A Cyberbullying Intervention With Primary-Aged Students

Troy Toshack and Susan Colmar
The University of Sydney, Australia

A small-scale evaluation of a psycho-educational program on cyberbullying with a group of Year 6 girls was implemented over six sessions, and was subsequently evaluated. Its content included knowledge of cyberbullying and its effects, and management and safety strategies for the participants and their peers. Increases in the girls' detailed knowledge of cyberbullying and safety strategies followed the program's implementation. Students provided positive evaluations of the program and also suggested some good ideas for a schoolwide policy on cyberbullying. To date there has been minimal intervention research on cyberbullying, and few studies with primary-aged students. The present study redresses this imbalance.

■ **Keywords:** cyberbullying, safety strategies, intervention program, primary school

Information and research into the phenomenon of cyberbullying (CB) has exploded in recent years. Both academic literature and media coverage have identified that CB is a new form of harassment that is increasing in its frequency and negative effects; however, the academic literature is still limited (Bamford 2004; Kift, 2007; Li, 2006, 2007). Additional research is needed to establish a more informed understanding of CB, which will facilitate the development of useful programs for children and young people.

Rigby states that CB has added a 'new dimension' to the concept of bullying (Rigby, 2010, p. 111). Currently, many varying definitions of CB are used in both academic literature and popular culture. However, Belsey provides a definition that clearly describes CB as involving: 'the use of information and communication technologies to support deliberate, repeated and hostile behaviour by an individual or group, that is intended to harm others' (2006, p. 8). To expand on this definition: CB is about exploiting technology (Kift, 2007); is open to both children and adults (Shariff, 2009); and includes harassing people through social networking sites by writing hurtful comments about others that can be available publicly for others to view (Campbell, 2005). Additionally, CB is not restricted to the internet as mobile phones are also used; thus, CB can include not only words, but also pictures, with the mobile phone the most popular medium for CB in Australia (Kraft, 2006).

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Troy Toshack, Email: troy.toshack@det.nsw.edu.au

Volume 22 | Issue 2 | 2012 | pp. 268–278 | © The Authors 2012 | doi 10.1017/jgc.2012.31

Research has stated that a key feature of CB is the ability of the perpetrator to be anonymous (Li, 2006; Shariff, 2009). People can harass others online without being easily identified (Belsey, 2006; Li, 2006). The use of abstract screen names online (Shariff, 2009) or blocking one's telephone number can aid disguise. This sense of being unknown can heighten a person's feeling of power and reduces their perceived risk of being caught. However, a variety of actions can still be taken to identify a perpetrator (Campbell, 2005).

Much of the research on the role of gender in CB has found marked differences among males and females. Li (2007) reported that males were significantly more involved in CB than females. Additionally, Li (2006) found that, among adolescents in Grades 7–9, males were more likely to be bullies and cyberbullies. Alternatively, among self-reporting measures that addressed levels of engagement in harassing others online, Ybarra and Mitchell (2004) found no gender differences among individuals aged 10–17 years, with an almost equal distribution of male to female (48%) participants. Conversely, a study conducted in secondary schools by Smith and colleagues (2008) found females were more likely to be victims of CB.

Another interesting finding related to gender was the difference in the perceptions of CB between males and females. Agatston, Kowalski, and Limber (2007) found that, among adolescents aged 12–17 years, females perceived CB to be a bigger problem than males.

Although these are only some examples of the studies that have addressed gender and CB, contradictory findings are evident. It appears that both males and females are involved in CB; however, their relationship to CB and its effects may vary on an individual basis and further research is required (Li, 2006).

Media coverage and some academic studies have shown that CB is occurring among both primary and high school students (Li, 2006), occurring among children as young as 8 years (Bamford, 2005), with children aged 11 years having received hurtful messages on their phones or computers (National Children's Home, 2002, as cited in Brown, Jackson & Cassidy, 2006). However, most current research has studied CB using a high school population (see Li, 2006) and therefore the extent of CB among younger students is not well known. This is an area that requires further attention.

Recent research has shown that CB has significant effects on the target. Beran et al. (2005) found that one in four adolescents who were targets of CB reported a range of negative feelings such as anger and sadness. Pioneering research from Willard (2006, as cited in Brown et al., 2006) found that low self-esteem, anxiety and anger were related to CB. An increased tendency to hurt others and to engage in youth suicide was also evident. Rigby (2010) has also acknowledged the severe effects CB may have on an individual; in particular, when receiving continuous threatening SMSs. Additionally, he mentions the negative consequences a person may face when others repeatedly post hurtful information publicly on social networking sites. Rigby draws a distinction between the effects of low level, one-off messages versus life-threatening, continuous bullying through using electronic devices.

A large proportion of research has also shown that when individuals are experiencing CB and its negative effects, that informing adults is not always the strategy implemented by the young person (Agatston et al., 2007; Willard, 2005).

Some research indicates adolescents worry that adults will overreact or they will be restricted from internet use (Agatston et al., 2007; Rigby, 2010; Willard, 2005). Furthermore, young individuals today use 'netspeak', which is a specific language used online (Brown et al., 2006). Many older people may not understand this language, thus creating a communication barrier. These quoted factors may restrain the young person from informing an adult of their problems in online contexts (Agatson et al., 2007). Li (2006) found females in Grades 7–9 were more likely to tell an adult if they were being cyberbullied compared to males. Yet, among both males and females, only 64% of the sample felt that adults would try and stop CB if they were told about it. Furthermore, Li (2007) found that only 34.5% of secondary students ($n = 467$) would tell an adult about CB.

Therefore, if many young people are not informing adults of their experiences, a limit is placed on the extent to which they can receive help to deal with CB and its effects, which, in itself, is a serious effect of CB.

Knowledge of how to protect oneself online or when using a mobile phone, is essential in today's technological society. Professionals are offering a range of suggestions to parents and young people regarding being safe online and while using mobile phones. Additionally, key researchers such as Bamford (2005), Beckerman and Nocero (2003), Belsey, 2006, Campbell (2005), and Li (2006, 2007) have provided practical suggestions on how to handle CB. Their suggestions include:

1. Do not respond to the bully.
2. Save the messages sent as evidence of the harassment.
3. Tell a trusted adult/parent about the abuse, reporting the problem to the provider.
4. Provide students with education on internet management and how to use electronic communication devices safely.

Some young people do know how to employ appropriate safety strategies. Agatston et al. (2007) found adolescent respondents identified blocking the person and ignoring the messages as important ways to deal with CB and stay safe online. However, students were less aware of how to respond appropriately when witnessing others engaging in vicious behaviour online. A common theme among other studies investigating CB is that many young people have limited knowledge of online safety (Li, 2006). Patchin and Hinduja (2006) conducted an online survey of CB among individuals from 9 years of age ($n = 571$). Among those below 18 years, who identified themself as being a target of CB, the most common way of dealing with the CB was to tell the bully to stop. Telling an adult was one of the least chosen safety strategies. This finding is concerning as replying to the bully online can often make the situation worse, whereas not responding is a promoted safety strategy in the literature (Beckerman & Nocero, 2003; Belsey, 2006). Additionally, Li (2007) found that among adolescents who felt that they had knowledge of safety strategies, their responses indicated that their knowledge was actually very superficial, suggesting a lack of insight about their limited knowledge.

Research and education are required to enhance safety in young people, their parents and their teachers. In particular, there is a need to provide knowledge and

safety strategies to individuals at the primary school level, as this has not been extensively addressed to date.

The present study was built on the academic literature related to CB and addressed a real problem in a school. Many of the documented programs that address CB, such as 'Click Off' (Traxside Youth Health Service, 2008) have been aimed at older students in the high school setting. These programs have content and outcome expectations that are often inappropriate for younger children. However, the research literature and media stories have shown that the prevalence of CB is not only increasing, but is also starting at a younger age (Bamford, 2004; Campbell, 2005; Li, 2006). Therefore, new and appropriate programs need to be developed for younger students to educate them about CB and safety strategies.

Consequently, this study was initiated to develop a suitable program for primary school-aged students that addressed the nature of CB and safety strategies. It was expected that after taking part in the program, students would have a more in-depth understanding of CB. The second aim of the study was to teach and enhance the safety strategy knowledge of primary aged students, as advocated by Bamford (2005). Thus, it was predicted that participants would be able to give more examples of safety strategies in a survey after having taken part in the program.

The final aim of the current study was to implement a prominent suggestion made in the current literature, which is to encourage students to contribute to the management of CB in their schools (Brown et al., 2006). This aim can be achieved by allowing students to contribute to school policies on computer and internet use. Therefore, in this study, students were asked to provide suggestions anonymously on elements that should be included in their school's CB policy.

Method

Participants

The participants were five female students in Grade 6 at a school in a large metropolitan city in New South Wales, Australia. The average age of the participants was 11 years 4 months. The participants were selected by asking teachers to nominate students in their class whom they felt would benefit from the knowledge imparted by the program, or students who had recently been involved in a bullying/cyberbullying incident. A total of 12 were selected and offered the chance to take part in the study: however, only 5 permission notes were returned. The participants in this study did not have a relationship with the first author (the psychologist for the school) prior to this study, and participated voluntarily.

Materials

The participants' knowledge, experiences and understanding of CB and safety strategies was measured through the Cyber-Bullying Survey (CBS; Li, 2006), which consists of 21 items and is widely used in investigating CB (Li, 2007). The CBS was further developed for the purpose of this study. The participants of this study were asked to write down their definition of CB. This was incorporated so a better understanding of each participant's knowledge could be gained prior to the program's implementation. The participants' answers to this question were assessed according to the definition of CB given by Belsey (2006). Therefore, each time a student

referred to CB involving 'information technologies', such as a phone or computer, or mentioned that it was deliberate, hostile and repeated, it was recorded using a tally scoring system. Students were also asked to list in words the safety strategies they knew. In the original survey developed by Li (2006), students only had to tick yes or no to indicate if they knew safety strategies; thus, greater detail of the girls' safety strategies was obtained.

This CB program was closely based on 'The Click Off' program. Modifications were aimed at using examples more appropriate for primary aged children. At the end of each session, students were asked to write down in their journal the most important piece of knowledge they had gained from the session. At the end of the program, the participants were given a certificate of achievement.

Procedure

Initially, each participant was taken from class individually and completed the CBS (Li, 2006). The first author read each question to the participant to prevent any misunderstandings. The five participants then met for 1 hour each week for 5 weeks.[1] At the end of the program, each student was again individually asked to answer two of the questions from the original CBS (Li, 2006). The questions referred to their definition of cyberbullying and knowledge of safety strategies. The participants were then asked to evaluate the program by answering some questions on their feelings about the program and to describe what they did and did not like. In addition each participant was given the opportunity to anonymously make recommendations for the school's cyberbullying program.

Results

Each participant stated that they had been a target of traditional bullying (TB) and had also been a perpetrator. In terms of CB, four out of five participants stated they had been a target of CB, with three out of four stating it occurred less than four times and one out of four saying it had happened over ten times. Email was reported to be the most common method of CB. Three out of four participants indicated they knew who was doing it, with the identified people being friends. Four out of five participants also reported knowing others who had been cyberbullied.

When asked if they had bullied others online, three out of five participants reported having done so in the past and through email. Each participant stated they had engaged in this behaviour less than four times.

Of the four participants who had been cyberbullied before, only two reported telling an adult when it happened. Three out of five girls felt that if adults at school knew about CB, they would attempt to stop it. In terms of knowing safety strategies, three out of five participants reported knowing some safety strategies.

Table 1 shows how each participant defined CB in the pre- and post-program surveys. Additionally, to investigate if the participants were able to give a better definition of CB in the post-program surveys, a content analysis (Berg, 2007; Nardi, 2006) was conducted. First, a criterion for inclusion was established. Thus, each participant's definition in the pre- and post-survey of CB was compared to the key features of Belsey's (2006) definition. Reasons were analysed by verbatim words used and were tallied according to how many references they made to Belsey's

TABLE 1

Cyber-Bullying Definitions

ID#	Cyber-bullying definition pre-program	Number of links to Belsey	Cyber-bullying definition post-program	Number of Links to Belsey
1.	It's on the **computer**, swear on computer, send pictures, mean emails and teasing emails.	One link to Belsey (2007) by making reference to information and communication technologies. Gave examples of CB (swearing) as defined by Willard (2006).	It's a thing that is on the **computer** and talk to you online, it's bullying that happens on the computer and also happens on **phones** anywhere.	Two links to Belsey (2007) by making reference to information and communication technologies.
2.	Be **mean** to someone on the **computer**, swear at them.	Two links to Belsey (2007) by making reference to communication technologies and hostile behaviour. Gave an example of CB (swearing) as defined by Willard (2006).	Bullying on the **computer or phone** and it can happen anywhere and to anyone.	Two links to Besley (2007), making reference to information technologies.
3.	Swearing at people, bullying them through the **computer**.	One link to Belsey (2007) by making reference to communication technologies. Gave one example of CB (swearing) as defined by Willard (2006).	When you are on your **computer or phone** and you are pretending to be someone else and you bully them.	Two links to Besley (2007) by referring to information technologies and gave one example of CB (impersonation) as defined by Willard (2006).
4.	Anyone that hurts a person's feelings, hitting.	Zero links to Belsey (2007) and no examples given online according to Willard (2006).	Someone being bullied through the **internet or phone**, hurting someone's feelings.	Two links to Belsey (2007) by referring to communication technologies and a reference to hostile behaviour.
5.	Someone bullies someone, when someone does something to someone they don't like.	Zero links to Belsey (2007) and no examples given online according to Willard (2006).	When someone bullies someone, can be on the **internet** and someone makes someone feel bad.	Two links to Besley (2007) by referring to communication technololgies and a reference to hostile/hurtful behaviour.

Note: Linked words in bold.

definition. These data are illustrated in columns 2 and 4 of Table 1. These were then compared to see if more references were made in the post-program definition of CB. Furthermore, because some participants also gave an example of CB, these were compared to Willard's (2006) description of types of CB.

As displayed in Table 1, all participants showed some improvement in the depth of their CB definitions after taking part in the program. In particular, all participants identified the communication technologies, mainly mobiles and the internet, as being key features of CB. Several participants also made reference to CB being related to hostile behaviour that can hurt a person's feelings.

Table 1 also illustrates that the participants were able to give concrete examples of CB, as described by Willard (2006), prior to taking part in the program. However, reference to CB as a repeated action, able to be undertaken by groups, was not made.

Table 2 demonstrates each participant's knowledge of safety strategies before and after taking part in the program. A total score was given to each participant to indicate the number of strategies known. The third column of the table indicates if the participant's knowledge of safety strategies remained the same, increased or decreased in frequency after taking part in the program. As outlined in the table, the safety knowledge of the participants was limited and superficial in the pre-program survey; indeed, two participants were unable to provide any safety strategies. Nevertheless, all participants showed an increased knowledge of safety strategies after taking part in the program.

All five participants reported that the program had helped them to understand CB better, and to improve her knowledge of safety strategies. This finding is supported by the fact that, unlike the pre-program survey, in the post-program survey each participant was able to give examples of safety strategies. Each participant was also able to offer something they enjoyed from the workshops, including working as a group, writing, discussions, definitions, writing on the board and computer use. No participant offered suggestions on how to improve the program.

Each participant was asked to give the program a rating between 0 (meaning they disliked the program) and 10 (meaning they liked the program). Four out of five participants gave a rating of 10, with 1 participant giving a rating of 5.

The participants offered a range of suggestions of what to include in a CB school policy.[2]

Discussion

This small-scale study investigated the knowledge of CB and safety strategies among a sample of Grade 6 girls before and after taking part in a CB program. To date, a program that targets children in the primary school setting has not been fully developed. The results of this study have clearly illustrated that the participants' knowledge of CB and safety strategies increased after taking part in a school-based training program.

The first specific aim of this study was to investigate if students' knowledge of CB would increase after taking part in the program. As predicted, each student was able to give a better definition of CB, mentioning more key features of Belsey's (2006) definition in the post-program surveys. Particular improvement referred to the participants' knowledge of information technologies. While the overall participant responses identified emailing as the most popular form of CB in their own experiences, their knowledge that CB often occurs through mobile phones provides further weight to Kraft's (2006) statement that the mobile phone is the most common way for CB to occur.

TABLE 2
Safety Strategies

ID#	Safety strategies known pre-program	Safety strategies known post-program	Difference in number of strategies known from pre- to post-program
1	Block the person, delete off contact list. Total: 2	Ignore, blocking, delete contact, tell an adult or parent, and not talk on the computer until they leave. Total: 5	Increased by 3
2	Don't say anything mean, don't reply to mean messages. Total: 2	Ignore, know that it's not true, block or delete, use netiquette, hang up if it's on the phone, save text / message as evidence. Total: 6	Increased by 4
3	Don't know Total: 0	Try and ignore, block them, delete number or contact, tell someone you trust. Total: 4	Increased by 4
4	Don't talk to them online, ignore the email, tell a parent or teacher. Total: 3	Tell my parents, delete the email, use netiquette. Total: 3	Same total score, but different safety strategies listed. One strategy (delete email) had to be reviewed.
5	Don't know Total: 0	Ignore them, save the messages as evidence, tell someone you trust, don't talk to people on net that swear, block them. Total: 5	Increased by 5

In the post-program surveys there were no observable increases in the participants' immediate knowledge regarding the fact that CB is a repeated form of harassment that can occur among individuals or groups. However, the participants did add some comments regarding CB, which were not specifically related to Belsey's (2006) definition, but were addressed during the program. In particular, the participants were taught about and mentioned the types of CB that exist as defined by Willard (2006), such as impersonation. Additionally, some participants also referred to how a person may feel when being cyberbullied. Feelings were discussed during the program.

Overall, these increases in CB knowledge provide clear support that explicit teaching of students about such content does increase their knowledge of this growing problem (Bamford, 2004). Additionally, as all participants reported having some experience with CB in their school life, the study shows that it is occurring in this age group, and further attention in the literature must be directed to younger children.

The second aim of this study was to investigate if the participants' understanding of safety strategies would increase after explicit teaching. The results of the pre-program survey showed that the participants had a limited and simplistic understanding, which is consistent with previous studies (Li, 2007; Patchin & Hinduja, 2006); however, the current study addressed the issue with a younger sample. As predicted, the post-program survey results showed an increase in each participant's knowledge of safety strategies.

These results clearly show that students need to be taught these strategies explicitly if they are going to protect themselves when using electronic communication devices (Bamford, 2004). Additional verbal discussions during the program showed that young students need to be educated on what a useful safety strategy is, as many of the students came up with ideas that may not be helpful (delete the email, respond to the person). Therefore, in addition to explicitly teaching good strategies, knowledge about safety needs to be constantly reframed and reviewed.

The third and final aim of this study was to include the participants in developing an acceptable internet use policy in their school, as recommended by Brown et al. (2006). Each participant showed great delight at the thought of their ideas being heard by the staff at their school. The interest observed among the participants illustrates the importance of implementing this task, and also communicates a sense of responsibility on their behalf.

In general terms, much of the frequency data collected in this study was consistent with previous studies, reinforcing Bamford's (2004) statement that CB does exist among younger age groups. Furthermore, this study has confirmed that females are involved in CB (Smith et al., 2008; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004). Additionally, participants reported that informing adults of the CB was not a popular choice despite the fact that most felt adults would try and help. Keeping information from adults is a common finding in previous studies among older students (Agatston et al., 2007; Li, 2006; Willard, 2005).

Finally, the finding that the students who were involved in TB were also part of CB further confirmed a consistent finding in the literature that the two forms of bullying are linked (Beran & Li, 2005; Li, 2007).

There was one contrasting finding in this study. Participants in this research reported that email was the most popular form of CB, which is a direct difference to Kraft's findings (2006), which reported that mobile phones were the most popular medium for CB in Australia. However, this finding should be interpreted cautiously considering the small sample size.

This study did not specifically address the effects of CB, although discussions showed that feelings of anger and also anxiety were evident during the experience of CB, confirming the potentially devastating effects of CB.

Overall, the participants included in this study reported that they enjoyed taking part in the program. The results also demonstrated that they did improve their knowledge of both CB and safety strategies. It would prove beneficial to review the participants and their knowledge at certain points during their high school years — for example in 2 years — to see if this knowledge has had an impact on bullying and CB behaviours in their lives. Acknowledging this study was small-scale, it has yielded some important results. Future studies should continue to

address the issues concerning CB among this age group by extending this work with a larger mixed gender sample. Additionally, this study largely relied on self-report measures; future studies could include additional measures of CB and safety strategy knowledge by obtaining information from classroom teachers or parents, and behaviour observations of internet and/or mobile phone activity. Furthermore, professionals using this program in the future, or those who build on the current study, may wish to include input from Police Youth Liaison Officers to include the new legal ramifications around CB and internet behaviour that are currently being developed.

In conclusion, this study has effectively extended previous literature by showing that CB occurs in younger school populations and that explicit teaching of safety strategies and psycho-educational guidance on the features of CB is beneficial. It is essential that schools address the issue of CB with children in primary schools. Knowledge of safety strategies and CB itself is the first step to dealing with this issue and critical in protecting both children and young people from the potentially harmful effects of CB.

Endnotes

1 Contact first author via email at troy.toshack@det.nsw.edu.au for a copy of the program used.

2 For a list of their responses, please contact the first author.

References

Agatston, P.W., Kowalski, R., & Limber, S. (2007). Students' perspectives on cyber-bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *41*, 59–60.

Bamford, A. (2004, September). *Cyber-bullying*. Paper presented at AHISA Pastoral Care National Conference, Melbourne Australia.

Beckerman, L., & Nocero, J. (2003). High-tech student hate mail. *The Education Digest*, *68*(6), 37–40.

Belsey, B. (2006). Cyber-bullying: An emerging threat to the 'always on' generation. Retrieved from http://www.cyber-bullying.ca/pdf/Cyber-bullying_Article_by_Bill_Belsey.pdf

Beran, T., & Li, Q. (2005). Cyber-harassment: A study of a new method for an old behavior. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *32*, 265–277.

Berg, B.L. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Brown, K., Jackson, M., & Cassidy, W. (2006). Cyber-bullying: Developing policy to direct responses that are equitable and effective in addressing this special form of bullying. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, *57*, 1–35.

Campbell, M. A. (2005). Cyber bullying: An old problem in a new guise? *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, *15* (1), 68–76.

Traxside Youth Health Service. (2008). *Click Off Program*. Sydney, Australia: Author.

Kift, S.M. (2007). Cyber-bullying by young people: A criminal matter for psychologists? In *Proceedings Psychology making an impact: The Australian Psychological Society 42nd Annual Conference*, 228–232.

Kraft, E. (2006). Cyber-bullying: A worldwide trend of misusing technology to harass others. *WIT Transactions on Information and Communication Technologies*, *36*, 155–166.

Li, Q. (2006). Cyber-bullying in schools: A research of gender differences. *School Psychology International*, *27*, 157–170.

Li, Q. (2007). Bullying in the new playground: Research into cyber-bullying and cyber victimization. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *23*, 435–454.

Nardi, P.M. (2006). *Doing survey research: A guide to quantitative methods*. California: Pearson Education.

Patchin, J.W., & Hinduja, S. (2006). Bullies move beyond the schoolyard. A preliminary look at cyber-bullying. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *4*, 148–169.

Rigby, K. (2010). *Bullying interventions in schools. Six basic approaches*. Melbourne, Australia: ACER.

Shariff, S. (2009). *Confronting cyber-bullying. What schools need to know to control misconduct and avoid legal consequences*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, P.K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., & Tippett, N. (2008). Cyber-bullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *49*(4), 376–385.

Willard, N. (2005). *An educator's guide to cyber-bullying and cyber threats: Responding to the challenge of online social aggression, threats and distress*. Eugene, OR: Center for Safe and Responsible Use of the Internet. Retrieved March 27, 2007, from http://csriu.org and http://cyberbully.org

Willard, N. (2006). Flame retardation. *School Library Journal*. Retrieved from www.slj.com

Ybarra, M.L., & Mitchell, K.J. (2004). Youth engaging in online harassment: associations with caregiver-child relationships, internet use and personal characteristics. *Journal of Adolescence*, *27*, 319–336.

About the Author

Troy Toshack is a registered psychologist and an Associate Member of the Australian Psychological Society who holds a Bachelor of Education (Secondary) and a Bachelor of Arts (Psychology) Honours 1. Troy has experience working in private practice and as a school counsellor across a variety of areas located throughout South Western Sydney. Troy has expertise in working with children and adolescents from a wide variety of cultural backgrounds to actively support their mental health needs. In addition to contributing to the academic literature around cyber-bullying, Troy has presented on this topic to parents and the larger community. He has also published research investigating the link between motor development and socialisation in children.