

The contemporary issue of bullying education essay

[Sociology](#), [Bullying](#)



The modern-day issue I have focused upon in this assignment is Strong-arming. This is a prevailing issue in today 's society. I feel this is of great importance particularly with the concerns originating from recent research into the effects of strong-arming. This research indicates that strong-arming can hold societal, physical and psychological effects on pupils every bit good as on their academicsuccess.

What is strong-arming

Bullying is a societal phenomenon that is non easy to specify. It is a behavior that can be either be physical/verbal or direct/indirect. A bully is defined in the dictionary as `` a individual, who hurts, intimidates or persecutes person who is perceived to be different or weaker '' .

The Government defines strong-arming as 'Behaviour by an person or group, normally repeated over clip, that deliberately hurts another person or group either physically or emotionally ' . Dan Olweus a taking expert in this field has a similar definition to the authorities and he asserts that `` A pupil is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over clip, to negative action on the portion of one or more other pupil ' (Olweus, 1993 p. 9)

The most widely used definition nevertheless is one that is developed by Olweus (993) and extended by Whitney and Smith (1993, p. 7) : " We say a kid or immature individual is being bullied, or picked on when another kid or immature individual, or a group of kids or immature people, say awful and unpleasant things to him or her. It is besides strong-arming when a kid or a

immature individual is hit, kicked, threatened, locked inside a room, sent awful notes, when no- one of all time negotiations to them and things like that. These things can go on often and it is hard for the kid or the immature individual being bullied to support himself or herself. It is besides strong-arming when a kid or immature individual is teased repeatedly in a awful manner. But it is non strong-arming when two kids or immature people of about the same strength have the uneven battle or wrangle " .

Different type of strong-arming

The word intimidation is used to depict many diffident types of violent or intimidating behavior. Bullying is surely non easy to sort but here are the chief types that have been identified. The first is verbal strong-arming which is the most common intimidation harmonizing to research. Childline reported that 56 per centum of kids that rang about intimidation called about verbal intimidation. This type of strong-arming includes name naming and dish the dirting. Name naming is the most prevailing signifier of strong-arming harmonizing to most surveies. One kid in the Childline research for 2007/08 declared `` I am being bullied at school and experience no 1 likes me. I am ever running to conceal or shout on my ain because I 'm called names and am pulled at. I feel self-destructive but I wo n't make it " .

The 2nd is physical strong-arming which involves the usage of physical force such as striking and forcing. This type of intimidation is considered to be direct because it is deliberately focussed at the victim. In 2007/08 Childline reported that 53 per centum of kids and immature people that called about intimidation reported physical intimidation. It can be identified through

physical marks such as bodily harm although physical intimidation does not ever average hurt. Physical intimidation can be a manner of seeking to mortify the victim and show power over them.

The 3rd is indirect verbal intimidation and this sort of strong-arming involves hurtful and untruthful remarks behind the victims back. It can include spreading of rumors, letters or notes or even graffiti. The last is Cyber-bullying which is the newest signifier of strong-arming identified and has become a concern in recent old ages. This is a technology-enabled intimidation and involves strong-arming by agencies of confab suites, instant messaging, nomadic phones or even electronic mails. Research initiated as a portion of the DCSF cyber-bullying run highlighted that 30 four per centum of 12-15 twelvemonth olds reported being capable to cyber-bullying. Similarly research carried out by Goldsmiths College for the Anti-bullying Alliance found that 20 two per centum of 11-16 twelvemonth olds had fallen victims to cyber-bullying.

Prevalence

Assorted surveys have been undertaken on this topic but because of the topic's sensitive nature it is difficult to find solid, valid and dependable statistics. The research being completed nevertheless does foreground the true extent of the intimidation job in the schoolroom scene. Bullying is a modern-day issue with the first national study on this topic being conducted comparatively late. Kidscape 's conducted the national study between the old ages of 1984 and 1986 utilizing a sample of 4000 kids ages 5 to 12. The study revealed the extent of the job. The study showed that 68 % of the kids

had been bullied at least one time, 39 per centum had been bullied at least twice and 0.5 % of those kids felt it had affected their lives that well that they tried to perpetrate self-destruction. Recent research besides suggests that the job is still outstanding in the school scene. Harmonizing to one recent survey, one-fifth of primary school students and a one-fourth of students in Year 8 perceived intimidation as a 'big job' in their school.

A ulterior study by ChildLine showed that 15 per cent of primary school kids and 12 per cent of secondary school kids said they had bullied in the last twelvemonth (ChildLine2004). In another survey, 50 per cent of badly bullied male childs said that they bully others, as did 33 per cent of badly bullied miss. Childline the national helpline for kids received between the months of April 2000 to process 2001 about 20,300 calls from kids and immature people concerned about intimidation. Kidscape another helpline believes it receives more that 16,000 calls from parents each twelvemonth concerned about their kids acquiring bullied.

Research has besides suggested that Cyber-bullying which is the newest identified signifier of intimidation is going a major job. The figure of Cyber-bullying instances is on the rise (Noret and Rivers, 2006). A survey by National Centre for Social Research released to co-occur with November 2009 Anti-bullying hebdomad revealed that Cyber-bullying is now one of the commonest signifiers of intimidation in school. The Longitudinal survey tracked 15,000 students who had their fourteenth birthday in 2004. The research besides pointed out that 47 % of 14-year-olds, 41 % of 15-year-olds and 29 % of 16-year-olds reported being bullied. Disabled kids and kids with

particular educational demands were besides found to be more likely marks. This coincides with other such research that shows SEN kids or kids with disablements are 2 to 3 times more likely to be bullied (Smith, 2007) The Longitudinal survey besides showed that kids who reported being bullied went on to accomplish on mean 2 GCSE classes lower so kids who were non bullied and were more likely to drop out of instruction at 16. This research is worrying and provides grounds of the damaging effects strong-arming can hold.

Effectss of Strong-arming

Strong-arming can hold all kinds of effects on kids so it is of import that intimidation is tackled caput on. The DfEE provinces that 'The emotional hurt caused by strong-arming in whatever signifier - be it racial, or as a consequence of a kid 's visual aspect, behavior or particular educational demands, or related to sexual orientation, can prejudice school accomplishment, lead to lateness or hooky, and in utmost instances, terminal with self-destruction. ' (DfEE, 1999: 24-25) . Vernon Coaker the schools curate besides asserted at the event for Anti-Bullying Week that `` Bullying, in any signifier, should non be tolerated. It can destruct lives and have a permanent impact on immature people 's assurance, self-esteem and emotional development. ''

Research has indicated that strong-arming can non merely consequence academic accomplishment, it has besides been linked with low self-prides, anxiousness, impaired concentration, hooky, depression and self-destructive ideas. Kidscape performed the first of all time study of grownups with the

purpose of happening out if intimidation had any permanent effects. The study which was funded by the national lottery and proved that being severely bullied as a kid had knock on affects. 46 % about half of the study population contemplated suicide compared with 7 % of those who were non bullied. Most of the grownups surveyed had small or no aid at the clip of the incidents.

Undertaking school intimidation

The Government in recent old ages has emphasised that undertaking the job of intimidation is a chief precedence of theirs. The Government in 1999 said it was a legal duty for all schools to hold an anti intimidation policy in topographic point. Legislation places a responsibility on the caput instructor to implement an anti intimidation policy and provinces that schools must promote regard for others and forestall all signifiers of strong-arming among pupils. A Government counsel to boot states that the policy should be reviewed yearly and that every member of the school community (including kids, immature people, carers and parents) should be involved in this reappraisal.

Each school is in charge of planing their ain policy with the aid from Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) . The DCSF aid schools to plan schemes and effectual anti -bullying policy to undertake strong-arming caput on. They do this by supplying really comprehensive counsel paperss and have regional advisors on manus who have expertise in this country to assist implement their counsel.

Schools have a legal duty to guarantee steps are in topographic point to turn to intimidation:

Head instructors must implement a policy as a preventive step against strong-arming in conformity with the Human Rights Act 1998.

The Standards & Frameworks Acts (1998) states that all schools are required by jurisprudence to hold an anti-bullying policy. Schools have statutory liability sing behaviors of students under the School Standards and Framework Act 1998: 'the caput teachers shall find steps to be taken with a position to a^|a^|a^| be promoting good behavior and regard for others on the portion of students and, in peculiar, forestalling all signifiers of strong-arming among students ' .

Article 28 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child provinces that strong-arming policy should be in topographic point in each school and every kid should cognize what to make if they find them self in the state of affairs where they are being bullied.

Section 175 of the Education Act 2002 provinces what is required of the regulating organic structures in relation to the well-being of the students in their school: 'The regulating organic structure of a kept up school shall do agreements for guaranting that their maps associating to the behavior of the school are exercised with a position to safeguarding and advancing the public assistance of kids who are students at the school. '

The Education Act 2002 lays down out two purposes for the national course of study, whereby schools must do certain that it 'provides chances for all students to learn and accomplish ' and 'promotes the religious, moral, cultural, mental and physical development of students at the school and of society, and prepares students at the school for the chances, duties and experiences of ulterior life ' .

The DfES handbill, Social Inclusion: Pupil Support Circular lineations authorities outlooks and the legal responsibility of caput instructors with respect to strong-arming

The National Health School Guidance asserts that it is necessary that schools have 'a policy and codification of pattern for undertaking intimidation, which is owned, understood and implemented by all members of the school community and includes contact with external support bureaus ' .

Under the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 schools are required to advance race equality.

Children 's Act (2004) sets out five results that professionals should work towards. These are to ; Be Healthy ; Stay Safe ; Enjoy and achieve ; Make a positive part and Achieve economic wellbeing.

Safe to Learn: implanting anti-bullying work in schools is the new overarching anti-bullying counsel for schools which was introduced in September 2007. The safe to learn counsel includes advice on intimidation.

In add-on to this Ofsted 's model for inspecting schools provinces that inspectors must measure and give an history on the magnitude and grade of intimidation, racism and other signifiers of torment. They must besides describe on the schools prosperity at covering with strong-arming incidents and expression at the schools dealings with parents.

Schools are non instantly responsible for strong-arming that takes topographic point outside of the educational scene but their anti-bullying policy should do it cognize that stairss are in consequence to react to such incidents. The Government publicised two anti-bullying counsel paperss on 15 April 2009. These paperss gave advice on how to undertake strong-arming outside of the schoolroom scene. Versions of the counsel paperss were besides for local governments, young person workers, college staff, drama workers, conveyance suppliers and kids 's places.

Despite all of this there is no jurisprudence which states that Scots schools must hold a specific anti-bullying policy. However there have been paperss such as `` Action Against Bullying '' distributed to Scottish schools in 1992 that recommend that they should implement a policy. Scots local governments have approved of this recommendation but it is n't truly plenty.

Other available aid

Equally good as the statute law and counsel paperss there are other avenues of support and counsel. Schools for one can plight their commitment to undertaking intimidation by subscribing up to the Anti-bullying charter whereby there can self-assess their intimidation policy.

An anti-bullying hebdomad is besides held every twelvemonth by the Anti-bullying Alliance The anti strong-arming Alliance was established in July 2002 by NSPCC and NCB, it has combined 68 administrations into one association. Their purpose is to cut down intimidation and make a safeenvironmentfor which kids can analyze. Anti strong-arming hebdomads purpose is to raise consciousness of intimidation and the issues that surround it. This twelvemonth 's Anti-Bullying Week was focused on undertaking cyber-bullying. Sue Steel, National Manager of the Anti-Bullying Alliance, said on the 2009 anti-bullying hebdomad that: `` It is really encouraging that the Government is making so much to do Anti-Bullying Week a existent success. We all need to work in partnership to guarantee kids, immature people and their parents are cognizant of the hazards of cyber intimidation and cognize how to forestall it "

There are besides assorted web sites to assist both parents and grownups such as the DirectGovA web site which has plentifulness of advice for immature people concerned about intimidation. Parentline Plus has a helpline for parents, provides support through the Be Someone to Tell web page and a web site for parental advice on covering with intimidation of their kid. A comprehensive list of administrations that provide both aid and support referring intimidation is available in AnnexA I of the overarching Safe to larn counsel.

Developing a whole-school attack

The whole school attack is recommended by the DfES and plants by prosecuting affecting the whole school community from students and

instructors to staff, carers and parents. This attack works by affecting everyone and making a model that endorses shared beliefs and values that help to antagonize and cut down strong-arming efficaciously. The model sets out stairss to rede and pull off incidents of intimidation. The DfES recommends establishing this whole-school policy in four stages: consciousness and audience, execution, monitoring and rating. The policy should take to:

Ensure that the whole school community understands strong-arming and what is meant by strong-arming.

Make it apprehensible that strong-arming will non be accepted inside or outside of the school scene.

Create an effectual system to cover with strong-arming incidents that enables kids to easy describe strong-arming happenings.

Ensure that all incidents reported are investigated earnestly and the steps in topographic point are acted upon in response.

That clearly defined processs are in topographic point.

Supply a systematic method of entering incidents that take topographic point this in bend can assist in measuring and reexamining policy.

Have a equal support programme in topographic point.

Continually reappraisal processs and policy and maintain the whole school community informed of any alterations or revamps.

Anti-bullying Policy Case Study

In my little instance survey I looked at 3 anti-bullying policy 's for schools in the Surrey country. I would foremost wish to observe that out of the 5 web sites I viewed, two did non hold any anti-bullying policy online. Anti-intimidation policy should be readily available for the school community and should be on-line for easy entree for the whole school community. I will turn to the schools as A, B and C.

School A had a really comprehensive Anti-bullying scheme in topographic point utilizing the whole school attack. It clearly defined anti-bullying process in topographic point for kids staff and parents utilizing headers such as 'guidance for kids ' . The Policy included an effectives system clearly saying each phase of process and utilizing the no blasted attack. School A besides asserted that all incidents would be recorded and used in farther instances if needed. The usage of a equal support scheme was besides in topographic point which seems to add to the policies effectiveness as these systems have been found to be effectual in cut downing the negative effects of strong-arming for victims. This policy was said to hold been reviewed in 2009 and was to be reviewed on a regular footing which once more seemed first-class pattern. School A 's policy was seemed precise and effectual utilizing the whole school community and in making so advancing a shared set of values and beliefs. The fact it is reviewed on a regular footing makes certainly the policy is fresh and effectual. This school besides had regular newssheets with any new updates on anti-bullying schemes or alterations in policy these were in bend clearly published online.

School B 's policy had a clear precise definition of strong-arming but nevertheless it was non every bit comprehensive as School A. The policy did demo the process in topographic point and stated the support in topographic point for kids ; it nevertheless was aimed at staff and parents merely and did non affect the whole school community. The policy had clearly non been reviewed in some clip as it was dated May 2005 which is about 5 old ages ago and seemed outdated and forgotten. School C 's policy was merely shocking ; it consisted of a paragraph about the definition of intimidation and a list of behavior codifications. It did advance a shared value on the expected codifications of behavior but no set clear procedure in topographic point for covering of strong-arming for staff, kids or parents.

Is the authorities 's scheme working?

There is non much in the manner of research into this field and whether anti-intimidation policy is effectual or non. Bullying has decreased somewhat since the old twelvemonth which could be a contemplation of the alteration in authorities policy and publicity of equal support but truly it is non a lessening in incidents. I conducted a little graduated table study of 8 learning helpers and instructors in schools around the UK to happen out whether they felt the authorities were making plenty in relation to intimidation.

"U. KA authorities is making plenty for schools inA relation to strong-arming " A How make you experience about this statement?

A Strongly AgreeA

A 0A

A 0 % A

A AgreeA

A 1A

A 8 % A

A NeutralA

A 2A

17 % A

A DisagreeA

A 5A

42 % A

A Strongly DisagreeA

A 0A

A 0 % A

The consequences show that 42 % disagreed with the statement that the authorities was making plenty in relation to intimidation, 17 % were impersonal and 8 % agreed. This study merely indicates that people within the school context experience more can be done to halt intimidation. One participant even stated 'There are anti strong-arming plans in topographic

point at schools but the kids frequently do not come forward. The Government could work with the schools to do it easier for kids to come forward. '

Bullying UK 'S CEO, John Carnell was reported stating `` These figures are scandalous and show that the authorities and schools are merely not acquiring to grips with this job.

Strong-arming UK was founded 10 years ago and the jobs we are seeing now are the same as we saw 10 years ago. Day in, twenty-four hours out, twelve months in, twelve months out, we are having precisely the same ailments from despairing parents and kids and it is a pity that there is no authorities support for the critical work we do which we know saves self-destructive kids 's lives. "

In the Childline instance notes one counselor asserts `` I do not believe things have changed, " and `` when you ask the kids whether there are anti-bullying policies the kids say yes, but it still makes you powerless. The frustrating thing is that we still receive so many calls about intimidation "

What can schools make to undertake intimidation?

Research has proven that the whole school approach is the most effective scheme and recommended by the DfES. The whole school community should be involved in inventing and implementing an anti-bullying policy. It requires everyone to keep and recommend the criteria in the policy and act quickly when incidents occur. This approach promotes shared values and beliefs and enables a clear apprehension of the acceptable criteria of behavior. In

Wales, Lambert, Scourfield, Smalley and Jones (in imperativeness) found a important association between lower degrees of intimidation, and students describing that the school had clear regulations on intimidation. The jurisprudence does province that behavior policy should be publicised to the school community one time a twelvemonth although truly it should be communicated a batch more so this to review heads.

Research has indicated that merely holding an anti-bullying policy entirely is non plenty. In order for a policy to be effectual it needs to be expeditiously implemented, reviewed and evaluated invariably. As for case one survey found that school-wide policies decline in effectivity over a 2-3 twelvemonth period, after which clip intimidation additions (Sharp et al, 2002) . Smith states `` Bullying is an on-going job, so a 'one-off ' attempt over a term or a twelvemonth without continuance will hold small or no permanent impact " (Smith, 2004, p101) . Strong-arming policy should be reviewed on a regular basis and the whole school community should be involved in and notified of alterations.

Children should hold a say in the policy as suggested by the DCSF. There are guidance papers such as the Anti-Bullying Alliance resource Are you speaking to me? : Young People 's Engagement in Anti-Bullying. It is of import to prosecute kids and integrate their thoughts in the anti-bullying policy leting them to be an active portion of school life. There are a scope of suggested schoolroom activities to promote students to discourse anti-bullying policy. The Government has late made PSHE lessons compulsory

and these are a perfect platform for discouraging intimidation and anti-bullying policy.

The demand is to hold a comprehensive anti-bullying policy and schemes in topographic point. Not every school has a policy that is comprehensive and covers the extended intimidation types. For illustration, Adams, Cox & A ; Dunstan (2004) reported that out of 19 schools surveyed in the UK none of them specifically mentioned sexual orientation in the anti-bullying policies.

What can the authorities do to undertake intimidation?

There are a scope of things the authorities can still make to undertake intimidation. A statutory responsibility should be made on schools and instruction governments in Scotland to hold anti-bullying policy in topographic point. Scots Schools are non lawfully obliged to hold any policy or scheme in topographic point to antagonize strong-arming. Wales should besides hold regional advisers like England to rede schools about the effectual schemes against strong-arming including best pattern and how to make all an effectual anti-bullying policy. The authorities should besides happen a manner of measuring anti-bullying policy in each school as holding this policy in topographic point does non intend it is being implemented decently or carried out in the School context.

Finally consciousness should be raised on the newest signifiers of strong-arming such as cyber-bullying this should besides be reflected in relevant policy. PSHE lessons can assist raise this consciousness and I feel strong-arming should go a mandatory subject leting the school to discourse non

merely strong-arming in general but their ain anti-bullying policy and pattern.

Decision

After analyzing the research, articles, statistics and other information it does go evident intimidation has of all time so somewhat demised in the last few old ages but non truly plenty. This tells me that the authorities enterprises and policies have had a little consequence in cut downing intimidation. The large job with the anti-bullying policy is that each school has to invent the policy and implement it, which means the policy 's effectivity can run dramatically between each school. If the authorities is to win at checking down on strong-arming significantly I feel it is necessary to make the research and implement the same effectual policy in each school. It may be utile for the Government to analyze taking states in the battle against strong-arming. The authorities besides needs to listen to the people that this job effects and happen out their positions on the policy that stands.