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Previous research has suggested that moral disengagement is strongly associated with bullying. The current study evaluated the effectiveness of a five-week class-wide bullying intervention, *The Bullying Literature Project - Moral Disengagement Version (BLP-MD)*, on moral disengagement and bullying among elementary school students. This intervention is developed to be incorporated into a general language arts curriculum and uses bibliotherapy (i.e., reading children’s books on topics related to bullying), writing, and role-playing activities to teach students social skills and promote moral reasoning and positive bystanding. A quasi-experimental design using mixed ANOVA was used to evaluate the effectiveness of the BLP-MD. A sample of 84 grade students from four classrooms and their teachers participated in this study. The results revealed significant time by treatment interactions for decreasing both victimization and moral disengagement in treatment classrooms compared to wait-list control classrooms. That is, the combination of the between-subjects factor (BLP-MD versus control) and within-subjects factor (time) influenced these dependent variables. The program also resulted in improved perception of peer friendships and was rated as having high social validity for both students and their teachers.
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The Bullying Literature Project: A Class-Wide Bullying Intervention Targeting Moral Disengagement

The United States Center for Disease Control and Prevention defines bullying as “any unwanted aggressive behavior(s) by another youth or group of youths.” It also involves a “perceived power imbalance and is repeated multiple times or is highly likely to be repeated.” (p. 7, Gladden, Vivolo-Kantor, Hamburger, & Lumpkin, 2014). Bullying is a popular form of aggression that presents a problem for a large percentage of children in schools with overall prevalence rates rising to nearly thirty percent, according to the National Center for Education Statistics (2011). Bully perpetration rates range in studies from 6.4% to 38% (Nansel et al., 2001; Swearer, Siebecker, Frerichs, & Wang, 2010; Wang, Iannotti, & Nansel, 2009), and from 28% to 69% for victimization (Robers, Kemp, Truman, & Snyder, 2013; Swearer et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2009). These high rates are concerning, as evidence suggests that bullying increases the risk of both academic and behavior problems in the school setting.

Students who are victims as well as those who both bully others and are victimized (i.e., bully-victims) are likely to have lower academic achievement scores than their uninvolved peers (Glew, Fan, Katon, Rivara, & Kernic, 2005). In addition, individuals who bully others are more likely to become involved in other aggressive acts later in life, such as crime and violence, as well as low job status and drug use (Farrington & Ttofi, 2011). Although those students in this study who were victimized experienced significantly more internalizing issues than their uninvolved peers, those who are involved in both bullying roles (perpetrators and victims) were at risk for both
more internalizing and externalizing problems (Arseneault et al., 2006). Review articles have indicated that bullying is associated with depressive symptoms, anxiety, low self-esteem, and suicidal ideation (Card & Hodges, 2008; Swearer, Collins, Haye-Radliff, & Wang, 2011). Because bullying has a detrimental impact on both academic and psychological functioning of the students involved, it is important to develop interventions to reduce this form of aggressive behavior in the schools.

**Bullying Interventions at School**

Anti-bullying interventions that aim to tackle aggression of students towards their peers by teaching strategies to decrease bullying in school are strongly warranted. Meta-analyses for bullying interventions reveal, however, that most current programs do not result in significant behavior change. Merrell, Gueldner, Ross, and Isava (2008) found that the majority of outcomes for bullying interventions in a 25-year span did not produce bullying behavior change. Rather, these programs were more likely to change the knowledge, attitudes, and self-perceptions about bullying, rather than actual bullying behavior for the children in intervention groups (Merrell et al., 2008). In another meta-analytic review, Ferguson, San Miguel, Kilburn, Jr., and Sanchez (2007) uncovered that anti-bullying interventions had a small effect size of $r = 0.12$, but this did not reach “practical significance” due to the bias of publishing mainly positive effects in the literature (i.e., file drawer effect). Testing for moderating variables revealed that programs specifically targeted for populations who were at-risk for aggression were slightly more effective than those built for the general population of students (Ferguson et al., 2007). Fortunately, in a more recent meta-analysis, Ttofi and Farrington (2011) found
more promise for school-based anti-bullying programs. Although bullying perpetration and victimization were shown to decrease for programs in general, larger effect sizes were found for programs that included parent components (odds ratio [OR] = 1.57 for perpetration and OR = 1.41 for victimization), as well as support from the school staff in terms of disciplinary methods (OR = 1.57 for perpetration and OR = 1.44 for victimization) and playground supervision (OR = 1.53 for perpetration) (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). These findings encourage all parties (i.e., student, home, and school) to work together to prevent bullying behavior at the systems-level.

A few successful programs (i.e., KiVa, Steps to Respect) were developed to promote a systems-level change in the schools in which they are implemented. KiVa, which is abbreviated Finnish for “against bullying,” is a comprehensive program focusing on prevention, intervention, and monitoring. The universal curriculum includes lessons and online games for all students, while further action is taken for at-risk students identified through progress monitoring by the administrative team. Parent participation is also encouraged and the program involves the distribution of handouts. Kärnä et al. (2010) randomly assigned 39 schools to implement the intervention and compared bullying variables to 39 control schools, finding that this program was effective at reducing self- and peer-reported victimization as well as self-reported bullying for fourth through sixth graders. Another evidence-supported program, Steps to Respect, focuses on reducing bullying and destructive bystander behavior while increasing pro-social beliefs and social-emotional skills in a classroom curriculum. The 10-lesson program involves staff training and parent engagement. Frey et al. (2005) randomly assigned six schools to
the intervention or control condition and assessed bullying behavior through surveys and playground observation. Bullying and argumentative behavior decreased in the intervention schools when compared to control schools, while agreeable interactions increased. Additionally, those who participated in Steps to Respect reported more bystander responsibility and less acceptance of bullying. Self-reported aggression, however, did not differ between intervention and control groups (Frey et al., 2005).

Although KiVa and Steps to Respect are effective in producing positive change, these programs are costly and resource intensive, involving administrative oversight and family involvement. Schools are more likely to implement a program that is relatively straightforward and easy to access (Langley, Nadeem, Kataoka, Stein, & Jaycox, 2010). However, brief and inexpensive interventions have a limited effect for changing bullying behavior. One of these programs, a 30-minute puppet show (Project Ploughshares Puppets for Peace) consisting of characters dealing with bullying situations, is performed for students in order to distribute knowledge regarding bullying and strategies that may be implemented in these situations. Beran and Shapiro (2005) did not find a significant increase in knowledge or skills of third and fourth grade students after the puppet show. Children did however self-report feeling more confident in managing bullying situations after the intervention (Beran & Shapiro, 2005).

Bibliotherapy. A few anti-bullying programs use children’s literature to guide the teaching of skills and strategies. This form of intervention where reading materials are selected to assist personal problem solving is called bibliotherapy. One such example is STORIES (Telgasi & Rothman, 2001), a 15-session program designed for small groups of
identified aggressive children to learn social skills and problem solving from structured discussions of books. Telgasi and Rothman (2001) found that teachers reported less externalizing problems and antisocial behaviors for fourth and fifth grade children who underwent the STORIES intervention than those identified as aggressive in the waitlist control group. Unfortunately, even those who participated in the program increased in aggression over time, while non-aggressive children decreased over time. Thus, the intervention may be more effective for children who are not already displaying aggressive tendencies. Still, comparing groups of the teacher-identified aggressive children, students in the intervention may have learned effective methods for dealing with social situations from the characters in the stories (Telgasi & Rothman, 2001).

Another program that uses bibliotherapy is the *WITS Primary Program* (Leadbeater, Hoglund, & Woods, 2003). This class-wide intervention uses a publicly available selection of books (i.e., www.witsprogram.ca) to teach children the strategies of the W.I.T.S. acronym- Walk Away, Ignore, Talk It Out, and Seek Help. Leadbeater and Sukhawathanakul (2011) assessed the effects of this program on bullying victimization and social responsibility and found that those who were in the experimental group showed reduced victimization over time compared to the control group, and teachers reported greater social responsibility for those in the schools that received the WITS intervention (Leadbeater & Sukhawathanakul, 2011). A strength of bibliotherapy is that it can easily be incorporated into the general language arts curriculum in schools, which typically is not a factor that is considered in the design of most anti-bullying interventions (Domitrovich et al., 2010; Swearer, Espelage, & Napolitano, 2009). However, although...
bibliotherapy provides a promising venue for teaching children strategies for dealing with bullying, the effectiveness of anti-bullying programs using this technique in a class-wide intervention requires more attention. Thus, we must turn to the social-cognitive processes that are responsible for aggressive behavior. The current study investigates the efficacy of an anti-bullying bibliotherapy program (the *Bullying Literature Project*), which was modified to target the social-cognitive processes of moral disengagement.

**Moral Disengagement**

The social cognitive theory of moral agency suggests that there are continuous and reciprocal interactions taking place between an individual’s behavior, his/her thoughts, and the environment (Bandura, 1986). Moral behavior may be explained by the interplaying forces of both outside stimuli (i.e., the social context) and internal stimuli (i.e., cognition). Thus, a person’s behavior is the result of moral reasoning (i.e., differentiating between right and wrong) when assessing a situation. Immoral behavior, such as bullying, occurs when one disengages from moral standards in order to justify their aggressive action so that they may achieve absolved guilt and/or shame. This phenomenon is known as moral disengagement, which encompasses a total of eight mechanisms that are classified into four broad categories: cognitive restructuring, minimizing one’s agentic role, disregarding/distorting the negative impact of harmful behavior, and blaming or dehumanizing the victim (Bandura, 1999).

Cognitive restructuring involves reframing the way one is perceiving the aggressive act; it includes moral justification, advantageous comparison, and euphemistic labeling. Immoral actions can be viewed as moral when the individual uses cognitive
processes to justify why they are engaging in such behavior. This specific mechanism that
lies under the umbrella of cognitive restructuring is termed moral justification. An
example of the use of this mechanism may be considering one’s bullying perpetration as
helping out a friend or for another just cause. Another mechanism involving cognitive
restructuring is advantageous comparison, where the individual compares their
aggression to a more harmful act and when doing so, they are able to feel better about
their less severe behavior. The final mechanism in this category is euphemistic labeling.
Individuals utilizing moral disengagement in this form use language that puts their
behavior in a better light. Here, the bully may refer to their actions as “playfully teasing”
or that they were “just kidding.”

The second category, minimizing one’s agentic role, occurs in a group setting.
Here, one passes the responsibility to other group members so as not to feel guilty for
contributing to the transgression. By placing the blame on to other party members, this
mechanism leads to the individual believing that bullying would have occurred whether
they were involved or not. Disregarding or distorting the negative impact of harmful
behavior is associated with the removal of severe consequences due to their actions.
Here, individuals convince themselves that their aggression will not result in substantial
pain for the victim, allowing them to not feel as guilty for their wrongdoings.

The final category, blaming the victim, involves placing the blame on the person
who is getting bullied so the victim is the one at fault. Dehumanization can also occur
when the perpetrator does not view the victim as a human being with feelings, so in their
eyes, the individual can not get hurt by their actions. When a behavior is not in line with
their moral code, individuals actively utilize these moral disengagement mechanisms so that they may not feel that they committed a wrongful act (Bandura, 1999).

**Moral disengagement and bullying.** Because immoral actions are justified using these mechanisms, it is no surprise that moral disengagement has been found to be closely tied to bullying roles in a series of studies. Menesini et al. (2003) found that peer nominated bullies (compared to victims and outsiders) showed a higher level of both disengagement emotions and motives when asked to put themselves in the role of a hypothetical bully. That is, bullies were more likely to report emotions of indifference and/or pride as opposed to guilt or shame associated with assuming responsibility for an aggression action. According to Bandura (1999), these feelings were made possible due to disengagement motives, which, in this study, consisted of bullies providing a rationale for their aggression that included the observation of positive consequences and personal advantages attained from bullying. Thus, the authors proposed that egocentric reasoning guided immoral behavior for bullies (Menesini et al., 2003). This study revealed how emotions and feelings can be altered when using morally disengaged rationales, leading to the justification of unfavorable behavior.

Pozzoli, Gini, and Vieno (2012) assessed individual and classroom levels of pro-bullying behavior and their association with moral disengagement, specifically applying Bandura’s (1999) four broad categories of mechanisms. Overall, moral disengagement was related to pro-bullying behavior, but different mechanisms were associated with the aggressive tendencies at the individual-level versus classroom-level. Cognitive restructuring was positively associated with individual pro-bullying behavior, while
minimizing one’s agentic role and blaming/dehumanizing the victim was positively related to classroom-level pro-bullying behavior. Disregarding/distorting consequences, however, was negatively associated with classroom-level pro-bullying. This makes intuitive sense because cognitive restructuring involves viewing an aggressive action as a means of attaining something greater or for a just cause, which would involve the individuals’ perspective. On the other hand, minimizing one’s role and blaming/dehumanizing the victim are more likely to be achieved when bullying is a group effort that includes others. Nevertheless, Bandura’s moral disengagement mechanisms were found to be associated with aggression in the classroom (Pozzoli, Gini, & Vieno, 2012).

When comparing levels of moral disengagement, Obermann (2011) assessed both peer nomination and self-reported bullying roles for sixth and seventh graders. Peer nominated bullies and self-proclaimed bullies displayed similar levels of moral disengagement. Results indicated that moral disengagement occurs as long as an immoral action takes place, regardless of whether or not one classifies themselves as a bully. Both pure bullies and bully-victims (individuals who both bullied and were bullied) showed higher moral disengagement than children not involved in bullying (Obermann, 2011). When assessing moral disengagement’s association with different bullying roles, Gini (2006) found that bullies (as well as their “assistants” and “reinforcers”) highly endorsed mechanisms of moral disengagement, suggesting that as long as one contributes to the bullying situation, moral disengagement comes into play.
The bullying role of defender is also tied to one’s level of moral disengagement; however, this association is in the expected opposite direction. Gini (2006) found that defenders ages eight to eleven were more likely to display moral sensitivity than their aggressive counterparts. Children willing to help out the victim being bullied showed fewer moral disengagement mechanisms (Gini, 2006). Thornberg and Jungert (2013) also found moral disengagement to be negatively associated with defender and outsider behavior, while it was positively associated with pro-bullying behavior. Furthermore, Obermann (2011) found that unconcerned bystanders (i.e., bystanders who were not willing to help out the victim) possessed higher moral disengagement than those bystanders that either felt guilty or were defenders. This cross-sectional research suggests how moral disengagement and bullying roles are strongly correlated, while longitudinal studies show this relationship over time.

In a longitudinal study, Sticca and Perren (2015) found that initial levels of moral disengagement, low moral responsibility, and weak feelings of remorse were positively associated with initial levels of bullying. These “moral deficiencies” also predicted changes in bullying development over time (Sticca & Perren, 2015). This finding was consistent in the longitudinal study performed by Wang, Hoo, Swearer, Turner, and Goldberg (in press), who found moral disengagement to predict bullying perpetration across three time points for students from fifth to ninth grade. Obermann (2013) found the opposite direction when the initial level of bullying as well as changes in bullying predicted changes in moral disengagement. Furthermore, there were no significant changes between bullying groups (i.e., stable bullies, non-bullies, new bullies, and
desisting bullies). Thus, there are mixed results as to whether moral disengagement is a fixed trait that influences behavior or whether it changes over time; however, Bandura (1999) proposed that the process between moral reasoning and behavior is reciprocal. Once moral disengagement is used to justify aggression, it becomes easier for the individual to morally disengage on the next immoral action. An individual who commits a minor transgression and morally disengages to avoid feeling guilty about their behavior is more likely to engage in similar behavior in the future due to their cleared conscience. This allows for more aggressive behavior to take place at a later time, leading to the activation of moral disengagement for their more severe behavior. In other words, moral disengagement influences behavior and vice versa in a gradual process over time (Bandura, 1999). Although the literature presents mixed results on whether moral disengagement is a constant trait or more variable state, there is agreement that moral disengagement is strongly linked to bullying and other aggressive acts.

Interventions for moral disengagement. Despite the recurring finding of the association between moral disengagement and bullying, there exists a gap in the literature assessing bullying interventions that include aspects of moral disengagement. Interventions exist that focus on social-cognitive processes, such as targeting social norms by informing students of peer perceptions and attitudes regarding bullying (Perkins, Craig, & Perkins, 2011) and taking responsibility for bullying by being an active bystander (Menesini, Codecasa, Benelli & Cowie, 2003; Salmivalli, Kaukiainen & Voeten, 2005). After raising awareness of the harmful effects of cyberbullying, Barkoukis, Lazuras, Ourda, and Tsorbatzoudis (2015) found a significant decrease in total...
moral disengagement, distortion of consequences, and attribution of blame for adolescents due to targeting empathy, moral disengagement, and social cognition. This school-based intervention displayed how children may be trained in the social-cognitive processes of morality, where empathy is elicited for victims of aggression and moral disengagement is discouraged. Barkoukis et al. (2015) targeted moral disengagement for adolescent cyberbullying; however, no known intervention to date specifically taps into Bandura’s moral disengagement mechanisms when addressing the problem of bullying taking place at the school. The current study aims to encourage discussions revolving around moral disengagement ideas to prevent social-cognitive processes from influencing behavior in a harmful manner.

**Current Study**

The *Bullying Literature Project (BLP)* is a five-week class-wide program embedded in bibliotherapy that includes the reading of five stories (i.e., *Bullying B.E.A.N.S., Just Kidding, Recess Queen, Say Something, Juice Box Bully*) with bullying situations, where students are asked about how the characters feel, how they would feel in these situations, and other critical thinking questions throughout the books. Previous research has shown that the *BLP* leads to increased pro-social behavior (positive bystanding) and social-emotional assets, as well as prevents a negative change in pro-bullying attitudes among intervention groups when compared to control groups (Wang, Couch, Rodriguez, & Lee, 2015; Couch, 2015).

In the edition of the *BLP* used for this study, each of Bandura’s moral disengagement mechanisms are included as questions for students to answer throughout
the stories. Children are asked if it would be okay to participate in bullying under different circumstances. The purpose of doing so was to identify when students would justify acting aggressively. Conversations around moral disengagement would then take place, and students were led to understand how bullying is never okay under any circumstance. Evidence-based strategies, including WITS (Leadbeater et al., 2003), are also taught throughout the BLP curriculum for responding to bullying at school. Each story is followed by an activity that allows children to practice what they learned during that week’s lesson. Activities include making a bookmark, finishing a story starter, writing about a bullying situation, a group poster, and constructing a booklet. Direct instruction, modeling by the implementers and teacher, and role playing with feedback for students was also included for strategy practice. Furthermore, on-going feedback was communicated to the school staff to encourage the use of skills and strategies throughout campus. At the end of each lesson, students raise their right hand to make the bullying promise, which encourages them to use their WITS and help other kids to use their WITS when dealing with bullying.

**Research Questions**

1. To what extent does the BLP-MD reduce moral disengagement among elementary school students?
2. To what extent does the BLP-MD reduce bullying behavior (i.e., perpetration and victimization) among elementary school students?
3. To what extent does the BLP-MD increase pro-social behavior among students (based on teacher-report)?
4. To what extent does the BLP-MD influence student peer friendships?

5. To what extent does the BLP-MD influence social-emotional assets of students?

Methods

Participants

Recruitment letters were distributed to all elementary school principals in a southern California school district, and one school expressed interest to participate in the Bullying Literature Project. All 98 third grade students at the school were invited to participate in the Bullying Literature Project, and HRRB (Human Research Review Board) approved consent forms were sent to the parents of all students. Of these 98 children, parent consent and student assent were obtained for 84 students (42 were assigned to the treatment group, 42 assigned to control group).

The sample consisted of 46.4% male and 53.6% female. Participants were predominately Hispanic (94%), followed by 3.6% Caucasian and 2.4% Asian/Asian American/Asian Pacific Islanders. However, it was assumed all students spoke English as this was the language which they were instructed in during school. These racial/ethnicity demographics were roughly representative of the school district, which consisted of 85.3% Hispanic, 9.9% Caucasian, 1.5% Asian, and 2.8% Other. Participants ranged from 7 to 9 years old (M = 7.93 years; SD = 0.30 years).

Items on measures that participants either skipped or endorsed two separate answers were considered missing data and that specific question was omitted from the analysis. Pairwise deletion was chosen in order to carry out analyses with all cases where
variables were present due to the small original sample size. A limitation in using this missing data technique, however, is that an item that is deleted on a measure decreases the validity and reliability of the instrument, which may lead to bias. Another limitation with pairwise deletion is the assumption that data are missing completely at random.

**Procedure**

A quasi-experimental design was utilized; two classrooms were randomly assigned to the treatment condition while the other two classrooms were assigned to the wait-list control condition. Students were assigned to treatment or control groups based on their classroom membership. Two treatment classrooms participated in the *Bullying Literature Project - Moral Disengagement Version*, while the other two waitlist-control classrooms received intervention after the conclusion of the study as it was determined to be unethical to withhold a treatment designed to improve student outcomes. A pre-test survey was given to all participating students to establish initial thoughts and behavior concerning bullying. The treatment classrooms then underwent the five weeks of the *BLP-MD*. One week after intervention, the post-test survey was taken by the four classrooms in order to determine if there were significant differences in thoughts and behavior between the groups.

**Measures**

Data on behavior and thoughts associated with bullying were gathered from students and their teachers using a questionnaire at the beginning and end of the intervention. The survey assessed moral disengagement, bullying and victimization, pro-
social behavior, student friendships, and social-emotional assets. The social validity of the *Bullying Literature Project - MD* was also assessed for treatment classrooms.

**Moral disengagement.** The *Moral Disengagement Scale (MDS; Thornberg & Jungert, 2013; Thornberg & Jungert, 2014)* for adolescents was modified to cater to the elementary-aged audience of the current investigation. The scale consisted of 15 items, which assessed the participants’ endorsement of Bandura’s moral disengagement mechanisms for bullying scenarios. Instead of asking students to state how true they felt statements were as in the original measure, items were reworded as questions and students were asked to rate “how okay or not okay would it be” to justify bullying using different moral disengagement mechanisms. Sample items included, “how okay or not okay would it be to harm another person a little if you do it to protect your friends?” (moral justification), “how okay or not okay would it be to bully a classmate if my friends are doing it too?” (minimizing one’s agentic role), and “how okay or not okay would it be to tease people because they don’t really get too sad about it?” (dehumanization). The 6-point Likert scale was modified so that students were asked to choose how they felt about each situation on a scale of six “smiley faces” ranging in emotion. This differs from the original scale that was on a Likert scale of “1-not true at all” to “7-very true.” Although modifications to the original measure were necessary for the third grade sample, this has implications for the validity of the data as the original measure was tested using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis (Thornberg & Jungert, 2013; 2014). For the current investigation, the internal consistency of this scale was $\alpha = 0.70$ at pre-test and $\alpha = 0.82$ at post-test, which are considered to be ranging from
moderate to large based on Cohen’s (1988) criteria. The original measure’s overall reliability was $\alpha = 0.84$ (Thornberg & Jungert, 2014).

**Bullying and victimization.** Self-reported bullying behavior and victimization were measured using the student versions of the *Verbal and Physical Bullying Scale-Perpetration* and the *Verbal and Physical Bullying Scale-Victimization*, respectively (*VPBS*; Swearer, Turner, Givens, & Pollack, 2008). Teacher-reported bullying behavior and victimization were measured using the teacher versions of the *VPBS*, which is parallel to the student version (Swearer et al., 2008). The *VPBS* is an 11-item scale where the participant rates on 5-point Likert scale from “never” to “always” on how often they were bullied (victimization) or how often they “have done these things to others” (perpetration). Examples of items include “called names”, “played nasty/mean jokes”, and “pushed or shoved.” On the teacher version, teachers were allowed to skip the section if they reported that the student was not involved in perpetration or victimization.

A principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was used to establish the validity of the *VPBS*, where a two-factor solution for bullying ($\alpha = 0.79$) and victimization ($\alpha = 0.85$) was found (Swearer et al., 2008). The internal consistency for the *VPBS* in previous studies has ranged from $\alpha = 0.74$ to 0.92 on the perpetration scale and from $\alpha = 0.79$ to 0.89 on the victimization scale (Radliff, Wang, & Swearer, 2016; Swearer et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2015). The internal consistency of the bullying perpetration scale for students in the current study was $\alpha = 0.79$ at pre-test and $\alpha = 0.79$ at post-test. The internal consistency for the victimization scale for students was $\alpha = 0.82$ at pre-test and $\alpha = 0.84$ at post-test. On the teacher-report scales, reliability was $\alpha = 0.85$ at
pre-test and $\alpha = 0.80$ at post-test for perpetration. Internal consistency was $\alpha = 0.91$ at pre-test and $\alpha = 0.82$ at post-test for teacher-reported victimization.

**Pro-social behavior.** The pro-social behavior subscale in *Children’s Social Behavior Scale- Teacher Form (CSBS-TF; Crick, 1996)* was used to assess teachers’ perception of the pro-social behavior of their students. This four-item 5-point Likert scale asks whether “the child is helpful to peers”, “the child is kind to peers”, “says supportive things to peers”, and “tries to cheer up peers when they are sad or upset about something.” A principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was run to establish the validity of the full original scale which consisted of relational aggression, overt aggression, and pro-social behavior. The analysis yielded three expected factors, where pro-social behavior had an eigenvalue of 1.0. These four questions made the subscale for pro-social behavior. The reliability in the original study in which the measure was used was $\alpha = 0.83$ (Crick, 1996). For the current study, the internal consistency was $\alpha = 0.90$ at pre-test and $\alpha = 0.95$ at post-test for teacher-reported pro-social behavior.

**Peer friendships.** The peer friendships subscale of the *ClassMaps Survey (CMS; Doll et al., 2009; Doll et al., 2010)* was used to assess student friendships in the classroom. The measure included six items where student-peer relations were rated on a 4-point scale from “disagree a lot” to “agree a lot.” Items included “I have friends to eat lunch with and play with at recess” and “I have friends who would stick up for me if someone picks on me.” Factor analysis revealed an eight-factor solution for the original measure with peer friendship items making up a separate factor (Doll, Spies, LeClair, Kurien, & Foley, 2010). The internal consistency of this scale ranged from $\alpha = 0.78$ to
0.93 in the original study (Doll et al., 2009; Doll et al., 2010) and was \( \alpha = 0.74 \) at pre-test and \( \alpha = 0.79 \) at post-test for the current investigation.

**Social-emotional assets.** The *Social Emotional Assets and Resilience Scales-C* (short form for grades 3–6; *SEARS*; Merrell, 2011) was used to measure the participants’ assessment of their own social-emotional knowledge, resiliency, use of coping and problem solving, and empathy. The seven items on this measure were on a 4-point scale, where participants rated their social-emotional assets ranging from “never,” “sometimes,” “often,” and “always.” Sample questions included “I understand how other people feel” and “I think before I act.” The internal consistency in the original study was \( \alpha = 0.85 \) (Merrell, 2011). The internal consistency for the items on this measure was \( \alpha = 0.70 \) at pre-test and \( \alpha = 0.78 \) at post-test in the current investigation.

**Social validity.** A 5-item scale for students and a 9-item scale for teachers were modified from Castro-Olivo (2014) to assess the social validity of the *Bullying Literature Project-MD*. Students and teachers were asked questions as to whether they liked the program and if they thought useful skills were taught in the program on the 4-point scale (teachers on a 6-point scale) from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” The reliability of this measure was \( \alpha = 0.79 \) for students and \( \alpha = 0.81 \) for teachers.

**Analysis**

Mixed analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to establish the treatment’s effect over time, and the SPSS statistical software package was used to run the analysis. Mixed ANOVA was chosen because it was of interest to assess the difference between treatment and control classrooms by determining if there was a significant time by treatment
interaction for the following variables: moral disengagement, bullying behavior (i.e., teacher- and student-reported perpetration and victimization), pro-social behavior, student friendships, and social-emotional assets.

**Assumption testing.** The first assumption for mixed ANOVA was met because all dependent variables were measured on a continuous scale (i.e., Likert scales).

The second assumption that the within-subjects factor consists of at least two categorical “related groups” or “matched pairs” was also satisfied. In the mixed ANOVA, data was collected from the same subjects at two separate time points (i.e., pre-test and post-test).

The third assumption that the between-subjects factor consists of at least two categorical independent groups was also satisfied as subjects either belonged to the intervention or control group.

The fourth assumption that there should be no significant outliers in any group of the within-subjects or between-subjects factor was checked by examining the box-and-whisker plots for each dependent variable. No outliers were present in either the control or intervention group for moral disengagement pre-test and post-test scores. Outliers for victimization and bullying consisted of the students reporting bullying behavior because the majority of students indicated that they “never” engaged in bullying behavior (six outliers in control group and three in intervention group for victimization pre-test, six outliers in control group and one for victimization post-test; two outliers in control group and three in intervention group for bullying pre-test, nine outliers in control group and five outliers in intervention group at bullying post-test). Again, outliers found for teacher-
reported victimization and bullying consisted of severe bullying behavior because the majority of students were not involved in bullying (floor effect). There were no outliers for teacher-reported pro-social behavior for any of the groups. No outliers were present in the control group at pre-test and post-test for social-emotional assets, and only one outlier was found for the pre-test and two outliers were found at post-test for the intervention group. One outlier was found in the pre-test control group for peer friendships, while there were none for the intervention group. No outliers were present in the post-test control group, while two were present in the intervention group at post-test.

The assumption of normality was met for each combination (within- and between-subject factors) of the moral disengagement dependent variable, Shapiro-Wilk ($W$) = 0.96, $p = 0.194$ for the pre-test control group, $W = 0.98, p = 0.577$ for the pre-test intervention group, $W = 0.95, p = 0.064$ for the post-test control group, and $W = 0.96, p = 0.200$ for the post-test intervention group. The data points fell along the normal distribution line on the normal Q-Q Plots, and the histograms were roughly symmetrical.

The assumption of normality was not met for each combination of the victimization dependent variable, $W = 0.67, p < 0.001$ for the pre-test control group, $W = 0.82, p < 0.001$ for the pre-test intervention group, $W = 0.75, p < 0.001$ for the post-test control group, and $W = 0.81, p < 0.001$ for the post-test intervention group. The data points did not fall along the normal distribution line on the normal Q-Q Plots, and the histograms revealed that the data was skewed right. The assumption of normality also was not met for any combination of the bullying dependent variable, $W = 0.51, p < 0.001$ for the pre-test control group, $W = 0.65, p < 0.001$ for the pre-test intervention group, $W =$.
0.52, \( p < 0.001 \) for the post-test control group, and \( W = 0.44, p < 0.001 \) for post-test intervention group. The data points did not fall along the normal distribution line on the normal Q-Q Plots. The data on bullying behavior variables are skewed right due to the majority of students reporting never being engaged in bullying and victimization.

The assumption of normality was not met for each combination of the teacher-reported victimization dependent variable, \( W = 0.33, p < 0.001 \) for the pre-test control group, \( W = 0.43, p < 0.001 \) for the pre-test intervention group, \( W = 0.34, p < 0.001 \) for the post-test control group, and \( W = 0.49, p < 0.001 \) for the post-test intervention group. The data points did not fall along the normal distribution line on the normal Q-Q Plots. The assumption of normality was not met for each combination of the teacher-reported bullying dependent variable, \( W = 0.39, p < 0.001 \) for the pre-test control group, \( W = 0.37, p < 0.001 \) for the pre-test intervention group, \( W = 0.14, p < 0.001 \) for the post-test control group, and \( W = 0.55, p < 0.001 \) for the post-test intervention group. The data points did not fall along the normal distribution line on the normal Q-Q Plots.

The assumption of normality was satisfied for the pre-test intervention group on the pro-social dependent variable, \( W = 0.96, p = 0.201 \). However, the assumption of normality was not met for the pre-test control group (\( W = 0.93, p = 0.016 \)), the post-test control group (\( W = 0.86, p < 0.001 \)), or the post-test intervention group (\( W = 0.90, p = 0.003 \)).

The assumption of normality was not met for each combination of the peer friendship dependent variable, \( W = 0.80, p < 0.001 \) for the pre-test control group, \( W = 0.81, p < 0.001 \) for the pre-test intervention group, \( W = 0.90, p < 0.001 \) for the post-test
control group, and $W = 0.74, p < 0.001$. The data points did not fall along the normal distribution line on the normal Q-Q Plots.

The assumption of normality was satisfied for the intervention group at pre-test for the social-emotional assets dependent variable, $W = 0.95, p = 0.099$, but not for the control group at pre-test, $W = 0.89, p < 0.001$. The normality was assumption was also not met for the control group at post-test, $W = 0.92, p = 0.008$, or for the intervention group at post-test, $W = 0.89, p = 0.001$.

The assumption of homogeneity of variance for each dependent variable was checked using Levene’s Test. Moral disengagement pre-test and post-test score variances were homogenous, $F(1, 80) = 0.90, p = 0.345$ and $F(1, 80) = 0.23, p = 0.635$, respectively. Victimization pre-test score variances were not homogenous, $F(1, 80) = 13.41, p < 0.001$, but error variances were homogenous at post-test, $F(1, 80) = 2.52, p = 0.116$. The same was true for teacher-reported victimization, $F(1, 80) = 10.57, p = 0.002$ at pre-test and $F(1, 80) = 2.59, p = 0.111$ at post-test. Variances in bullying scores were not homogenous at either time point, $F(1, 80) = 7.18, p = 0.009$ and $F(1, 80) = 5.70, p = 0.019$. Teacher-reported bullying variances were homogenous at pre-test, $F(1, 80) = 2.05, p = 0.156$, but not at post-test, $F(1, 80) = 6.877, p = 0.010$. Pro-social behavior variances were homogenous at both time points, $F(1, 80) = 0.07, p = 0.786$ and $F(1, 80) = 0.001, p = 0.970$. Friendship variances were also homogenous at both time points, $F(1, 80) = 0.08, p = 0.784$ and $F(1, 80) = 1.11, p = 0.295$. Error variances for social-emotional assets were not homogenous at pre-test, $F(1, 80) = 6.86, p = 0.011$, but were at post-test, $F(1, 80) = 1.37, p = 0.245$. 
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Results

Moral Disengagement

The primary research question addressed to what extent the BLP-MD reduced moral disengagement among elementary school students. A significant time by treatment interaction was found for the students’ endorsement of moral disengagement mechanisms, $F(1, 81) = 6.06, p = 0.016$ (see Figure 1). The computed effect size using this $F$-value statistic is $d = 0.544$ (Thalheimer & Cook, 2002). Students in the treatment condition decreased their use of moral disengagement mechanisms that justified bullying behavior (from $M = 2.30; SD = 0.53$ to $M = 1.89; SD = 0.58$ after the BLP-MD) compared to the wait-list control group (from $M = 2.07; SD = 0.62$ to $M = 1.97; SD = 0.65$). Scores of the two groups were not significantly different on the pre-test survey ($\alpha = 0.089$), providing evidence that differences at pre-test were not a potential confounding variable.

Bullying and Victimization

The second research question asked to what extent the BLP-MD reduced bullying behavior (i.e., perpetration and victimization) among elementary school students according to both student- and teacher-report. Compared to the waitlist-control classrooms, the treatment classrooms showed a significant time by treatment interaction for student-reported bullying victimization, $F(1, 81) = 7.41, p = 0.008$ (see Figure 2). The computed effect size using this $F$-value statistic is $d = 0.601$ (Thalheimer & Cook, 2002). That is, students in the two treatment classrooms reported a decrease in victimization at school after the intervention (from $M = 1.76; SD = 0.81$ to $M = 1.60; SD = 0.66$ after the
BLP-MD) compared to the waitlist-control group (M = 1.23; SD = 0.38 to M = 1.38; SD = 0.53). A caveat to this finding, however, is that groups were significantly different during the initial time point (α < 0.001), which limits the comparison of groups. Although student self-reported victimization decreased after the BLP-MD, the time by treatment interaction for teacher-reported victimization was not significant, $F(1, 81) = 1.52, p = 0.221$. The pre-test scores from teachers were not significantly different (α = 0.123) between groups prior to intervention implementation, which allows for the comparison of groups.

Finally, neither teacher-reported or student-reported bullying behavior showed a significant time by treatment interaction, $F(1, 81) = 0.07, p = 0.793$ and $F(1, 81) = 0.79, p = 0.378$, respectively. Pre-test scores between teacher groups for bullying perpetration were not significantly different at the initial time period (α = 0.484), while scores between student groups were (α = 0.043). Again, this limits the interpretability of findings for the student-report because the treatment and control groups were not similar prior to the start of the intervention.

**Pro-Social Behavior**

The third research question addressed to what extent the BLP-MD increased pro-social behavior among students. Teacher-reported pro-social behavior did not significantly change according to the students’ membership to the treatment versus control group, $F(1, 81) = 0.01, p = 0.941$. Pre-test scores were not comparable between groups (α = 0.002) before the BLP-MD, limiting the interpretability of the comparison of groups.
Peer Friendships

The next research question examined to what extent the BLP-MD influenced peer friendships. Student friendships significantly improved over time, $F(1, 81) = 4.77, p = 0.032$, for treatment classrooms (see Figure 3). The computed effect size using this $F$-value statistic is $d = 0.482$ (Thalheimer & Cook, 2002). Students in the treatment condition reported improved friendships (from $M = 3.44; SD = 0.62$ to $M = 3.55; SD = 0.60$ after the BLP-MD) compared to the wait-list control group (from $M = 3.47; SD = 0.61$ to $M = 3.29; SD = 0.63$). The two groups were not significantly different ($\alpha = 0.837$) from each other during the pre-test, allowing for the observation of treatment’s effects on student friendships.

Social-Emotional Assets

In regards to the final research question on the extent to which the BLP-MD influenced the social-emotional assets of students, the treatment group did not show significant change over time compared to the control group, $F(1, 81) = 1.11, p = 0.295$. Additionally, pre-test scores between the treatment and control groups were not significantly different ($\alpha = 0.255$), allowing for the comparison of groups over time.

Social Validity

Social validity of the BLP-MD was high for both students and their teachers. The students’ mean rating on the 4-point Likert-scale for the intervention was 3.70 with a standard deviation of 0.47. The mean rating for teachers on the 6-point Likert-scale was 5.58 with a standard deviation of 0.26. Additionally, all teachers reported the highest rating of “strongly agree” for the following statements: “I liked this program”, “I would
recommend this program to others”, “I liked the way this program was taught”, “The graduate student/interventionist was very professional”, and “The skills taught were appropriate for this age group.”

Discussion

Results from this study suggest that the *Bullying Literature Project - Moral Disengagement Version* was successful in decreasing student endorsement of moral disengagement mechanisms. Elementary school students were less likely to report that “it is okay” to bully/harm/tease others for varying reasons after the intervention. In other words, students who underwent the program decreased their likelihood to justify aggressive and immoral behavior using cognitive restructuring, minimizing one’s agentic role in bullying, disregarding/distorting the negative impact of harmful behavior, and blaming or dehumanizing the victim. Because of the association of moral disengagement and bullying, the current revision of the *BLP-MD* sought to address these mechanisms throughout the course of the five-week intervention by promoting discussion of these topics built around the literature. Sample questions asked during stories included “Is it okay to blame the person who is getting bullied?” (blaming the victim), “Does it make it right/okay for her to bully because she has been bullied before? Can you blame others for your actions?” (displacement of responsibility), and “He always says he is ‘just kidding’ instead of admitting ‘I am being mean.’ How might this be bad?” (euphemistic labeling). The positive results suggest that moral disengagement may be targeted in interventions for children as young as 7-9 years to build moral reasoning and teach students that bullying is never okay under any circumstance. Although Barkoukis et al. (2015) targeted
moral disengagement as an intervention for bullying, this intervention focused on adolescents aged 16-18 years. No known intervention has targeted elementary-aged children as does the current study.

The BLP-MD was also successful in decreasing bullying victimization for third grade students. Students in the treatment classrooms reported less bullying of their peers, which included calling them names, making fun of them, playing nasty/mean jokes on them, not letting them be part of the group, breaking their things, attacking them, not talking to them, writing or saying mean things, and pushing/shoving them. This significant change in behavior is a novel finding from the BLP. Previous research has shown that the BLP prevents the negative change in pro-bullying attitudes among intervention groups as compared to control groups (Wang et al., 2015; Couch, 2015). The current study resulted in a decrease in actual bullying behavior- victimization.

Unfortunately, bullying perpetration did not change for treatment groups compared to control groups. That is, students did not self-report that they were bullying less than at the start of intervention. A possible explanation for this lack of behavior change may be due to a floor effect of not many students initially admitting to engaging in bullying behavior such as calling others names, making fun of others, saying they would do bad things, playing mean jokes, not letting others be part of their group, breaking things, attacking others, making sure nobody would talk to them, saying or writing mean things about others, or pushing/shoving others. Additionally, behavior (perpetration and victimization) was not reported by teachers to have decreased over time. Again, this may be due to the floor effect of only very few students engaged in the
bullying perpetration before the intervention. The nature of this measure (i.e., teacher was allowed to skip section if they answered that the student did not participate in bullying behavior) may have also led to teachers only reporting severe perpetration or victimization. The pro-social behavior of students reported by their teachers also did not change for treatment classrooms. Teachers did not observe a change in the students’ behavior from before BLP-MD implementation. Although students spent the most time with teachers in their classroom, it is important to note that bullying was reported on the pre-test measure as most likely occurring during recess when supervisors (rather than teachers) observed them on the playground. Data-based decision making and feedback to teachers, students, the school psychologist, and principal were built into the intervention to promote awareness and encourage school-wide strategies. The need for increased supervision at bullying hot-spots (i.e., recess) was communicated, and teachers agreed to see that positive reinforcement was given to students who were caught using their “WITS”. A limitation here, however, is the absence of a follow-up to assess whether teachers were adhering to this plan with integrity.

Student-peer friendships were found to improve after the Bullying Literature Project- MD. That is, students were more likely to report higher quality friendships after the intervention. After treatment, children viewed their peer friendships as generally more positive. This may be due to increased empathy for other students in the classroom because of the intervention. For example, taking care of one another in the classroom and positive bystanding were encouraged at the end of every session, where the students would recite the “bullying promise.”
Different from previous research with the BLP where the interaction effect for social-emotional assets was marginally significant (Wang et al., 2015, \( p = 0.08 \)), social-emotional assets did not improve after the intervention. A possible explanation for this may be that the current version of the intervention focused more on promoting defending behavior through social-cognitive processes and thus did not put as much emphasis on the social-emotional aspect of bullying. Third graders did not report more knowledge over their thoughts, feelings, and actions than they did from before the BLP-MD in the following areas: understanding how others feel, teaching someone else how to calm down, caring about what happens, thinking before acting, making good decisions, thinking about problem in ways that help, or naming different feelings.

The acceptability of the Bullying Literature Project – MD was high for both students and their teachers. Social validity measured at the end of the intervention indicated that the third grade classrooms enjoyed the program and felt they learned useful skills and strategies along the way.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

Although the current study supports the Bullying Literature Project - Moral Disengagement Version as a class-wide bullying intervention for decreasing victimization and moral disengagement and improving student-peer friendships, these findings are subject to limitations. First, as previously mentioned, the results for student-reported victimization and perpetration should be interpreted with caution because groups were not similar at pre-test. That is, the treatment and control groups were significantly different before the intervention. The same was true for teacher-reported pro-social
behavior. It is suggested that future work carry out multiple regression controlling for
pre-test scores to examine the treatment’s effect above and beyond what occurred at the
initial time point.

Another statistical limitation of the study is that multiple tests were run on
multiple dependent variables. Separate ANOVAs for each dependent variable increases
the risk of committing a Type 1 error (i.e., rejecting the null hypothesis when it is true).
This may be remedied using Bonferroni’s correction, which would adjust the significant
$p$-value for each hypothesis ($p = 0.05/8$ dependent variables $= 0.00625$). Doing so,
however, would lead to non-significant findings. An alternative would have been to
conduct a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) to determine the time by
treatment’s effect on several dependent variables at once. Future analyses should use
MANOVA to determine the effectiveness of the BLP-MD.

Third, the study was performed solely in a southern California school, limiting the
generalizability of the findings. Future studies should explore the efficacy of this
intervention in other regions. Specific types of bullying (e.g., physical, relational) may
present themselves differently for schools in other regions with varying school climates
and environmental factors that warrant consideration. As such, the intervention would
need to target specific aspects tailored to the particular needs of the school. Fourth, the
majority of students in the school were of Hispanic origin (94%). Future research should
address the efficacy of the BLP-MD for other populations. That being said, however, the
BLP-MD did take into account culturally linguistic variables and provided parents with a
letter during the intervention describing the BLP-MD together with parenting strategies to
prevent bullying and a list of recommended books in both English and Spanish to promote communication with parents and encourage their involvement in bullying prevention by reminding children to use the strategies at home. Lastly, the program targeted third grade students. Future studies may seek to assess the BLP-MD’s effect on different age groups of students to support the generalizability of the program for various populations.

**Implications**

The current study supports the idea that moral disengagement may be effectively targeted in anti-bullying efforts for children in elementary school classrooms. The addition of the social-cognitive component to the BLP decreased bullying victimization and students’ utilization of moral disengagement mechanisms to justify bullying. Implications for teachers and school staff include that the program fits in well with the general language arts curriculum because of its incorporation of reading and writing activities that help foster academic skills. In addition, the social validity of the BLP-MD for students and their teachers displays that anti-bullying strategies can be learned and practiced in a positive manner that is highly acceptable.

Because bullying is such a prevalent problem, school psychologists may do well to adopt such programs in their schools to discourage bullying behavior and promote positive bystanding among students. As a brief (five-week) intervention, the BLP-MD is a promising means of thwarting bullying and the thoughts surrounding bullying at an early age, which would be valuable for school psychologists and teachers to incorporate in their schools struggling with bullying.
Conclusion

Bullying continues to be a pressing concern for students in schools, where brief and inexpensive interventions that are effective are strongly warranted. When designing effective anti-bullying interventions, the social-cognitive variables that underlie the behavior need to be considered. In this edition of the *Bullying Literature Project*, Bandura’s (1986) moral disengagement was targeted so that classroom discussions revolved around the thoughts commonly used to justify aggressive behavior.

Results suggest that the *Bullying Literature Project- Moral Disengagement Version* was a successful anti-bullying intervention for decreasing victimization and moral disengagement in third grade classrooms. The *BLP-MD* also improved the quality of student-peer friendships and was high in social validity for both students and teachers. The findings of the current investigation reveal the value of targeting moral disengagement when tackling the problem of bullying.
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### Descriptive Statistics for Outcome Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral Disengagement Pre-test</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Disengagement Post-test</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization Pre-test</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization Post-test</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Reported Victimization</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Reported Victimization</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying Pre-test</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying Post-test</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Reported Bullying Pre-test</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Reported Bullying Post-test</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Social Behavior Pre-test</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Social Behavior Post-test</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Friendships Pre-test</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Friendships Post-test</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Emotional Assets Pre-test</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Emotional Assets Post-test</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Mixed Analysis of Variance, Moral Disengagement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time*Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>6.060</td>
<td>0.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12.947</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>13.916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Asterisk (*) denotes statistical significance.
### Table 2

*Mixed Analysis of Variance, Bullying*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time*Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.181</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Asterisk (*) denotes statistical significance.
Table 3

*Mixed Analysis of Variance, Victimization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time*Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>7.411</td>
<td>0.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10.310</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11.253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Asterisk (*) denotes statistical significance.
Table 4

*Mixed Analysis of Variance, Teacher-Reported Bullying*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time*Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.128</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Asterisk (*) denotes statistical significance.
Table 5

*Mixed Analysis of Variance, Teacher-Reported Victimization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time*Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>1.523</td>
<td>0.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.963</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Asterisk (*) denotes statistical significance.
Table 6

*Mixed Analysis of Variance, Teacher-Reported Pro-Social Behavior*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time*Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16.942</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16.943</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Asterisk (*) denotes statistical significance.
Table 7

*Mixed Analysis of Variance, Student Friendships*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time*Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>4.774</td>
<td>0.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14.965</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15.847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Asterisk (*) denotes statistical significance.
Table 8

*Mixed Analysis of Variance, Social-Emotional Assets*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time*Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>0.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16.983</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17.216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Asterisk (*) denotes statistical significance.
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