were bullying because they sought attention. He explained, "…bullies who are bullies for certain reasons, like the one who experienced something sad at the beginning of his life, can't be talked out of their type of bullying because it is technically for attention" (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 50).

Mrs. Charles framed her answer to this question in the context of the two girls in her class with the kicking and hitting problem, and then she discussed the difficulties she encountered with her class the previous year. She postulated the following:

> I would like to take those two girls and put them on a team so that they are having to work together in the classroom. I think there probably is a relationship because I saw it last year with my class. The more we would do games, like for example, I would play scrabble a lot, and my class last year they didn't even know how to play games and take turns. They could not work together. They were arguing. They were fighting. They were, you know, criticizing each other for putting down a stupid word. The more we did that and the longer that went on I saw relationships get better on the playground and outside of school. They were starting to play with each other after school where, as before, they kind of splintered. I had this one boy, and he wouldn't play with anybody in the class. He played with, you know, an older grade because he didn't feel like he was a

> part of that community. So I think that there is definitely a relationship. (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 40)

For the most part, the three fifth-grade teachers saw a clear relationship between the use of cooperative learning skills, positive interdependence, and interpersonal skills and the observed bullying behaviors. The students, however, had a broader range of views on its effectiveness and that varied from student to student and school to school. After thoroughly conducting a thematic analysis of the focus group interview data, the researcher concluded that approximately two-thirds of the interviewed students believed that cooperative learning was helpful in bullying situations.

The students at St. Alena's have commented separately on the value of cooperative learning in group work and bullying situations. The first five respondents in the following comments to focus group interviews perceived that working in groups was helpful in dealing with bullies because they learned how to work things out, how to agree with others, and how to settle disagreements. The last respondent, Rose, noted that she had trouble with group members and had to get help from the teacher. These claims were demonstrated in the following responses:

> Katie: When I was working in a group, I learned that bullying isn't that much. You just have to work things out.
>
> Natalia: You have to come to an agreement on what you are going to do like on a project.
>
> Katie: Sometimes in class, it doesn't really work like that. Like one time, one of the girls said bug off, and I didn't really want to get in her hair so I just bugged off...I think working in groups has helped because it helps me know how to talk it out and stuff.
>
> Rory: If you work in a group, it sort of helps you because you know how to deal with disagreements and bullying because in groups if you get in an argument you can vote and majority rules.

> Rosyln: …working in a group you learn that you can agree with people…people vote because that is a way to get [along] or you can do "row sham bow." You can do that instead of fight.
>
> Rose: I have learned that if you are having trouble with a group, then, I am having to do all the work, then, I need to tell the teacher. (*Interviews*, 2007. pp. 10-11 & 19)

Students, in focus group interviews, explained how cooperative learning skills were helpful in bullying situations. Some skills that they attributed to cooperative learning included knowing how to "keep your cool", how to deal with bullying situations through past group work experience, how to get people together, and simply how to walk away from a situation. These views were evident in the following student comments:

> Katie: If someone is bullying you, then you just have to keep your cool and talk things out.
>
> Rory: It [cooperative learning] can help you with bullying because you are in a fight with someone you can talk it out and figure out how to deal with it from your experiences of being in a group because it is basically the same except you might be with just one person.
>
> Roslyn: For bullying…try to get the two people together and explain how that person hurt their feelings.
>
> Emma: I have learned to walk away from things instead of being violent, and I would like to learn more. (*Interviews*, 2007, pp. 10-11 & 19)

The students from St. Blane's School had conflicting opinions. About half the interviewees perceived that cooperative learning helped with bullying and half did not. This split in opinion also reflected their teacher's views. She opined that cooperative learning was helpful in how students handled bullying situations, but did not cause bullying to stop occurring as described in her comments previously in this section. The students' responses about cooperative learning demonstrated this split in opinion:

> Daniel: I think it helps us. You can talk it out instead of arguing or take it with you and settle down because some people can be aggressive, and you probably

> slow them down because you can talk like in a good way. None of us will be mad or anything like that.
>
> Josh: You want to listen to what they want.
>
> Marco: Well, none of the skills. I haven't really needed them because usually they get in trouble because the teacher finds out somehow.
>
> Katia: I haven't learned anything in the classroom…but Ms. Babb says that you shouldn't do anything. You should just walk away. That doesn't really help if you are sitting right next to them and you can't do anything about that.
>
> Frances: I don't think we really learned anything while we were working in groups to help us with like a bullying situation because like participating and learning about your subject and stuff, I don't think it has much to do with it. (*Interviews*, 2007, pp. 30-31).

Because interview time had expired and the class had returned from lunch, the second focus group at this school only had time to respond *yes* or *no* to this question (Has any of this learning [of interpersonal skills] helped when faced with a bullying situation at school?). Their responses were three firm *yeses*, two *yeah-pretty much*, and one *a little of both*.

All of the students from St. Christopher's School thought that there was a relationship between the two variables except for one girl. She maintained, "The stuff we have talked about hasn't really helped because they [bullies] just think that they are bigger and stronger than you" (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 52). Most of the other students' perceived that they could talk things out or explain things to a bully, but a few actually gave answers that discussed particular interpersonal skills, such as empathy and patience.

> Sam: You can try to talk it out with the bully.
>
> Lilly: …you can talk it out in a sense, and I guess like find out why the person is doing it instead of just saying, "Well, stop you are going to hurt him."
>
> Steve: …you can talk it out with the bully or maybe get your friend to help you try to talk it out with the bully.

> Robert: …you could talk to them and tell them about being a bully that no one will really like you and tell them all the down sides of being a bully.
>
> Jamie: ...if you have worked with them. Then you kind of see a little more about how they work and understand things, and if you like say…know them a little better then you may think, well, if you are bullying people no one is going to like you and you've got to try to stop bullying and try to make better friends and try to work harder to make friends than bully.
>
> John: You could try to talk it out, but if they are like sad about something, if they are bullying for a reason you could like feel for them, agree with them, like empathy.
>
> Sara: In a group you learn to use patience and you would like have to have some kind of patience to deal with a bully because you would want to ask them, "Why are you doing this?". (*Interviews*, 2007, pp.46-47)

The researcher found that most of the teachers and students observed a positive relationship between the uses of cooperative learning in the classroom as an intervention to bullying behaviors schoolwide.

Summary

This chapter reported the findings of the five research questions of this study. Although each site was a Catholic elementary school in the Archdiocese of San Francisco, there were similarities and differences among the three. The teachers from St. Alena's and St. Blane's postulated that name-calling and cruel criticism occurred most frequently, but the results revealed that physical contact was the most prevalent bullying behavior at the two schools. The teacher from St. Christopher's perceived that the only bullying behavior to occur at her school was physical contact. It was the most frequent of the bullying behaviors, but taking of property and cruel criticism closely followed this behavior.

The three teachers observed and interviewed for this study were fairly equal in

their implementation of interpersonal skills into their curricula. This was mostly done at the beginning of the school year as told through the interviews, but some evidence of this implementation was still apparent through observations near the end of the second quarter of the academic year. All teachers believed that these interpersonal skills were necessary for the use of cooperative learning in their classrooms. Of the observed cooperative learning skills, working for a common goal, staying with the group, and using eye contact occurred most often while encouraging, disagreeing without criticism, and caring for one another were the least observed behaviors.

There was a mix of opinions among teachers and students on the impact of cooperative learning skills on bullying behaviors. The teachers from St. Alena's and St. Christopher's clearly recognized that cooperative learning had an effect on bullying. However, Ms. Babb perceived that the use of cooperative learning was helpful in how students dealt with bullying situations, but that it did not cause the bullying to stop completely. Overall, the majority of students perceived that there was a positive effect between these two variables, cooperative learning and bullying. The students who did not see a positive effect were mainly from St. Blane's. The following chapter will examine the conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research and practice based upon these findings.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview

After providing an overview of this study, Chapter Five presents a summary of conclusions and implications, based on the findings reported in Chapter Four. It, then, provides a list of recommendations for future research and practice.

Summary of Study

The frightening frequency of school shootings and growing violence, like bullying, in schools at all levels is a growing quandary for students and educators (Coloroso, 2003). Consequently, this study investigated the perceptions of students and teachers about the use of cooperative learning strategies, specifically positive interdependence and interpersonal skills, and their effectiveness on bullying behaviors, such as name-calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to a bullied child; and excluding.

In this qualitative study, the researcher observed students and teachers in three, Catholic, fifth-grade classrooms for ten consecutive school days at each site. The classes were selected based on responses to a questionnaire that had been mailed to each fifth-grade teacher in the Archdiocese of San Francisco. The questionnaire solicited teachers' cooperative learning experience and their willingness to participate in the study.

During her schedule of observations, the researcher interviewed each teacher before classroom observations to orient herself to any unique student characteristics or personalities. For observations, the researcher sat on the outer perimeter of the room

watching the teacher and the students. The researcher took field notes in spiral bound notebooks, one for each site. Observations were recorded onto cooperative learning and bullying checklists (Appendixes I & J). The researcher rotated around the room to better observe groups during cooperative activities. At lunch and recess periods, the researcher followed each class to the designated eating or playing area for observations. Each observed class had numerous teachers for other subjects, such as physical education, foreign language, computers, art, and music. The researcher accompanied the class to each of these locations recording observations in the same fashion as the homeroom observations.

Two focus group interviews were conducted at each research site on the fifth and tenth days of observations. Each focus group comprised six randomly selected students, three boys and three girls, at St. Alena's and St. Christopher's and the first focus group at St. Blane's. The second focus group at St Blane's consisted of five girls and one boy because of the small number of boys in the class and the absence of one boy on the day of the focus group interview. The observation and interview data were subsequently analyzed for results. Data from field notes and cooperative learning and bullying checklists (Appendixes I & J) were analyzed. Information from the checklists were tallied, and then recorded into occurrence charts to better answer the research questions. The conclusions and implications of the results follow.

Conclusions and Implications

This study's conclusions were based on the findings of the five research questions.

Research Question 1. In what ways do bullying behaviors, such as name-calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging or destroying clothes or property belonging to a bullied child; and excluding; occur among fifth-grade students in three elementary schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco?

All five bullying behaviors were observed at each of the three schools. Physical contact was the most prevalent behavior, followed by cruel criticism; taking, damaging, and destroying property of a bullied child; excluding; and name-calling. The observational finding that boys were most often the perpetrators of physical bullying echoed the research of Bolton and Graeve (2005), Coloroso (2003), and Olweus (1993). These findings validated the perceptions of Maureen Huntington, the Superintendent of Catholic Schools for the Archdiocese of San Francisco, (personal communication, May 8, 2007), namely, that bullying occurs in Catholic schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco. The occurrences of these behaviors are listed in Table 9.

Table 9

Total Occurrences of Bullying Behaviors

Type of Bullying	Total Occurrences In All Three Schools	Percentage of Total Occurrences of Bullying Behaviors
Name-calling	17	9 %
Cruel criticism	45	25%
Physical contact	53	29%
Taking of property	35	19%
Excluding	33	18%
Totals	183	100%

The main conclusion related to this research question was that all three types of bullying behaviors (verbal, physical, and relational) that were investigated in this study occurred at each research site. The findings revealed that physical bullying was the most frequently occurring behavior with 53 (29%) total occurrences. On the other hand, name-calling was the least frequently observed bullying behavior with only 17 (9%) total occurrences.

Observations revealed that boys tend to be more physical than girls, and this physical behavior most often occurs outside the classroom. The exception to this is shown in comments by Mrs. Charles, the fifth grade teacher at St. Christopher's. Though her comments the researcher learned that there was an ongoing bullying situation between two girls in her classroom. Mrs. Charles described it in this way:

> I know of one incident that is going on right now, and unfortunately I am not on the yard so I don't see it. But another teacher has told me that there is some hitting going on or sort of kicking. I think it is between two girls. I know they are friends, but yet I know the one is dominant and seems to have power over the other one even though in size one of them is much shorter than the other one. (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 39)

These findings support findings from both Owens (1996) and Tulloch (1995). This implies that more attention may need to be directed to the physical behavior of boys as they relate to potential bullying behaviors as recommended by Olweus (1993). To overlook these overt behaviors as "boys being boys" could potentially contribute to more serious occurrences of bullying behaviors in schools.

The low percentage of name-calling (9%) in comparison to that of cruel criticism (25%) implies there could be an evolution of basically calling other children names into the more advanced technique of cruelly criticizing another child. The findings of this study revealed minimal name calling that was almost never malicious; examples of these

included, “copycat”, “mean”, “shrimp”, “cheater”, “devil”, and “sandwich boy.” However, cruel criticism was observed to be more malicious and to consist of many forms. For example, students would roll their eyes in response to student remarks, use body gestures towards another student, or use “put downs” to belittle one another. These behaviors appeared to be more hurtful to the students observed.

Excluding was one of the lower occurring behaviors at 33 (18%) observed occurrences. However, the observations determined that girls were the largest perpetrator at all three schools. This is shown during the first focus group interviews at St. Blane’s, Katia stated:

> …like Beth, she can’t find anybody that she is the same with. Like she is really shy and sheepish or something. Like most people in our class are really loud and different. She is weird. (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 29)

This discovery endorsed the findings of Bolton and Graeve (2005), Coloroso (2003), and Olweus (1993) that girls are largely responsible for relational bullying. This implies that boys and girls relate to and play with each other differently, girls being more subtle while boys are more overt.

Research Question 2. How do fifth-grade students in three elementary schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco use cooperative learning skills related to positive interdependence and interpersonal behaviors in the classroom?

Nine behaviors for cooperative learning were observed in this study. The most frequently occurring behaviors were evenly distributed between positive interdependence and interpersonal skills. Of the lower level skills, which were the most commonly observed, the most frequent behavior was helping, followed by staying with the group, using eye contact, expressing support for ideas, and asking for help. The higher level

skills, disagreeing without criticism, providing constructive feedback, and talking through issues, were either harder to observe or were practiced less by the students. The variance in these observed behaviors could be due to the varying forms of cooperative learning taught by each teacher. The total occurrences for these skills are listed in Table 10.

The main conclusions from these findings were that students in these three classrooms were using all the observed skills. The findings demonstrated that students were more willing to engage in simpler behaviors, such as expressing support for ideas

Table 10

Occurrences of Cooperative Learning Skills

Cooperative Learning Skill	Total Occurrences In All Three Schools	Percentage of Total Occurrences of Skill
Working for a common goal	95	10%
Caring for one another	77	8%
Talking through issues	94	10%
Helping	104	11%
Encouraging	67	7%
Staying with the group and using eye contact	145	16%
Expressing support for ideas and asking for help	190	21%
Providing constructive feedback	86	9%
Disagreeing without criticism	74	8%
Totals	932	100%

and asking for help (190, 21%), staying with the group and using eye contact (145, 16%),

and helping (104, 11%). These observations imply that students may be more willing to execute behaviors that are of less personal risk. However, the lower occurring behaviors, such as encouraging 67 (7%), disagreeing without criticism 74 (8%), and caring for one another 77 (8%) total occurrences, appear to be of little risk as well. These behaviors are more relational and could appear risky to the observed students.

The following comments from focus group interviews conducted at each school gives detail as to how the children view cooperative group work. Students from St. Alena's School had differing opinions about working in cooperative learning groups. The first comment by Rory described his perception that working in groups was beneficial because group members have help. The next two comments, by Jane and Rose, ascertained that working in a group was often difficult because of unequal participation and people not getting along. The last two comments, by Chris and Glen, gathered that it was good to work in a group because other members can help members of the group and the group members can get to know each other, but that it was bad because of arguments that occur in the groups. These perceptions are shown in the following representative comments that emerged from focus group interviews containing a randomly selected sample of 12 students:

> Rory: …in a group if you have a really good partner and if you really stay on task, you know they can sort of pull you along. They can keep you on task more, but you can kind of have fun because then you know you are both doing it right and it's really fun!
>
> Jane: Well, I don't like being in a group with someone who is just like, well, I will just like do this and you can do the rest. Because if you have to work harder while they just do a little bit which barely counts for anything and you both get the same grade, it is not that fair because you actually did work, and they didn't…I would rather work with a nice group [that is] on task.
>
> Rose: If I don't like the people in the group I am working with, then I would

> rather work alone. Because if I don't like the people, then I just wouldn't understand or just get along with people.
>
> Chris: Sometimes it is good to work in a group. If you don't really know someone really well, it is kind of a good time to learn about them, but sometimes you fight with a group and that is what I don't really like about it. You get mad, and you guys don't work well together, and you don't get a good grade.
>
> Glen: …first of all, you have someone to work with and if you get stuck they will probably help you, and you will get to know how artistic they are…or you might argue about who gets which part or no I want this or I want that or all that nonsense. (*Interviews*, 2007, pp. 4-5 & 12)

Although the students thought that there were positive and negative aspects to cooperative learning groups, many of them pointedly mentioned positive interdependence and social interdependence skills, such as working for a common goal and helping.

The focus group interviews from St Blane's revealed that Josh and Marco liked working in cooperative learning groups because of the participation of members within a group. Janet and Beth not only liked working alone, but also enjoyed working in a group. They declared that working with others gave them more creativity and resources. Katia, the last student quoted, did not like cooperative group work because group members always thought their answers were correct. These views are expressed in the following representative student remarks about cooperative learning:

> Josh: In a group, you don't have to do all the work. You can participate and say some things and they will do the rest.
>
> Marco: I like being with a group because I don't get lonely.
>
> Janet: I like working in a group, but I also like working by myself because when you work by yourself you don't have to agree on anything. You can come up with you own answers, and you don't have to compare or anything. But working in a group is also nice because then you have like other resources. Other people might have other resources like they might have gotten information like from their mom or dad or something…and you can learn a lot either way.
>
> Beth: …if you have your own idea, you could write it down, but I also like

> working in a group because then you can have like more creative ideas, and so if someone has like an answer to a question and you don't…then you could like figure it out together.
>
> Katia: I also think well some people they think they know everything and they think they are always right. So if you say no that is wrong, then they get really mad. (*Interviews*, 2007, pp. 24 & 32)

The comments of the interviewees supported the inclusion of positive interdependence and interpersonal skills in their classroom.

The focus group results from St. Christopher's demonstrated that Sara, Jamie, and Lilly recognized that it was beneficial to work in groups when help was needed, but when able to do the assignment alone the students would rather work independently. Sam determined that group members "goofed off", so he did not prefer to work with others. Alexis thought that group members were good because they helped when she was stuck. Phil and Terry determined that the group could be chaotic and just take your answers. Representative comments from student focus groups at this school consisted in the following:

> Sara: The positive thing about working in a group is that if you get stuck on a question, then you can get help. That's good! But sometimes the people just don't want to work so you get stuck doing all the work.
>
> Jamie: It depends on what sort of thing we are doing. So sometimes I like working in a group if we are doing something really hard, but if I thought we were doing something that I was capable of doing myself, then, I would probably work by myself.
>
> Lilly: One of the good things is you get the answers, and the bad things is that sometimes you don't finish because other people need you to help them.
>
> Sam: …the negative things are that sometimes they goof off, and it is not very productive.
>
> Alexis: …if you need help you can ask for help. It is just more fun to work in a group because you can actually talk to each other. Then, if you are stuck on something, then you can just ask each other.

> Phil: Sometimes your group can be chaos, just pure chaos. If you have an answer that ends up being the right answer, but the rest of your group thinks that's wrong and eventually you end up using their answers and the whole group gets it wrong.
>
> Terry: People just ask you what the answers are, and they are not doing their work. They are mostly just copying off of you. Also, if somebody asks you, then they go ask another person. It kind of makes you feel bad. (*Interviews*, 2007, pp. 42-43 & 48-49)

Although all of the teachers used varying forms and degrees of cooperative learning activities, the responses from the six student focus groups, two focus groups from each school, uncovered common themes. Foremost among these was information sharing and mutual assistance. The students liked working in cooperative groups because they could discuss the information and help each another with assignments. The majority of comments demonstrated that cooperative learning in classrooms fostered positive interdependence and interpersonal skills. This finding is consistent with statements made by sixth and seventh grade students in the study by Fleming and Mueller (2001). Although five students interviewed expressed negative aspects of cooperative learning, such as getting into arguments and failing to finish assignments because other students needed help, the findings still support the observed skills for helping and disagreeing which were also maintained in the study by Fleming and Mueller.

Research Question 3. How have fifth-grade teachers in three elementary schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco incorporated the instruction of interpersonal skills into the teaching of cooperative learning strategies?

The three teachers all reported that their current students were "great children with natural interpersonal skills". Through conversations with all three teachers the researcher discovered that the interpersonal skills of the observed students was in stark

contrast to each teachers previous year's classes, which had difficulty working together from the beginning of the year. It was only after numerous attempts at intervention with interpersonal skills training and the practice of cooperative learning that the previous year's students were able to successfully work together. The observered teachers' current students arrived in the fifth grade with the ability to work well together in groups with their classmates. The strong interpersonal skills that the current students exhibited could be attributed to their home lives, their schools' Catholic environment, or the interpersonal skills taught by their teachers. The latter were a combination of schoolwide programs, Archdiocesan policies and school policies, and classroom instruction on interpersonal skills. The homeroom teachers from St. Alena's and St. Blane's Schools and the science teacher from St. Christopher's School used the methods for promoting interpersonal skills advocated by Johnson et al. (1998), which incorporate assigned student roles for the development of social interdependence, group accountability, and positive interdependence, as discussed in Chapter Two.

The main conclusions from these findings were that all three teachers were using numerous methods, such as modeling, direct instruction, and packaged programs, to instruct their students in interpersonal skills. However, it was not only the instruction of interpersonal skills in the classroom that had an impact on student behavior. There were also many factors that were specific to each school and student that determined the social skill level and the ability of students to work together successfully in groups. One important factor was the schools' attempts to interweave Catholic traditions and values throughout the school day. These attempts were evident at varying degrees.

These conclusions imply that these schools need to assess their daily procedures

and curriculum to ensure that Catholic values and traditions are lived and not simply a subject to be rotely taught. There may need to be training for both faculty and parents so that there is a cohesiveness of interpersonal skills in the school and the home.

Research Question 4. What are the perceptions of fifth-grade teachers in three elementary schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco about the bullying behaviors (that is, name-calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to a bullied child; and excluding) of their students?

All three teachers perceived that the above bullying behaviors occurred among their students. The teachers' perceptions and the actual occurrence of bullying behaviors, however, were quite different. Mrs. Charles from St. Christopher's thought that there was only one behavior occurring in her class, physical contact. Although this behavior was observed to be the most frequent, all of the other behaviors occurred as well.

The teachers from St. Alena's and St. Blane's Schools were more realistic about the bullying behaviors at their schools because they acknowledged the occurrence of these behaviors among their students. The teacher from St. Christopher's replied in her interview that the behaviors did not exist among the students in her class. The teachers from St. Alena's and St. Blane's Schools reported that name-calling and cruel criticism occurred the most, but the researcher's findings indicated that these behaviors actually happened the least. Only Mrs. Abbott from St. Alena's and Ms. Babb from St. Blane's acknowledged excluding among their students, but it actually occurred at all three schools. The only teacher who claimed to observe the taking of property was Mrs. Abbott from St. Alena's, but this bullying behavior occurred at all three research sites.

These findings conclude that teachers do not always accurately perceive what is

actually occurring in their classrooms and schools. The teachers from St. Alena's and St. Blane's were more accurate in their perceptions of the occurrence of bullying behaviors than was the teacher from St. Christopher's. However, all three teachers interviewed and observed had misconceptions about perceived bullying behaviors and actual bullying behaviors.

This conclusion implies that teachers need to be more aware of actual bullying behaviors occurring among their students. This is not easy, as stated by Mrs. Abbott: "Kids are kind of sauvé because they know when to do it [bullying] and when not to do it." (*Interviews*, 2007, p. 2) All three teachers reported that it happened outside of the classroom and they would sometimes learn about the behaviors from other teachers, students, parents, or not at all. Therefore, a better method of communicating behaviors outside the classroom needs to be developed in these schools.

Research Question 5. What is the relationship between cooperative learning (positive interdependence and interpersonal skills) and bullying behaviors (such as, name-calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to a bullied child; and excluding) among fifth-grade students in three elementary schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco?

Although the three teachers had differing views about the effectiveness of cooperative learning on bullying behaviors, they all believed that teaching cooperative learning skills helped to deter or mitigate bullying. The students' views were not as unanimous as their teachers'. For the most part, the students interviewed believed that they were better able to diffuse a bullying situation because they had learned to work together in the classroom. About one-third of the students, however, believed that there

was no relationship between cooperative learning and bullying. Not surprisingly, these students were also members of the class in which the teacher had the most negative response to cooperative learning skills reducing bullying behaviors.

These findings conclude that teachers viewed the effectiveness of cooperative learning on bullying behaviors to be more successful than did the students from the schools observed. Teachers viewed cooperative learning to be more effective on the deterrence of bullying behaviors than did the students. On the other hand, the students reported that cooperative learning skills equipped them with techniques that allowed them to better deal with bullying situations they were faced with.

Although interpersonal skills were observed and students discussed them with the researcher, however, this discussion was difficult. The researcher confirmed the findings of Salmivalli et al. (1996) that children do not completely understand how to verbalized social or interpersonal skills and cooperative behavior. Salmivalli claimed that these are concepts that need to be explicitly taught in the classroom. During focus group interviews the researcher had to explain to students the meaning of social or interpersonal skills before each focus group was able to answer questions pertaining to interpersonal skills.

These conclusions imply that both students and teachers value cooperative learning skills taught in the classroom. These skills enable the teachers to approach the instruction of interpersonal skills that allow students to diffuse bullying in numerous ways. This instruction empowers students with appropriate skills for handling bullies. These conclusions implied that teachers' attitudes about bullying were projected onto

some students, for example, Ms. Babb's belief that bullying would always occur no matter what instructional techniques were employed to diffuse it.

This section addressed the conclusions and implications of the five research questions. The following two sections will discuss recommendations for future research in this field of study and recommendations for professional practice.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following are recommendations for future research based on the findings of this study.

1. This qualitative study described how cooperative learning skills, such as positive interdependence and interpersonal skills, can affect bullying behaviors like name-calling; cruel criticism; physical contact; taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to a bullied child; and excluding. More in-depth quantitative studies with larger populations should be conducted to gather more generalizable data.
2. This study limited its investigation to fifth-grade teachers in Catholic schools who declared that they are using cooperative learning in their classrooms. The researcher's observations made it clear that the degree of actual cooperative learning varies. Thus, future studies of different research sites: public, private, and parochial would be useful.
3. Because only Catholic elementary schools were observed in this study, it remains unclear if the influence of Catholicism, a potentially important variable, contributed to the students' interpersonal skills and ability to work through bullying situations with other students. Future studies should investigate schools

that are not faith based to determine if the values embedded in their curricula appreciably influence student behavior.

4. This study only observed cooperative learning and bullying behaviors in fifth-grade students. Similar studies should be conducted in other grades in Catholic schools, including secondary schools.
5. Two variables in this study, the Catholic affiliation of the schools and their homeroom teachers, established differences in observed behavior by the researcher in the student's cooperative learning behaviors. Future studies may wish to consider these variables when addressing cooperative learning and its relationship to bullying behaviors. These studies could focus on Catholic identity only in regard to cooperative learning and bullying or on Catholic schools whose teachers include those of other faiths and its outcome on cooperative learning and bullying.
6. Research is needed to address the infusion of Catholic values into the school community and the occurrence of bullying behaviors.
7. This research did not address the emerging phenomenon of *cyberbullying*. Bolton and Graeve (2005) found that the Internet and popular communication options, such as *instant messaging*, are used to harass, humiliate, and manipulate enemies and friends. This new area of bullying requires further research at all levels of education.
8. Research should address the relationship between the socioeconomic status of the student population and the occurrence of bullying.

Recommendations for Future Practice

The following are recommendations for future practice based on the findings of this study.

1. In-service opportunities for teachers and support staff in schools and district-wide are needed to enable them to identify the various types of bullying and equip them with strategies to deter the occurrence of those bullying behaviors. The need for such training is corroborated by Johnson and Johnson (2000).
2. Educators should be informed about the research on bullying (Olweus, 1978, 1993), the types of bullying, and the roles of the bully, the bullied, and the bystander (Bolton & Greave, 2005; Coloroso, 2003).
3. In-service opportunities for administrators and teachers to become cognizant of students who consistently display bullying behaviors and provide way to appropriately provide counseling intervention services for these students.
4. In-service opportunities need to be available for teachers and teachers' aides in regard to the elements of cooperative learning, the various approaches to cooperative learning both conceptual and direct, and the ways to successfully implement these approaches in their classrooms.
5. Schools need in-service on ways to effective implement cooperative learning approaches that may deter bullying behaviors in schools.
6. Teacher in-service is needed on interpersonal skill building and the ability to relate these skills to students and the discrete infusion of interpersonal skills into the curriculum.
7. Schools and districts would benefit from in-services on the different interaction patterns between boys and girls and effective methods for dealing with both.

Final Thoughts

This study suggested that cooperative learning could positively decrease students' bullying in schools through students' understanding of how to diffuse situations through communication. The researcher did not fully anticipate or account for the numerous variables in the field of social sciences. The recommendations for future research could elucidate some of the mysteries that surround the bullying phenomenon. One wonders if bullying is, and always has been, integral to human behavior. If so, cooperative learning may be an indispensable tool to combat such tendencies in our youth. Training and implementation of cooperative learning skills, however, must be consistent for cooperative learning to truly to be effective in combating bullying.

REFERENCES

Ames, C., & Ames, R. (1981). Achievement attributions and self-instructions under competitive and individualistic goal structures. *Journal of Educational*

Psychology, *76*(3), 177-208. Retrieved August 27, 2007, from ERIC database (EJ306022): http://www,eric.ed.gov

Aronson, E. (2000). What Happened at Columbine? In *Nobody Left To Hate*. W. H. Freeman and Company.

Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Stephan, C., Sikes, J., & Snapp, M. (1978). *The jigsaw classroom*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Ballard, M., Tucky, A., & Remley, T. P., Jr. (1999, May). Bullying and school violence: A proposed prevention program. *NASSP Bulletin*, 38-47.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social formation of thought and action: A social-cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bean, J. (1996). *Engaging ideas: The professor's guide to integrating writing, critical thinking, and active learning in the classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Benard, B. (2005). *What is it about Tribes?* Windsor, CA: Center Source Systems.

Bligh, D. A. (1972). *What is the use of lectures*? Karmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Bolton, J., & Graeve, S. (Eds.). (2005). *No room for bullies: From the classroom to cyberspace teaching respect, stopping abuse, and rewarding kindness*. Boys Town, NE: Boys Town Press.

Boulton, M. J., & Underwood, K. (1992). Bullying/Victim problems among middle school children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *62*, 73-87.

Bransford, J. D., & Stern, B. S. (1993). *The ideal problem solver* (2nd ed.). New York: W. H. Freeman.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Carney, J.V., & Hazler, R.J., & Higgins, J. ((2002)). Characteristics of school bullies and victims as perceived by public school professionals. *The Journal of School Violence, 1, 91-106.*

Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence. (2004). Retrieved September 14, 2007, from University of Colorado Web site: http://www.colorado.edu/cspv

Clarke, E. A., & Kiselica, M. S. (1997). A systematic counseling approach to the problem of bullying. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 31*, 310-324.

Choi, J. (2006) Relationship *among cooperative learning experiences, social interdependence, children's aggression, victimization, and prosocial behavior.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Edina.

Cobia, D. C., & Carney, J. S. (2002). Creating a culture of tolerance in schools: Everyday actions to prevent hate-motivated violent incidents. *Journal of School Violence, 1*(2), 87-103. Retrieved September 24, 2007, from ERIC database: http://eric.ed.gov

Cohen, B. P., & Cohen, E. G. (1991). From Groupwork among children to R & D teams: Interdependence, interaction, and productivity. A*dvances in Group Processes, 8*, 205-226.

Cohen, E. G. (1994, Spring). Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive small groups . *Review of Educational Research, 64*(1), 1-35. Retrieved August 14, 2007, from JSTOR database (doi:10.2307/1170744): http://links.jstor.org

Cohen, E. G. (1998). Making cooperative learning equitable. *Educational Leadership, 56*, 18-21.

Cohen, S., & Willis, T. (1985). Stress and social support and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 98*, 310-357.

Coloroso, B. (2003). *The bully, the bullied, and the bystander: From pre-school to high school how parents and teachers can help break the cycle of violence*. New York: Harper Collins.

Congregation for Catholic Education. (1988). *The religious dimension of education in a Catholic school*. Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference.

Cooper, J., Prescott, S., Cook, I., Smith, L., Mueck, R., & Cuseo, J. (1984). Cooperative learning and college instruction- effective use of student learning teams. Unpublished raw data, California State University, California. Retrieved August 14, 2007, from ERIC database: http://eric.ed.gov

Costa, A. L., & O'Leary, P. W. (1992). Co-Cognition- The cooperative development of the intellect. In Davidson & Worsham (Eds.), *Enhancing thinking through cooperative learning*. New York: Teachers College Press

Cowie, H., Smith, P., Boulton, M., & Laver, R. (1994). *Cooperative learning in the*

multi-ethnic classroom: The impact of cooperative group work on social relationships in middle schools. London: David Fulton Publishers.

Crawford, N. (2002, October). New ways to stop bullying. *Monitor on Psychology, 33*(9), 64. Retrieved June 1, 2005, from American Psychological Association Web site: http://www.apa.org/monitor/oct02/bullying.html

Cresswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cuseo, J. (1992). Collaborative & cooperative learning in higher education: A proposed taxonomy. *Cooperative Learning and College Teaching, 2*(2), 2-4.

Damon, W., & Phelps, E. (1989, December). Problem solving with equals: Peer collaboration as a context for learning mathematics and special concepts. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*(4), 39-46. Retrieved August 13, 2007, from ERIC database (EJ404608): http://www.eric.ed.gov

Dedman, B. (2000). Case studies: Secret Service Findings. *Chicago Sun-Times*, October 15.

Deutsch, M. (1949). A theory of cooperation and competition. *Human Relations, 2*, 129-152.

Deutsch, M. (1962). Cooperation and trust: Some theoretical notes. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation* (pp. 275-320). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Dewey, J. (1943). *The school and society* (Rev. ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and Education. An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Free Press. (Original work published 1916)

Dillenbourg P. (1999) What do you mean by collaborative learning? In P. Dillenbourg (Ed) *Collaborative-learning: Cognitive and Computational Approaches*. Retrieved on April 2, 2008, from Elsevier: http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/journal_browse.cws_home?q=1&SH1Code=&pseudotype=&sortBy=Title&letter=C

Dillenbourg, P., Baker, M., Blaye, A., & O'Malley, C. (1995). The evolution of research on collaborative learning. In P. Reimann & H. Spada (Eds.), *Learning in humans and machines: Towards an interdisciplinary learning science* (pp. 189 - 211). London: Pergamon.

Doll, B., Zucker, S., & Brehm, K. (2004). *Resilient classrooms: Creating healthy environments for learning*. New York: Guilford Press.

Espelage, D. L., & Bosworth, K. & Simon, T. (2000, July). Short-term Stability and Prospective Correlates of Bullying in Middle School Students: An Examination of Potential Demographic, Psychosocial, and Environmental Correlates [Electronic version]. *Whitted, Cleary, & Takiff LLC.*

Felder, R. M. (1997, June). *Beating the numbers game: Effective teaching in large classes*. Retrieved September 24, 2007, from North Carolina State University Web site: http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/Largeclasses.htm

Fieldnotes A (2007). Unpublished raw data.

Fieldnotes B (2007). Unpublished raw data.

Fieldnotes C (2007). Unpublished raw data.

Fleming, T., & Mueller, A. (2001, May/June). Cooperative learning: Listening to how children work at school. *The Journal of Educational Research, 94*(5), 259-265.

Floyd, N. M. (1985). "Pick on somebody your own size!": Controlling victimization. *The Pointer, 29*(2), 9-17.

Frederiksen, N. (1984). Implications for cognitive theory for instruction in problem solving. *Review of Educational Research, 54*, 363-407.

Gabbert, B., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1986). Cooperative learning, group-to-individual transfer, process gain, and the acquisition of cognitive reasoning strategies. *The Journal of Psychology, 120*(3), 265-278. Retrieved March 13, 2007, from INIST-CNRS database: http://cat.inist.fr/?aModele=afficheN&cpsidt=8148483

Gabelnick, F., MacGregor, J., Mathews, R. S., & Smith, B. L. (1990, Spring). *Learning Communities: Creating connections among students, faculty, and disciplines* (New Directions for Teaching No. 41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Getzels, J. W., & Jackson, P. W. (1962). *Creativity and intelligence*. New York: Wiley.

Gibbs, J. (1995). *Tribes: A new way of learning and being together*. Sausalito, California: Center Source Systems.

Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Halverson, C., & Waldrup, M. (1974, September). Relations between preschool barrier behaviors and early school measures of coping, imagination, and verbal development. *Developmental Psychology, 10*(5), 716-720. Retrieved September 3, 2007, from ERIC database (EJ104690): http://www.eric.edu.gov

Hansell, S., & Slavin, R. E. (1981, April). Cooperative learning and the structure of interracial friendships. *Sociology of Education, 54*(2), 98-106. Retrieved August 15, 2007, from JSTOR database: http://www.jstor.org

Hausfather, S. J. (1996). Vygotsky and schooling: Creating a social contest for learning. *Action in Teacher Education, 18*, 1-10.

Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., Sharan, S., & Steinberg, R. (1980). Classroom learning style and cooperative behavior of elementary school children. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 72*, 97-104. Retrieved August 14, 2007, from ERIC database (EJ229152): http://www.eric.ed.gov

Holmes, K. J. (2002). *The relationship between self concept and self-reported bullying behaviors*. Unpublished master's thesis, Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, MI. (WorldCat Libraries No. 51082299) Retrieved September 26, 2007, from http://worldcat.org/wcpa/oclc/

Hooper, S., & Hannafin, M. J. (1988). Cooperative CBI: The effects of heterogeneous vs homogeneous grouping on learning of progressively complex concepts. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 4*, 413-424. Retrieved August 14, 2007, from ERIC database (EJ385864): http://eric.ed.gov

Hoover, J., & Hazler, R. J. (1991). Bullies and victims. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 25*, 212-219.

Hoover, J. H., Oliver, R. L., & Hazler, R. J. (1992). Bullying: Perceptions of adolescent victims in the Midwestern USA. *School Psychology International, 13*, 5-16.

Huitt, W., & Hummel, J. (2003). Piaget's theory of cognitive development. In *Educational psychology interactive*. Retrieved May 20, 2007, from Valdosta State University Web site: http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/col/cogsys/piaget.html

Hwong, N. C., Caswell, A., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1993, February). Effects of cooperative and individualistic learning on prospective elementary teachers' music achievement and attitudes. *Journal of social Psychology, 133*(1), 53-64. Retrieved March 13, 2007, from NCBI database: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

Interviews (2007). Unpublished raw data.

James, N., & Johnson, D. W. (1983). The relationship between attitudes toward social interdependence and psychological health within three criminal populations.

Journal of Social Psychology, 121, 131-143. Retrieved September 24, 2007, from JSTOR database: http://www.jstor.com

James, S., & Johnson, D. W. (1988). Social interdependence, psychological adjustment, orientation toward negative stress, and quality of second marriage. *Journal of social Psychology, 128*(3), 287-304. Retrieved September 24, 2007, from JSTOR database: http://www.jstor.org

Johnson, D., Johnson, R., & Holubec, E. (1998). *Cooperation in the classroom*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Johnson, D. W. (1971). Effectiveness of role reversal: Actor or listener. *Psychological Reports, 28*, 275-282.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., & Holubec, E. (1993). *Cooperation in the classroom* (6th ed.). Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., & Krotee, M. (1986). The relationship between social interdependence and psychological health within the 1980 United States Olympic ice hockey team. *Journal of Psychology, 120*, 279-292. Retrieved September 24, 2007, from JSTOR database: http://www.jstor.org

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1989). *Cooperation and competition*. Edina, Minnesota: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1991). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualized learning* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. (Original work published 1975)

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1994). An overview of cooperative learning. In J. Thousand, A. Villa, & A. Nevin (Eds.), *Creative and collaborative learning*. Baltimore: Brookes Press.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1995). *Creative controversy: Intellectual challenge in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1998). Cooperative learning and social interdependence theory. *Social Psychological Applications to social Issues, 4*, 9-35. Retrieved March 13, 2007, from SpingerLink database: http://www.springerlink.com

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2000). *Teaching students to be peacemakers: Results of twelve years of research*. Unpublished raw data, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Houlbec, E. J. (1986). *Circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom*. Edina, Minnesota: Interaction book Company.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., Roy, P., & Zaidman, B. (1985). Oral interaction in cooperative learning groups: Speaking, listening, and the nature of statements made by high, medium, and low-achieving students. *Journal of Psychology, 119*, 303-321. Retrieved August 14, 2007, from NCBI database: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Stanne, M. B. (2000, May). *Cooperative learning methods: A meta-analysis*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota.

Johnson, D. W., & Norem-Hebeisen, A. (1977, June). Attitudes toward interdependence among persons and psychological health. *Psychological Reports, 40*, 843-850. Retrieved August 27, 2007, from NCBI database: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

Johnson, R. T., & Johnson, D. W. (1985). Relationships between African American and Caucasion students in intergroup cooperation and competition. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 125*(4), 421-428.

Kagan, S. (1985). *Learning to cooperate, cooperating to learn* (R. Slavin, S. Sharan, S. Kagan, R. Hertz-Lazarowitz, C. Webb, & R. Schmuck, Eds.). New York: Plenum.

Kagan, S. (1994). *Cooperative learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan Cooperative Learning. (Original work published 1992)

Kleiber, D., & Roberts, G. (1981, June). The effects of experience in the development of social character: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Sports Psychology, 3*(2), 114-122. Retrieved August 27, 2007, from https://www.humankinetics.com/JSEP/viewarticle.cfm?aid=8784

Koffka, K. (1935). *Principles of Gestalt Psychology*. London: Lund Humphries.

Kulik, J. A., & Kulik, C. L. (1979). College teaching. In Peterson & Walberg (Eds.), *Research in teaching: Concepts, findings, and implications*. Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon Publishing.

Lew, M., Mesch, D., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1986, Fall). Positive Interdependence, Academic and Collaborative-Skills Group Contingencies, and Isolated Students . *American Research Journal, 23*(3), 476-488. Retrieved March 13, 2007, from JSTO database: http://www.jstor.org

Lewin, K. (1946). Action research in minority problems. *Journal of social issues, 2*, 34-46.

Lewin, K., Lippit, R., & Caucasion, R. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology, 10*, 271-301.

Limber, S. P., & Nation, M. M. (1998, April). Bullying among children and youth. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Retrieved May 1, 2005, from http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org//jjbulletin/9804/bullying2.html

Lotan, R. A., & Benton, J. (1990). Finding out about complex instruction: Teaching math and science in heterogeneous classrooms. In N. Davidson (Ed.), *Cooperative learning in mathematics*. California: Addison-Wesley.

Lyman, L., & Foyle, H. (1988). *ERIC* (Version ED306003) [Data file]. Retrieved February 10, 2006, from ERIC database (ED306003): http://eric.ed.gov

MacDougall, J. (1993). *Violence in the schools - Programs and policies for prevention* [Pamphlet]. Toronto: Canadian Education Association.

Madden, N. A., & Slavin, R. E. (1983). Effects of CL on the social acceptance of mainstreamed academically impaired students. *Journal of Special Education, 17*, 171-182.

Mahler, M. (1979). *Selected Papers of Margaret S. Mahler*. New York: Aronson.

Marano, H. E. (1995). Big. Bad. Bully. *Psychology Today*, September/October, 51-57.

Marr, N., & Field, T. (2001). *Bullycide, death at playtime: An expose` of child suicide caused by bullying*. Yorkshire, England: Success Unlimited.

McCracken, D. (2005, April). Bullying. In *UIS News Bureau*. Retrieved September 24, 2007, from http://www.uis.edu/newsbureau/archive/2005_04_01_index.html

Miller, C. K. (2006). Student and teacher perceptions of school social climate and attitudes toward bullying: Implications for intervention. Retrieved September 26, 2007 from ProQuest database (3215321): http://proquest.com

Millis, B. J. (2000-2001). Cooperative learning: It's here to stay. *The Professional & Organizational Development Network in Higher Education, 12*(8). Retrieved August 5, 2007, from University of Chicago Web site: http://teaching.uchicago.edu/pod/millis.html

Moos, R. H. (1979). *Evaluating educational environments*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (25. 2001, April). Bullying behaviors among U.S. youth: Prevalence and association with psychological adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 286*(16).

National Conference of Catholic Bishops. (1972). *To teach as Jesus did*. Washington,

DC: United States Catholic Conference.

Newman, K. S. (2004). *Rampage: The social roots of school shootings.* New York: Basic Books.

O'Connell, P., Pepler, D., & Craig, W. (1999). Peer involvement in bullying: Insights and challenges for intervention. *Journal of Adolescence, 22*, 437-452.

Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys*. Washington DC: Hemisphere (Wiley).

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Oxford: African Americanwell Publishing Inc.

O'Moore, A. M., & Hillery, B. (1989). Bullying in Dublin schools. *Irish Journal of Psychology, 10*(3), 426-441.

Orpinas, P., Horne, A. M., Staniszewski, D. (2003). School bullying: Changing the problem by changing the school. *School Psychology Review*, 32. Retrieved November 27, 2007, from http://www.questra.com

Ortega, R. & Lena, M.J. (2000). The Seville anti-bullying in school project. *Aggressive Behavior*, 26, 113-123.

Owens, L.D. (1996) Sticks and stones and sugar and spice: Girls' and boys' aggression in schools. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counseling*, 6, 45-55.

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension fostering and comprehension monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction, 1*(2), 117-175. Retrieved September 3, 2007, from LEA Online database: http://www.leaonline.com

Panitz, T. (n.d.). *Benefits of cooperative learning in relation to student motivation*. Retrieved August 27, 2007, from http://home.capecod.net/~tpanitz/tedsarticles/motivation.htm

Panitz, T. (1998, April 22). Posting on the listserve of the Professional and Organizational Development Network. Message posted to pod@iastate.edu

Panitz, T. (1999). *The Case for Student Centered Instruction Via Collaborative Learning Paradigms*. Retrieved August 6, 2007, from http://home.capecod.net/%7Etpanitz/tedsarticles/coopbenifits.htm

Parker, J., & Asher, S. (1987). Peer relations and later personal adjustment: Are low-accepted children at risk? *Psychological Bulletin, 102*, 357-389. Retrieved August 27, 2007, from American Psychological Association Web site: http://www.apa.org/journals/bul/

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc .

Pepler, D. J., & Craig, W. M. (1995). About bullying - Understanding this underground activity. *Orbit, 25*(3), 32-34.

Pepler, D. J., Craig, W. M., Ziegler, S., & Charach, A. (1994). An evaluation of an anti-bullying intervention in Toronto schools. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 13*(2), 95-110.

Perry, D. G., Kusel, S. J., & Perry, L. C. (1988). Victims of peer aggression. *Developmental Psychology, 24*(6), 807-814.

Peterson, P., & Swing, S. (1985). Students' cognitions as mediators of the effectiveness of small-group learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 77*(3), 299-312.

Piaget, J. (1926). *The language and thought of the child*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Piaget, J. (1950). *The psychology of intelligence*. New York: Harcourt.

Pressels, B. E. (1992). A perspective on the evolution of cooperative thinking. In Davidson & Worsham (Eds.), *Enhancing thinking through cooperative learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Rigby, K. (1994, April 8). School bullies. *Independent Teacher*.

Rigby, K. (1997). What Children tell us about bullying in schools [Electronic version]. *Children Australia, 22*(2), 28-34.

Rigby, K. (2002) *A meta-evaluation of methods and approaches to reducing bullying in pre-schools and in early primary school in Australia*, Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department, Canberra.

Rigby, K., Cox, I., & Black, G. (1997). Cooperativeness and bully/victim problems among Australian schoolchildren. *Journal of School Psychology*, 137(3). 357-368.

Rigby, K., & Slee, P. (1999). Suicidal ideation among adolescent school children, involvement in bullying-victim problems, and perceived social support. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 29*, 119-130.

Roberts, C. M. (2004). *The dissertation journey: A practical and comprehensive guide to planning, writing, and defending your dissertation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Crown Press.

Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (2001). *Social dominance*. New York: Cambridge University

Press.

Salmivalli, C. (1999). Participant role approach to school bullying: Implications for interventions. *Journal of Adolescence, 22*, 453-459.

Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K., Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (1996). Bullying as a group process: Participant roles and their relations to social status within the group. *Aggressive Behavior, 22*, 1-15.

Schmuck, R., & Schmuck, P. (1988). *Group processing in the classroom*. Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Second Vatican Council. (1965/1966). Vatican Council II: The basic sixteen documents. In A. Flannery (Ed.), *The declaration on Christian education* (pp. 575 - 591). Northport, NY: Costello Publishing.

Sharan, S. (1980, Summer). Cooperative learning in small groups: Recent methods and effects on achievement, attitudes, and ethnic relations. *Review of Educational Psychology, 50*(2), 241-271. Retrieved August 15, 2007, from JSTOR database: http://www.jstor.org

Sharan, S. (Ed.). (1990). *Cooperative learning: Theory and research*. New York: Praeger.

Sharan, S., Gal, I., & Stok, S. (1984). Mutual assistance teams for teachers: A field experiment. *Studies in Education, 39*, 73-88.

Sharan, S., & Shaulov, A. (1990). Cooperative learning, motivation to learn, and academic achievement. In S. Sharan (Ed.), *Cooperative learning: Theory and practice* (pp. 173-202). New York: Praeger.

Sharan, Y., & Sharan, S. (1992). *Expanding cooperative learning through Group Investigation*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Skinner, B. (1968). *The technology of teaching*. New York: Appleton-Crofts.

Slavin, R. E. (1985). Team Assisted Individualization: A cooperative learning solution for adaptive instruction in mathematics. In M. Wang & M. Walberg (Eds.), *Adapting instruction to individual differences*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Slavin, R. E. (1987). Cooperative learning: Where behavioral and humanistic approaches to classroom motivation meet. *Elementary School Journal, 88*, 9-37.

Slavin, R. E. (1990). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Slavin, R. E. (1994). *Using student team learning* (4th ed.). Baltimore, MD: John

Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Slavin, R. E. (1995, October). *Research on cooperative learning and achievement: What we know, what we need to know*. John Hopkins University: Center for Research on Education of Students Placed at Risk.

Slavin, R. E. (1996). Research on cooperative learning and achievement: What we know what we need to know. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 21*, 43-69.

Slavin, R. E. (1997). *Educational Psychology Theory and Practice* (5th ed.). Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon. (Original work published 1986)

Slavin, R. E., & Karweit, N. (1981). Cognitive and affective outcomes of an intensive student team learning experience. *Journal of Experimental Education, 50*, 29-35.

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (1979). School practices that improve race relations. *American Educational Research Journal, 16*, 169-180. Retrieved August 15, 2007, from JSTOR database: http://www.jstor.org

Slavin, R. E., & Oickle, E. (1981, July). Effects of cooperative learning teams on students achievement and race relations: Treatment by race interactions. *Sociology of Education, 54*(3), 174-180. Retrieved August 15, 2007, from JSTOR database: http://www.jstor.org

Springer, L., Stanne, M. E., & Donovan, S. (1998). *Measuring the success of small-group learning in college-level SMET teaching: A meta-analysis*. Retrieved August 14, 2007, from University of Wisconsin-Madison Web site: http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/archive/cl1/CL/resource/scismet.htm

Stephenson, P., & Smith, P. K. (1987). Anatomy of a playground bully. *Education*, 236-237.

Swing, S., & Peterson, P. (1982). The relationship of student ability and small group interaction to student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 19*, 259-274. Retrieved August 14, 2007, from ERIC database (ED210319): http://www.eric.ed.gov

Timeline of recent worldwide school shootings. [Data file]. Retrieved on November 27, 2007, from http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0777958.html

Tobler, N., & Stratton, H. (1997). Effectiveness of school-based drug prevention programs: A meta-analysis of the research. *Journal of Primary Prevention, 18*(1), 71-128. Retrieved August 27, 2007, from SpringerLink database: http://www.springerlink.com/content/v3340v6h2317r450

Triplett, N. (1898). The dynamoginic factors in peacemaking and competition. *American*

Journal of Psychology, 9, 507-533. Retrieved August 8, 2007, from http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Triplett/

Tulloch, M. (1995). Gender differences in bullying experiences and attitudes to social relationships in high school students. *Australian Journal of Education, 39*(3), 279-293.

Vail, K. (1999). Words that wound. *American School Board Journal*, 37-40.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Webb, N. M. (1992). Testing a theoretical model of student interaction and in learning in small groups. In R. Hertz-Lazarowitz & N. Miller (Eds.), *Interaction in cooperative groups: the theoretical autonomy of group learning* (pp. 102-119). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Webb, N. M., & Cullian, L. K. (1983, Fall). Group composition, group interaction, and achievement in small groups. *American Educational Research Journal, 20*(3), 411-423. Retrieved August 27, 2007, from JSTOR database: http://www.jstor.org

Whitney, I., & Smith, P. K. (1993). A survey of the nature and extent of bullying in junior/middle and secondary schools. *Educational Research, 35*(1), 3-25.

Wood, D. J., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976, April). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17*(2), 89-100. Retrieved September 3, 2007, from African Americanwell Synergy database: http://www.African Americanwell-synergy.com

Woolfolk, A. (2001). *Educational Psychology* (9th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Yager, S., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1985). Oral discussion groups-to-individual transfer and achievement in cooperative learning groups. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 77*(1), 60-66. Retrieved August 14, 2007, from DTIC database (ADA15320): http://stinet.dtic.mil

Yates, C., & Smith, P. K. (1989). Bullying in two English comprehensive schools. In M. Roland & E. Roland (Eds.), *Bullying - An International Perspective* (pp. 22-34). London: David Fulton Publishers.

Ziegler, S., & Rosenstein-Manner, M. (1991). *Bullying at school: Toronto in an international context*. Toronto: Toronto Board of Education, Research Services.

Zindi, F. (1994). Bullying at boarding school: A Zimbabwe study. *Research in Education, 51*, 23-32.

APPEDIXES

APPENDIX A:

CONSENT FORM TO SUPERINTENDENT

Julie Alexander
357 Mendocino
Brisbane, CA 94005

May 8, 2007

Archdiocese of San Francisco
Department of Catholic Schools
One Peter Yorke Way
San Francisco, CA 94109

Dear Maureen Huntington,

In completion of my doctorate in Catholic Educational Leadership from the University of San Francisco, it is required that I conduct a formal research study. Since I have been employed by the Archdiocese of San Francisco as a fifth grade teacher for the past six years, I have attended workshops on both bullying and cooperative learning. Through observation of the behaviors of fifth grade students in my classroom and on the play yard, I became interested in how cooperative learning might affect bullying behaviors.

The purpose of this study will be to investigate the impact of cooperative learning skills on bullying behaviors of students in Catholic elementary schools in the Archdiocese of San Francisco. In addition, the study will explore the perspectives of fifth grade students on the effectiveness of these skills when encountered with bullying at school. Finally, the study will examine the role of the bystander in the bullying situation.

I hope to find three fifth grade classrooms, one in Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo counties, to conduct my research. Classrooms will be selected based upon teacher responses to a questionnaire. The research will involve these classrooms for a period of six weeks. I will attend each school one day per week for classroom and site observations. I will also conduct two focus group interviews with six students from each research site. The focus groups will be conducted at the third and sixth weeks of observations.

I hope that you will grant permission for me to conduct this research within the Archdiocese of San Francisco. It is anticipated that the results of the research will be beneficial to Catholic educators in our pursuit to encourage cooperation among our students.

Thank you for your help.

Yours In Christ,
Julie Alexander

APPENDIX B:

SUPERINTENDENT CONSENT RESPONSE

THE ARCHDIOCESE OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS
ONE PETER YORKE WAY, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109-6602 (415) 614-5660 FAX (415) 614-566-

May 17, 2007

Mrs. Julie Alexander
357 Mendocino
Brisbane, California 94005

Dar Mrs. Alexander,

Congratulations! You are nearing the completion of your doctorate degree from ICEL at the University of San Francisco. It was a pleasure to visit with you last week and discuss your new research project.

I want to affirm in writing my permission for you to conduct this research study and contact our fifth grade teachers to solicit their responses to the survey you submitted.

Best of luck to you in this project.

Sincerely yours,

Maureen Huntington

Ms. Maureen Huntington
Superintendent of Catholic Schools

APPENDIX C:

TEACHER COVER LETTER

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Julie Alexander
357 Mendocino
Brisbane, CA 94005

May 18, 2007

Dear Fifth Grade Teacher,

My name is Julie Alexander and I am a doctoral student in the Catholic Educational Leadership Program at the University of San Francisco and a fifth grade teacher at St. John's Elementary School near Glen Park in San Francisco. Next fall, I will be conducting a study for my dissertation that will examine students' perspectives on cooperative learning skills in fifth grade classrooms of the Archdiocese of San Francisco.

Enclosed with this letter you will find a brief questionnaire that will allow me to determine if a population of fifth grade teachers who incorporate cooperative learning in their classrooms exists to be studied. It would be very helpful if you would fill in the attached questionnaire and return it to me in the self-addressed stamped envelope that is also enclosed. Please return the questionnaire to me by June 8, 2007. I thank you in advance for helping me with this research. I feel it will be beneficial to the students who we teach.

Yours in Christ,

Julie Alexander

Attachment.

COOPERATIVE LEARNING QUESTIONNAIRE

1. NAME:

2. PHONE NUMBER:

3. EMAIL ADDRESS:

4. PLEASE CIRCLE THE COUNTY WHERE YOU TEACH:

MARIN SAN FRANCISCO SAN MATEO

5. HAVE YOU EVER RECEIVED TRAINING IN COOPERATIVE LEARNING? (PLEASE CIRCLE)

YES NO

IF YOU ANSWERED YES, PLEASE COMPLETE NUMBERS 6-8. IF YOU ANSWERED NO, GO ON TO NUMBER 9.

6. IN WHAT PROGRAM OR METHOD DID YOU RECEIVE TRAINING?

7. PLEASE CIRCLE THE AMOUNT OF TIME YOU DEDICATED TO THIS TRAINING.

LESS THAN ONE DAY

ONE DAY

WEEKEND

WEEK OR MORE

8. IF YOU HAVE HAD MORE EXTENSIVE TRAINING, PLEASE DESCRIBE.

9. TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU IMPLEMENT COOPERATIVE LEARNING IN YOUR CLASSROOM?

MORE THAN ONCE A DAY

ONCE A DAY

ONCE A WEEK

OTHER: _____
(PLEASE EXPLAIN)

10. WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN PARTICIPATING IN A STUDY THAT WILL INVESTIGATE THE IMPACT OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING ON BULLYING BEHAVIORS OF FIFTH GRADE STUDENTS?

YES NO

PLEASE RETURN TO:

JULIE ALEXANDER
357 MENDOCINO
BRISBANE, CA 94005

BY JUNE 8, 2007

APPENDIX D:

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL

September 25, 2007

Dear Ms. Alexander:

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS) at the University of San Francisco (USF) has reviewed your request for human subjects approval regarding your study.

Your application has been approved by the committee (IRBPHS #07-072). Please note the following:

1. Approval expires twelve (12) months from the dated noted above. At that time, if you are still in collecting data from human subjects, you must file a renewal application.

2. Any modifications to the research protocol or changes in instrumentation (including wording of items) must be communicated to the IRBPHS. Re-submission of an application may be required at that time.

3. Any adverse reactions or complications on the part of participants must be reported (in writing) to the IRBPHS within ten (10) working days.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRBPHS at (415) 422-6091.

On behalf of the IRBPHS committee, I wish you much success in your research.

Sincerely,

Terence Patterson, Ed.D., ABPP
Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
---
IRBPHS University of San Francisco
Counseling Psychology Department
Education Building - 017
2130 Fulton Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1080
(415) 422-6091 (Message)
(415) 422-5528 (Fax)
irbphs@usfca.edu

November 8, 2007

Dear Ms. Alexander:

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS) at the University of San Francisco (USF) has reviewed your modification request for human subjects approval regarding your study.

Your modification application has been approved by the committee (IRBPHS #07-072). Please note the following:

1. Approval expires twelve (12) months from the dated noted above. At that time, if you are still in collecting data from human subjects, you must file a renewal application.

2. Any modifications to the research protocol or changes in instrumentation (including wording of items) must be communicated to the IRBPHS. Re-submission of an application may be required at that time.

3. Any adverse reactions or complications on the part of participants must be reported (in writing) to the IRBPHS within ten (10) working days.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRBPHS at (415) 422-6091.

On behalf of the IRBPHS committee, I wish you much success in your research.

Sincerely,

Terence Patterson, EdD, ABPP
Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
---
IRBPHS - University of San Francisco
Counseling Psychology Department
Education Building - 017
2130 Fulton Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1080
(415) 422-6091 (Message)
(415) 422-5528 (Fax)
irbphs@usfca.edu
---
http://www.usfca.edu/humansubjects/

APPENDIX E:

CONSENT FORM FOR PRINCIPALS

Consent for Schools to Participate in Study

University of San Francisco

Purpose and Background

Mrs. Julie Alexander, a graduate student in the School of Education at the University of San Francisco, is doing a study on cooperative learning and bullying in fifth grade classrooms. The researcher is interested in understanding how cooperative learning may combat bullying at school and students' perspectives on this issue.

I am being asked to participate because the fifth grade teacher incorporates cooperative learning into the fifth grade curriculum.

Procedures

If I agree to be a participant in this study, the following will happen:

1. I will allow the researcher to observe the fifth grade classroom for ten consecutive school days.
2. I will allow the researcher to accompany the fifth grade to other areas of the school for schoolwide observations.

Risks/Discomforts

1. The researcher will be observing the fifth grade classroom and other areas of the school, such as hallways, eating areas, and play yard for ten consecutive school days and this may at times affect the normal interactions in the classroom.
3. Confidentiality: All observation notes and interview transcripts will be kept confidential. No individual identities will be used in any reports or publications resulting from the study. Study information will be coded and kept in a private residence at all times.

Benefits

I will benefit from the study by knowing that I have helped to further the qualitative research on cooperative learning and bullying in Catholic elementary schools.

Alternatives

I am free to choose not to participate in the study.

Costs

There will be no costs to me as a result of taking part in this study.

Reimbursement

There will be no reimbursement for taking part in this study.

Questions

I have talked to Mrs. Julie Alexander about this study and have had my questions answered. If I have further questions about this study, I may call Mrs. Julie Alexander at (415) 823-4373.

If I have any questions or comments about participation in this study, I should first talk with Mrs. Alexander. If for some reason I do not wish to do this, I may contact the IRBPHS, which is concerned with the protection of volunteers in research projects. I may reach the IRBPHS office by calling (415) 422-6091 and leaving a voicemail message, by e-mailing IRBPHS@usfca.edu, or by writing to the IRBPHS, Department of Psychology, University of San Francisco, 2130 Fulton Street, San Francisco, CA 94117-1080.

Consent

I have been given a copy of this consent form to keep.

PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH IS VOLUNTARY. I am free to decline to be in this study, or to withdraw from it at any point.

_____	_____
Date	Principal's Signature
_____	_____
Date	Mrs. Julie Alexander

APPENDIX F:

CONSENT FORM FOR TEACHERS

Consent for Classroom to Participate in Study

University of San Francisco

Purpose and Background

Mrs. Julie Alexander, a graduate student in the School of Education at the University of San Francisco, is doing a study on cooperative learning and bullying in fifth grade classrooms. The researcher is interested in understanding how cooperative learning may combat bullying at school and students' perspectives on this issue.

I am being asked to participate because I am a teacher who incorporates cooperative learning into the fifth grade curriculum.

Procedures

If I agree to be a participant in this study, the following will happen:

1. I will allow the researcher to observe my classes for ten consecutive school days.
2. I will share and discuss my curriculum and student work samples with the researcher.
3. I will participate in one 10 to 15 minute interview prior to the first observation.

Risks/Discomforts

1. The researcher will be observing ten consecutive school days and this may at times affect the normal interactions in the classroom.
2. Discussions about curriculum and student selection may take up a small portion of normal prep time.
3. Confidentiality: All observation notes and interview transcripts will be kept confidential. No individual identities will be used in any reports or publications resulting from the study. Study information will be coded and kept in a private residence at all times.

Benefits

I will benefit from the study by knowing that I have helped further the qualitative research on cooperative learning and bullying in Catholic elementary schools.

Alternatives

I am free to choose not to participate in the study.

Costs

There will be no costs to me as a result of taking part in this study.

Reimbursement

There will be no reimbursement for taking part in this study.

Questions

I have talked to Mrs. Julie Alexander about this study and have had my questions answered. If I have further questions about this study, I may call Mrs. Julie Alexander at (415) 823-4373.

If I have any questions or comments about participation in this study, I should first talk with Mrs. Alexander. If for some reason I do not wish to do this, I may contact the IRBPHS, which is concerned with the protection of volunteers in research projects. I may reach the IRBPHS office by calling (415) 422-6091 and leaving a voicemail message, by e-mailing IRBPHS@usfca.edu, or by writing to the IRBPHS, Department of Psychology, University of San Francisco, 2130 Fulton Street, San Francisco, CA 94117-1080.

Consent

I have been given a copy of this consent form to keep.

PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH IS VOLUNTARY. I am free to decline to be in this study, or to withdraw from it at any point.

_____	_____
Date	Teacher's Signature
_____	_____
Date	Mrs. Julie Alexander

APPENDIX G:

TEACHER INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Teacher Interview Questions

1. Describe how you incorporate the instruction of social skill into the teaching of cooperative learning strategies?
2. What are your perceptions of bullying among your students specifically with the following behaviors: name calling, cruel criticism, hitting, damaging or destroying clothes or property belonging to the bullied child, and excluding?
3. Do you see a relationship between cooperative learning (positive interdependence and interpersonal skills) and bullying behaviors (name calling, cruel criticism, hitting, damaging or destroying clothes or property belonging to the bullied child, and excluding)? Explain.

APPENDIX H:

PARENTAL CONSENT COVER LETTER

CONSENT FORM FOR PARENTS

Julie Alexander
357 Mendocino
Brisbane, CA 94005

Date

Dear Parent or Guardian:

I am a doctoral student at the University of San Francisco and I will be doing research at _____ Elementary School this fall for my dissertation. I have been a teacher for thirteen years. I am asking your permission for your child to participate in a research project that will investigate student perspectives on the use of cooperative learning and how that learning and teaching style might affect bullying behaviors at school.

This research is not an evaluation of either Ms./Mrs. _____ or your child. Classroom activities will not be changed because of my presence. For the next two weeks of classes, I will be observing in your child's class. I may also ask your child to participate in a focus group interview if he or she is willing.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Students' responses in the classroom or in an interview will be reported anonymously, meaning your child will not be identified by name in any representation of the study.

I hope that you will consent to your child's participation in this study by signing the attached permission slip and returning it to _____. I appreciate the chance to do my research in your child's class and at your school. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (415) 823-4373.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Julie Alexander
Doctoral Student, University of San Francisco

Consent For Student to Participate in Study

University of San Francisco

Purpose and Background

Mrs. Julie Alexander, a graduate student in the School of Education at the University of San Francisco, is doing a study on cooperative learning and bullying in fifth grade classrooms in the Archdiocese of San Francisco. The researcher is interested in understanding how the use of cooperative learning in the classroom affects bullying behaviors in other areas of the school. My student is being asked to participate in the study.

Procedures

If I agree that my student will participate in this study, the following will happen:

1. The researcher will observe my student's fifth grade class and other areas of the school for ten consecutive school days.
2. The researcher may ask my student if he or she would like to participate in one 45-minute focus group interview during the fifth grade lunch period.

Risks/Discomforts

1. Students may feel uncomfortable sharing experiences of bullying with the researcher.
2. Confidentiality: All observation notes and interview transcripts will be kept confidential. No individual identities will be used in any reports or publications resulting from the study. Study information will be coded and kept in a private residence at all times.

Benefits

My student will benefit from knowing that he or she provided educators with detailed examples of how students experience cooperative learning and its effects on bullying behaviors at school.

Alternatives

I am free to choose not to allow my student to participate in the study.

Costs

There will be no costs to my student as a result of taking part in this study.

Reimbursement

There will be no reimbursement to me or to my student.

Questions

I have talked to Mrs. Julie Alexander or to my student's teacher about this study and have had my questions answered. If I have further questions about this study, I may call Mrs. Julie Alexander at (415) 823-4373.

If I have any questions or comments about participation in this study, I should first talk with Mrs. Julie Alexander. If for some reason I do not wish to do this, I may contact the IRBPHS, which is concerned with the protection of volunteers in research projects. I may reach the IRBPHS office by calling (415) 422-6091 and leaving a voicemail message, by e-mailing IRBPHS@usfca.edu, or by writing to the IRBPHS, Department of Psychology, University of San Francisco, 2130 Fulton Street, San Francisco, CA 94117-1080.

Consent

I have been given a copy of this consent form to keep.

PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH IS VOLUNTARY. I am free to decline to allow my student to participate in this study, or to withdraw from it at any point. My decision about participation will have no influence on my student's present or future status in the fifth grade or at this school.

_____	_____
Date	Parent's Signature
	_____
	Student's Name
_____	_____
Date	Mrs. Julie Alexander

APPENDIX I:

COOPERATIVE LEARNING IN-CLASS OBSERVATIONAL CHECKLIST

COOPERATIVE LEARING REFERENCE LIST

School _____Date _____Time _____

Based on Johnson and Johnson (1993).

POSITIVE INTERDEPENDENCE	INTERPERSONAL SKILLS
Working for a common goal (PI 1)	Forming skills (IS 1) Staying with the group Using eye contact Exhibiting self-control
Caring for one another (PI 2)	Functioning skills (IS 2) Expressing support and acceptance toward ideas Asking for help using humor to motivate
Talking through issues (PI 3)	Formulating skills (IS 3) Providing constructive feedback
Helping (PI 4)	Fermenting skills (IS 4) Disagreeing without criticizing
Encouraging (PI5)	

Cooperative Learning Observations References

Based on Johnson, D., Johnson, R., & Holubec, E. (1998).

I. Positive Interdependence

The perception that one is linked with others in a way in which one cannot succeed without the success of the entire group. One must coordinate one's efforts with the efforts of others to complete a task (Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 1986).

Teacher establishes group goals (Positive Goal Interdependence)
Joint rewards (Positive Celebration/Reward Interdependence)
Shared Resources (Positive Resource Interdependence)
Group members have assigned roles (Positive Role Interdependence)
Groups agree on common identity (Positive Identity Interdependence)
Groups bond through physical environment (Environmental Interdependence)
Group solves imaginary tasks (Positive Fantasy Interdependence)
Group works in an organized sequential way (Positive Task Interdependence)
Groups work in competition with one another (Positive Outside Enemy Interdependence)

II. Promotive Interaction

Individuals are encouraging and facilitating each other's efforts to complete tasks and achieve in order to reach group goals (Johnson & Johnson, 1989).

Students are:

Helping
Sharing
Encouraging other group members' efforts to learn
Explaining
Discussing
Teaching what they know to classmates
Sitting in knee-to-knee formation or other group setting
Talking through aspects of the assignment

III. Individual Accountability

Each student's mastery of the assigned material is assessed, each student is given feedback on their progress, and the group is given feedback on how each member is progressing so that the other group members know whom to help and encourage. (Johnson et al., 1986, p. 9).

Student performance is frequently assessed by:

Individual tests
Random tests to one group member orally

Random tests to one group member written
Results are given to group
Results are given to individuals
One group member is assigned checker of understanding for the group
Students teach what they know to someone else
Students edit each other's work
Groups are kept small

Teacher uses following strategies with student groups to observe individual work:

Random checking
Assigning Roles
Jigsaw
Signatures on Paper
Signed Parts of Work
Round Robin Papers
Round Robin Answers
Individual Work Before
Individual Work After
Demonstrated Skills Checked
Discussion of Labor List Signed
See Everyone Participate
Give a Practice Test
Have Students Explain Answers

Teacher uses following strategies in-group to observe work of the group:

One set of answers from the group
Everyone must agree
Everyone must be able to explain the group's answers

Possible roles assigned by teacher to the group:

Reader
Recorder
Checker/Quizzer
Encourager/participation police
Other:

Small-group Interpersonal Skills
For cooperative grouping to be successful students must be taught and encouraged to use interpersonal skills. These include getting to know and trust each member of the group, communicating accurately, accepting the support of others, and resolving conflict constructively (Johnson & Johnson, 1994).

Teacher teaches the following skills to the class or observes of students using these skills:

Forming Skills:

Taking turns
Using quiet voices
Noise monitor
Participation monitor
Voice monitor
Turn-taking monitor

Functioning Skills:

Share ideas and opinions
Ask for facts and reasoning to help understand each other's work
Give direction to group work
Encourage everyone to participate
Express support and acceptance
Offer to explain and clarify
Paraphrase
Energize the group
Describe feelings

Formulating Skills:

Summarize out loud from memory
Seek accuracy by correcting member's summary
Seek elaboration by relating current material to previous knowledge
Help the group remember
Check for understanding by demanding verbalization
Plan out loud

Fermenting Skills:

Criticize ideas without criticizing people
Differentiate between ideas and reasoning of group members
Integrate ideas into a single position
Ask for justifications
Extend Answers
Probe by asking in-depth questions
Generate further answers
Test reality by checking group's work

Group Processing

A continuous process of reflection to clarify and improve the effectiveness of group members in their efforts to achieve group goals (Johnson & Johnson, 1994).

The teacher is:

Prepared for observations
Observes and supervises students
Supervises student observers in the groups
Summarizes and organizes observations

The teacher:

Sets aside time for students to reflect on their experience working in a group
Provides procedures for students to use in discussing group effectiveness

The students:

Describe what members' actions were helpful and not helpful in group reaching goals
Make decisions about which actions the group will continue or change

Feedback:

Immediate and appropriate feedback is given on:
Teamwork
Task work

Feedback generates energy in students
Group/individual performance is improved
Students have the opportunity to take action that improves performance

Reflection:

Each group member receives positive feedback for reflection
Group focuses on one group member at a time
Positive comments written about teammate on a note card
Students comment on proper use of interpersonal skills
Students are questioned on effectiveness of skills
Group members are given 60 seconds to identify ways group members were helpful
Group-processing questions are included on assignment sheet
Groups do a processing summary

Improvement Goals:

Students decide which interpersonal skills to use more effectively/efficiently next time

Group forms a consensus statement on what will be done at the next meeting

Students answer the following questions:

What might we do differently next time?
What are the group skills we want to use next time?
Which social skill do we want to emphasize next time?

Celebration:

Students congratulate each other on their hard work
Small-group celebration
Whole-class celebration

APPENDIX J:

BULLYING SCHOOLWIDE OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

School _____ Date _____ Time _____

Based on Bolton and Graeve (2005) and Coloroso (2003)

VERBAL BULLYING	PHYSICAL BULLYING	RELATIONAL BULLYING
Name calling (VB 1)	Physical contact (PB 1)	Excluding (RB 1)
Cruel criticism (VB 2)	Taking, damaging, or destroying clothes or property belonging to the bullied child (PB 2)	

APPENDIX K:

BULLYING OCCURRENCE CHART

COOPERATIVE LEARNING OCCURRENCE CHART

Bullying Occurrence Chart

School _____ Dates _____

Type of Bullying	VB 1	VB 2	PB 1	PB 2	RB 1
Day 1					
Day 2					
Day 3					
Day 4					
Day 5					
Week Total					
Day 6					
Day 7					
Day 8					
Day 9					
Day 10					
Week Total					
Observation Total					

Cooperative Learning Occurrence Chart

School _____ Dates _____

Type of Cooperative Learning	PI 1	PI 2	PI 3	PI 4	PI 5	IS 1	IS 2	IS 3	IS 4
Day 1									
Day 2									
Day 3									
Day 4									
Day 5									
Week Total									
Day 6									
Day 7									
Day 8									
Day 9									
Day 10									
Week Total									
Observation Total									

APPENDIX L:

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Focus Group Interview Questions

Bullying
Repeated acts of aggression or harm by individuals who have more power than their victims. More power meaning more advantages in strength, confidence, status, or aggression.

1. Would you rather work in a group or by yourself? Explain.
2. What are the positive aspects of working in groups with your peers?
3. What are the negative aspects of working in groups with your peers?
4. Have you ever observed bullying at your school? Describe the experience.
5. If you have observed bullying at your school, what do you think should be done about it?
6. What interpersonal skills have you learned while working in groups in your classroom?
7. Has any of this learning helped when faced with a bullying situation at school?