SB858

DAVID Y. IGE
GOVERNOR

RACHAEL WONG, DrPH
DIRECTOR

PANKAJ BHANOT
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
P. O. Box 339
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809-0339

February 3, 2015

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable Michelle N. Kidani, Chair
Senate Committee on Education

The Honorable Suzanne Chun Oakland, Chair
Senate Committee on Human Services and Housing

FROM: Rachael Wong, DrPH, Director

SUBJECT: **S.B. 858 – RELATING TO AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAMS FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS**

Hearing: Wednesday, February 4, 2015 1:30 PM
Conference Room 229, State Capitol

PURPOSE: The purpose of this bill is to establish a five-year evidence-based physical-activity and nutritional-education pilot program within the A+ Program in Hawaii's public elementary schools. This bill also makes appropriation for such program.

DEPARTMENT'S POSITION: The Department of Human Services (DHS) supports the intent of the bill provided that any appropriation to DHS does not adversely impact the Department's priorities set forth in the Executive Budget submitted by the Governor. The DHS provides comment for the committees' consideration.

The DHS subsidizes the cost of A+ Program fees for children of employed Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) eligible families. The number of children covered per month is approximately 8,081. This measure proposes an additional cost of $1.00 per child per month to fund the physical-activity and nutritional-education program within the A+ Program.

The DHS would require an appropriation of $77,000 annually to cover the additional cost to enable the DHS to continue to subsidize the entire cost of A+ Program fees for employed TANF eligible families. However, should this measure pass with a different proposed cost, the DHS would require an adjusted appropriation amount based on the new cost per child per month.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this bill.

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: EDU Testimony
Cc: tabalos@hsta.org
Subject: *Submitted testimony for SB858 on Feb 4, 2015 13:30PM*
Date: Tuesday, February 03, 2015 10:25:25 AM

SB858
Submitted on: 2/3/2015
Testimony for EDU/HSH on Feb 4, 2015 13:30PM in Conference Room CR229

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Tanya Abalos	Hawaii State Teachers Association	Support	No

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: EDU Testimony
Cc: nredfeather@kohalacenter.org
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB858 on Feb 4, 2015 13:30PM
Date: Friday, January 30, 2015 9:01:16 PM

SB858
Submitted on: 1/30/2015
Testimony for EDU/HSH on Feb 4, 2015 13:30PM in Conference Room CR229

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Nancy Redfeather	Hawaii Island School Garden Network	Support	No

Comments: Children today have very few instructional hours of Physical Activity or Nutrition education per year, yet children's health today is at risk. 30 % of children entering Kindergarten in Hawai'i are overweight of obese. Children are expected for the first time to have a shorter life than their parents. Children's health directly affects their attendance in school and their ability to learn. These classes could happen after school in one of the 195 school gardens in public schools in Hawai'i.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

HPCA
HAWAI'I PRIMARY CARE ASSOCIATION

Senate Committee on Education
The Hon. Michelle N. Kidani, Chair
The Hon. Breene Harimoto, Vice Chair

Senate Committee on Human Services and Housing
The Hon. Suzanne Chun Oakland, Chair
The Hon. Josh Green, Vice Chair

Testimony on Senate Bill 858

Relating to Afterschool Programs for Elementary School Students
Submitted by Robert Hirokawa, Chief Executive Officer
February 4, 2015, 1:30 pm, Room 229

The Hawai'i Primary Care Association, which represents community health centers in Hawai'i, supports Senate Bill 858, which establishes a five year evidence based activity and nutrition education pilot in Hawaii's public elementary schools.

The HPCA is a staunch believer in the social determinants of health, those economic and social conditions that influence an individual and a community's health status. These conditions serve as risk factors endemic to a person's living and working environment, rather than their behavioral or genetic histories. Factors such as home life, income, education, access to recreation and healthy foods, and housing environments can and do have measurable impacts on a person and a community, both in health and financial outcomes. Our youth need healthy, safe after-school opportunities that engage and connect them with positive experiences and outcomes in their lives. The health of our communities and the health of our future largely depend on the environments we provide our keiki to grow up in. The REACH program created by this measure is a good start to address this vital need for our youth while addressing social determinants of health.

This bill speaks directly to several very important determinants of health. It seeks to bolster (1) nutrition information, (2) physical activity, and (3) the educational development of Hawaii's schoolchildren. For these reasons we support this measure.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

ADD 735 BISHOP STREET, SUITE 230 HONOLULU, HI 96813 TEL 808.536.8442 FAX 808.524.0347 WEB WWW.HAWAIIPCA.NET

MOILIILI COMMUNITY CENTER

February 2, 2015

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
Senator Michelle N. Kidani, Chair
Senator Breene Harimoto, Vice Chair

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN SERVICES AND HOUSING
Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland, Chair
Senator Josh Green, Vice Chair

Re: Letter of Support for HB 858 Fun 5 Programs

This letter of support is for the afterschool Fun 5 Program, Senate Bill 858. As an advocate of afterschool programs, this bill will reinforce and educate young children to participate in physical activity and nutrition program during after school hours.

As school aged children face little time in school for health and physical activity, the Fun 5 program is an ideal place to promote and enhance the "whole" student to learn healthy snack choices and create fun and physical movement through dance, indoor and outdoor physical education and more.

Data has been proven, increasing awareness in wellness and promoting more time for physical movement, decreases childhood obesity. Hawaii's children deserve an opportunity to learn and grow through the Fun 5 program.

In support of HB 858, please consider the passage of this bill.

Sincerely,

Brenda Nakamura

Children & Families Director
E-mail: brendan@moiliilicc.org

To the House Commitee on Finance
In Support of S.B. No. 858
February 3, 2015
"Written Testimony Only"

To Committee Chairs, Senator Michelle Kidani and Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland and Members of the Committee:

The YMCA of Honolulu currently provides After School A+ Programs at 52 of the DOE School Sites, caring for nearly 7,000 children each school day. We have implemented Fun5 as an significant part of our program because we recognize the importance of daily physical activity and the need to foster healthy nutritional eating habits. Fun 5 provides nationally recognized, evidence-based curriculum, quality staff training opportunities, and valuable resource and support to providers of the After School A+ Program.

We support S.B. 858 because:

1. Fun5 provides high quality program at a reasonable cost.
2. Fun5 provides all children, particularly vulnerable groups of children, many of whom are from disadvantaged areas or families, with quality physical activity and nutrition-based activities – all of which promotes healthy habits.
3. It institutionalizes within the DOE's After School A+ Program system, the implementation of a quality physical activity curriculum and nutrition activities that meet minimum standards consistently throughout all program sites, statewide.
4. It will insure that those who work directly with the children each day receive a minimum of training on how to work with young children, how to get children to engage in physical activities, how to present healthy nutrition information, and what to say to children that encourages everyone to participate without regard to skill level or experience, all of which insures the success of the program.
5. We know first-hand that the Fun5 program works – children love it, front line staff feel competent in implementing it, and it is inclusive of all children regardless of their skill/development levels.

As a leader and advocate for children, you know that research clearly shows that children who are physically active: (1) do better academically; (2) have higher attendance levels than those who are not; and (3) are generally healthier, more confident, more attentive than their peers who are not.

We strongly urge your support of this bill.

Mahalo, for your attention to the needs of our keiki and for this opportunity to submit testimony on behalf of this important cause.

Respectfully,

Diane Tabangay
Executive Director of Children's Programs
YMCA of Honolulu
dtabangay@ymcahonolulu.org; 808 541-5470

Hawai'i Afterschool Alliance
841 Bishop Street – Suite 301
Honolulu, HI 96813
www.kahoomiki.org

Testimony to be presented before the
Senate Committee on Education and the
Senate Committee on Human Services and Housing
Wednesday February 4, 2015.
State Capitol, Room 229

by Paula Adams
Executive Director
Hawai'i Afterschool Alliance

In Support of SB 858: Relating to afterschool programs for elementary school students.

To Chairman, Senator Michelle Kidani, and Chairman, Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland, and members of the committees:

My name is Paula Adams, Executive Director of the Hawai'i Afterschool Alliance. The Alliance and I strongly support this measure. Senate Bill 858 seeks to establish and fund a nutrition and physical activity program within HIDOE A+ Afterschool Program in Hawaii's public elementary schools. This program will institutionalize an evidence-base physical activity and nutrition program during the A+ afterschool hours.

A physical activity and nutrition program called Fun 5 has been implemented in the A+ program since 2003. In those years private business and foundations have funded the program but there is a public need that Fun 5 is institutionalized within the structure of the A+ afterschool program.

The Fun 5 program have been proven to be effective in increasing the level of physical activity and the consumption of fruits and vegetables creating healthy habits among the A+ afterschool students.

By promoting physical activity and healthy nutrition, Fun 5 works as a childhood obesity prevention program. Childhood obesity has more than tripled in the past 30 years. The percentage of children aged 6–11 years in the United States who were obese increased from 7 percent in 1980 to nearly 20 percent in 2008. In that year, more than one third of children and adolescents were overweight or obese. Recent increases in obesity prevalence rates have raised the level to epidemic proportions among US children. Childhood obesity has both immediate and long-term effects on health and well-being, including a markedly increased risk for cardiovascular disease, diabetes and cancer. Recent data show that the usual diet of today's children includes foods high in saturated fat, high in sweetener calories, and low in fruits and vegetables. In addition, most elementary school children do not engage in moderate-vigorous physical activity for any extended period. These two factors are major contributors to the obesity epidemic. Both are directly addressed through Fun 5, first by involving the children in 30 minutes or more of moderate-vigorous physical activity five days a week, and second by engaging them in preparing and enjoying healthy snacks as a requisite for healthy living. Schools play a particularly critical role by establishing a safe and supportive environment with policies and practices that support healthy behaviors. Schools also provide opportunities for students to learn about and practice healthy eating and physical activity behaviors.

In conclusion, I hope the afterschool students in this state will get the support they need to have the opportunity to be healthy and active.

We ***strongly support*** SB 858 and respectfully urge the passage of this bill. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Paula Adams
Tel/fax: 808-380-1602

Testimony of Mark Zeug
President, Kahoomiki
To the Senate Committee on Education
In Support of SB 858
February 4, 2015

To Chairman, Senator Michelle Kidani, and members of the committee:

I am president of a small non-profit that manages the Fun 5 physical activity and nutrition program that is now part of A+ in more than 170 elementary schools statewide.

We support this bill because it will institutionalize within the A+ system (1) a requirement that physical activity and nutrition information be instituted on a regular and sustainable basis, and perhaps more importantly, (2) insure that those who work directly with the children each day – known as group leaders – receive a minimum of training on how to work with young children, how to get children to engage in physical activities, how to present healthy nutrition information, and what to say to children that encourages everyone to participate without regard to skill level or experience.

As you may know, there are approximately 20,000 Hawaii children currently enrolled in A+ statewide; afterschool these children remain at school – supervised by group leaders – until they are picked up by their parents or guardians. There are more than 800 group leaders statewide. They come from all walks of life, but many are students or others seeking part-time work to supplement their income. Turnover is high – perhaps as high as 50 percent per year. And many have limited experience or training in working with groups of children.

For the past seven years, Kahoomiki has been providing that training through the Fun 5 program – we bring the group leaders in for four hours of intense hands-on training in the fall, and another two hours of follow-up training in the spring. We utilize an evidence-based physical activity curriculum known as SPARK which was developed by the University of California at San Diego. The focus is on getting every child to participate, no matter what their skill level or experience. Games and activities are employed that are non competitive and non judgmental. Everybody participates, everybody has fun, no one is left out, and no one is discriminated against because of their own limitations.

In addition to the training, we provide play equipment – balls, hula hoops, parachutes, cones, etc. – because the play equipment used during the school day by the teachers cannot be used afterschool by A+; A+ must have its own equipment. We have been providing that through Fun 5. We also provide manuals for games and healthy nutrition, along with equipment and training for making healthy snacks.

In the past, this program has been funded by grants from private business and foundations. But in recent years we have experienced strong sentiment that the full cost of this program needs to be included within the A+ program itself, primarily because of the very basic organizational needs which we provide to A+ – i.e., training, equipment, agendas and manuals. These are basic to the success of A+. And it is very cost effective – about $1.50 per child per month.

The important part of this application is the training – without the regular training sessions, there is no program. The group leaders are generally very enthusiastic about working with the children, but without the training we provide, and the agenda of activities we expose them to, they often are left to their own resources regarding games, nutrition information and participation activities.

Just as important is the implementation – Fun 5 is designed to be implemented at least 30 minutes a day five days a week. But we know from our own research that this does not always happen – that inexperience and lack of training of group leaders, along with pressure from parents and others for the children to spend more time doing homework, causes the implementation level to be significantly less in some schools. That's why we believe that a program like Fun 5 needs to be institutionalized within A+.

We know Fun 5 works – we have twice done evaluative research to test the involvement of our children versus those who are not involved. And we can say with certainty that through Fun 5, obesity rates among participating children do not rise. That is, compared to the general Hawaii youth population – where the obesity rate is continuing to rise – we know that through Fun 5, at the very least we can stop that progression. We also know that if we can increase the frequency of implementing the Fun 5 program so that it is implemented each day, those obesity rates actually go down.

These two things are paramount – the physical activity program utilized by A+ must be (1) an evidence-based program that has been tested, not only in Hawaii but in other locations. And (2) it must encourage maximum and universal participation; that is, it must be economical to implement and it must be utilized on a regular basis, at least 30 minutes a day five days a week.

There is plenty of very credible national research which clearly shows that children who are physically active:

1. Do better academically than those who are not.
2. Have higher attendance levels than those who are not.
3. Are generally healthier and more attentive than those who are not.

We also know that when children participate in an afterschool program which they feel is fun, one they look forward to, that they (1) have higher educational aspirations, (2) are better able to make friends, (3) are less likely to be involved in crime or violence, and (4) have greater expectations for the future.

So we strongly urge your support of this bill. Thank you for your interest and the opportunity to address this committee.

Mark Zeug
President, Kaho`omiki

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: EDU Testimony
Cc: tutu4eva@gmail.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB858 on Feb 4, 2015 13:30PM
Date: Tuesday, February 03, 2015 8:59:24 AM

SB858
Submitted on: 2/3/2015
Testimony for EDU/HSH on Feb 4, 2015 13:30PM in Conference Room CR229

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Donna Ede	Individual	Comments Only	No

Comments: Testimony in Support SB858 RELATING TO AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAMS FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS My name is Donna Rego Ede, I retired from the Department of Education (DOE) in December of 2007, as the State Educational Specialist for Health and Physical Education. My career included teaching health and physical education, coaching league and high school soccer, and leading summer recreation programs. I continue to be active in many community organizations involved in the promotion of healthy nutrition and active lifestyles. Throughout Hawaii there are approximately 20,000 children enrolled in A+ after school programs. Funding A+ providers and requiring that they use a nationally recognized supplemental curriculum including healthy nutrition and physical activity, would be a valuable investment towards positive health outcomes for our keiki. Research tells us that physically active children achieve, aspire and exhibit the positive behaviors that all of us want our children to achieve. The only place children can learn or practice these behaviors is at home, school or in their community. The A+ after school setting is the perfect arena to support schools in practicing their message of healthy nutrition and active lifestyles. Providing appropriate equipment, supplies and program materials, as well as in-servicing A+ leaders in healthy nutrition and appropriate physical activity, are paramount to the systemic success of this effort. I further ask that the funding requested for SB858 will in no way impact present or future allocations made to the DOE Supplemental Budget. I appreciate your time and effort to enhance the quality of the after school programs in the State of Hawaii in the crucial area of healthy nutrition and physical activity, and I ask that you support SB858.

Telephone:
(808) 534-1514

Fax:
(808) 538-3075

JAMES HOCHBERG
ATTORNEY AT LAW

Bishop Street Tower, Suite 2100
700 Bishop Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

via USPS: P.O. Box 3226
Honolulu, HI 96801

Digital Pager:
(808) 256-7382

Email Address:
Jim@JamesHochbergLaw.com

February 3, 2015

Senate Committee on Education
Hearing Monday February 4, 2015 at 1:30 p.m.
Conference Room 229, 415 South Beretania Street

Senate Committee on Education
Chair: Michelle Kidani
Vice Chair: Breene Harimoto
Members: Suzanne Chun Oakland, Clarence K. Nishihara, Donovan M. Dela Cruz, Laura H. Thielen, Gilbert S.C. Keith-Agaran, Sam Slom and Ronald D. Kouchi

Re: Testimony In Opposition To and Commenting On SB 845, SB865, SB858 and All Other Bullying Bills

Dear Chair, Vice Chair and Members of the Senate Education Committee:

This testimony is submitted in opposition to and to provide comments with regard to SB 845, SB865, SB858 and all other bullying bills. I have been licensed to practice law in Hawaii since 1984. Since 1999 I have been an allied attorney with Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF), providing pro bono legal services in support of First Amendment Religious Liberties rights. In concert with ADF, I litigate cases implicating infringement on First Amendment rights. All of the bills addressed in this testimony raise First Amendment concerns because they apply to speech and not merely actions. Further, despite their titles about protecting ALL students, they instead only protect members of certain classes of students. And they leave unprotected ex-gay students, despite the fact that the ex-gay community may be the most bullied community in America.

Attached please find a document entitled "Anti-Bullying Policy Yardstick" published by Alliance Defending Freedom. Attached also please find a model bill for your consideration relating to bullying issues. It is also produced by Alliance Defending Freedom. Finally, I attach an article that discusses a study conducted by a professor at the University of Texas that found that anti-bullying policies do not curb bullying, but rather lead to more bullying than existed prior to enactment of the policy. That article can be found here:

http://www.uta.edu/news/releases/2013/09/jeong-bullying.php

The actual published study can be found here and is also attached:

http://www.hindawi.com/journals/jcrim/2013/735397/

That study included the following conclusion:

> Surprisingly, **bullying prevention had a negative effect on peer victimization**. Contrary to our hypothesis, students attending schools with bullying prevention programs were more likely to have experienced peer victimization, compared to those attending schools without bullying prevention programs. It is possible that bullies have learned a variety of antibullying techniques but chose not to practice what they have learned from the program. Sometimes, bullies maintain their dominant social status among peers in school. As a result, the preventive strategies may become ineffective.
>
> The other preventive measure, the Safe Passage program, had no effect on the likelihood of peer victimization. As a program designed to support at-risk adolescents, the program's goal is to create a safe school environment by reducing various school problems [52]. However, we did not find any significant impact on peer victimization. Without knowing specific details of the program, it is difficult to assess the effectiveness of the Safe Passage program.

Please apply the attached yardstick to each of these bills It will expose the deficiencies in each Feel free to adopt the model bill that is also provided with this testimony.

Sincerely,

JAMES HOCHBERG

Attachments
JH/lz

J:\Probono\Legislative Testimony\2015-2-3 testimony in opposition to SB 845, SB865, SB858 and other bullying bills.wpd

ALLIANCE DEFENDING
FREEDOM

Anti-Bullying Policy Yardstick

At Alliance Defending Freedom, we often field questions about what makes an anti-bullying policy good, and what makes one bad. Over the past few years, we have reviewed and commented on proposed anti-bullying laws and policies all across the United States. Gleaned from this experience, and from our knowledge of the constitutionally-protected rights of public school students and teachers, we offer below our Anti-Bullying Policy Yardstick, which discusses "good" and "bad" approaches to the top ten most common components of anti-bullying policies/laws.

GOOD ANTI-BULLYING POLICY	BAD ANTI-BULLYING POLICY
1) Definition of "Bullying":	
Good: • Precise definitions; not overly vague. • Addresses verbal expression traditionally not protected by the First Amendment. A *good* policy provides a precise definition of "bullying" that regulates bullying conduct. To the extent such a policy covers verbal expression, it must only cover expression that the courts have traditionally treated as unprotected in the school context (i.e., lewd, indecent, obscene, advocating illegal conduct, intended to incite an immediate breach of the peace, or severe, persistent, and pervasive use of threatening words that objectively inflict injury). A *good* policy also focuses on the acts or words said by the alleged bully rather than the intent or motives behind the actions.	Bad: • Uses vague and overly broad definitions of bullying. • Restricts student expression traditionally protected by the First Amendment. • Uses vague, overbroad terms like "offensive" and "emotional distress." A *bad* policy provides a definition of "bullying" using terms so vague and overbroad that it fails to provide students with adequate notice of what it prohibits, allows for unbridled discretion in enforcement decisions, and covers student expression that is protected by the First Amendment. Examples of such policies are those that: use vague and overbroad terms like "emotional distress," "offensive," "annoying," "uncomfortable," "alarming," and "mental harm" to describe what is prohibited; punish the alleged bully based on how the victim perceives the bully's acts/words or how the victim "feels," without any inquiry into whether the reaction is objectively reasonable; and focuses on the thoughts and motives of the alleged bully rather than the actual acts/words.

2) First Amendment Protection:	
Good: • Does not apply to religious, political, philosophical, or other protected student speech. A *good* policy includes a provision stating that it does not apply to expression protected by the First Amendment. Such a provision should expressly state that the bullying policy does not prohibit expression of religious, philosophical, or political views, provided that it otherwise does not meet the definition of bullying and does not cause a substantial and material disruption of the work of the school.	Bad: • Lacks exceptions for religious, political, or philosophical student speech that is protected by the First Amendment. A *bad* policy lacks a provision or statement that it does not apply to expression protected by the First Amendment. Such a policy becomes even worse when it uses vague and overbroad terms that imperil protected expression. *See* Point No. 1, above.
3) Punishing Based on Intent or Motive:	
Good: • Defines bullying based upon conduct or action, not upon motive or intent. • Objective, not subjective, definition of bullying. A *good* policy avoids any consideration of the motive or intent of the alleged bully (i.e. whether the alleged bullying dislikes all people with a specific characteristic). A good policy focuses on eliminating the wrongful bullying *conduct*, by providing sufficiently objective definitions and guidelines of what constitutes "bullying." Such a policy is based on the understanding that punishing thoughts and motives is outside of the school's proper role; punishing wrong conduct falls within it. If the conduct constitutes bullying on an objective basis, then there is no need for any further inquiry.	Bad: • Defines bullying based on motive or intent, not merely the conduct involved. • Examines the thoughts and beliefs of the alleged bully. • Includes "re-education" of persons accused of bullying to change the way they think. A *bad* policy authorizes punishment of the alleged bully on the basis of his motives or intent. This dangerous approach invites all kinds of inquiry and invasion into the private thoughts and beliefs of students, and permits punishing students based on those thoughts and beliefs. Further, such an approach opens the door to improper and unlawful attempts to "re-educate" students and to help them "think" or "believe" the "right thing."

4) Categorizing vs. Banning All Bullying:	
Good: • Prohibits bullying of all students. • Does not define bullying based upon the characteristics of the person being bullied. A *good* policy bans all bullying, regardless of the reason for the bullying. Anti-bullying policies exist to protect the ability of *every* student to receive a quality education. Thus, a good policy does not prohibit bullying based on certain characteristics, but rather bans all bullying so that every student who is bullied benefits from its protection.	Bad: • Prohibits bullying against students based upon certain characteristics only (i.e. race, sexual orientation). • Does not prohibit bullying against all students. A *bad* policy offers special protection to students who are bullied based on certain characteristics, but provides no protection to students who are bullied based on characteristics not listed in the policy. It is improper for bullying policies to favor some students over others in this way, especially considering that their primary purpose is to ensure all students receive a quality education.
5) Teacher Liability:	
Good: • Avoids mandatory reporting requirements that create liability risks. • Provides clear guidelines for teachers to follow when an act of bullying is observed. A *good* policy avoids treating teachers and school employees as mandatory reporters of bullying or, if it imposes such a requirement, defines bullying in a clear and precise manner to minimize the possibility that teachers and administrators will be held liable for failing to report bullying behavior. Teachers and staff who fear liability are likely to over-report bullying, leading to students being wrongfully accused of bullying and a drain on school resources due to the need to investigate every false report.	Bad: • Requires teachers and staff to report possible bullying without providing clear and precise definitions. • Exposes teachers and staff to civil liability. A *bad* policy defines bullying using vague and overbroad terms while treating teachers and school employees as mandatory reporters of bullying. A mandatory reporting requirement, without an objective standard of what constitutes bullying, may expose teachers and administrators to civil liability if they fail to report behavior that a jury later determines was bullying that should have been reported.

6) Cyber-bullying and Off-Campus Speech:	
Good: • Respects the limits of a school's authority to only regulate on-campus activity. A *good* policy avoids regulating off-campus student speech. Such a policy will limit its bullying prohibition to bullying behavior, including "cyber-bullying" (i.e., bullying via electronic means), that occurs on school premises, at school-sponsored functions or activities, or while students are being transported by any means of transportation provided or supported by the school.	Bad: • Gives school officials authority to punish words or actions that occur off-campus. A *bad* policy regulates off-campus student speech. This problem often arises in the context of prohibitions on cyber-bullying. For example, a policy may overreach by banning all electronic communications that meet its bullying definition, rather than limiting the prohibition to electronic communications that occur on campus. A policy that regulates off-campus speech or behavior opens the school to potential legal liability for off-campus bullying even though the school has no control over it.
7) Promoting Political Agendas:	
Good: • Does not single out groups for special protection; rather, prohibits bullying against all students. • Does not use materials or lessons plans from homosexual activist groups. A *good* policy avoids promoting any political agenda. It does so by prohibiting *any* student from bullying *any* child for *any* reason, rather than extending bullying protections to favored students on the basis of particular characteristics. The latter types of policies, which typically prohibit bullying based on sexual orientation and gender identity, open the door to the advancement of the political agenda of homosexual activist groups in schools. A good policy will also, to the extent that it requires instruction on bullying, limit the instruction to a description of bullying behavior, rather than the characteristics of bullying victims.	Bad: • Singles out "sexual orientation," "gender identity," etc. for special protection. • Requires tolerance training and similar programs using materials and lesson plans crafted by homosexual activist groups. A *bad* policy promotes a particular political agenda, typically that of homosexual activist groups. These groups have orchestrated a nationwide campaign to promote homosexual behavior to impressionable, school-age children. Anti-bullying policies that single out "sexual orientation" and "gender identity" for special protection stand at the forefront of this effort. The adoption of such policies has resulted in public schools subjecting young students to books, lessons, and programs designed to advance the homosexual agenda and undermine traditional notions of sexuality and the family. Policies that *require* instruction on bullying are problematic, as they often result in the inclusion of materials promoting homosexual behavior.

8) Parental Notice:	
Good: • Provides notice to parents if child has been bullied or has been accused of bullying. A *good* policy provides for notice to parents whether their child has been accused of bullying, or is the recipient, and gives opportunity for parental involvement in the complaint process related to their children. Such involvement properly respects parents' fundamental constitutional right to direct the upbringing and education of their children.	Bad: • Allows questioning of students being bullied or those accused of bullying without parent notification and consent. A *bad* policy provides for no, or very limited, parental involvement when a complaint has been made that their child engaged in, or is on the receiving end of, bullying behavior. This lack of parental involvement tramples the fundamental constitutional right of parents to direct the upbringing and education of their children.
9) Anonymous Complaints:	
Good: • Investigates anonymous complaints only when good cause or threat of imminent physical harm exists. A *good* policy allows an investigation or disciplinary action to be taken on the basis of an anonymous complaint only under rare circumstances, such as when good cause exists for filing anonymously, or school officials have good reason to believe that a student may be at imminent risk of physical harm.	Bad: • Investigates all anonymous complaints without evidence that the complaint is not intended to harass other students. A *bad* policy allows an investigation or disciplinary action to be taken solely on the basis of an anonymous complaint. Such an approach encourages the use of the complaint process as a tool to harass students.
10) Private Schools (state statutes only):	
Good: • State anti-bullying law that exempts private schools and respects their autonomy. A *good* law includes an express provision limiting it to public schools. Imposing anti-bullying laws on private schools interferes with the private interests and rights of non-public schools, and the rights of parents who choose to have their children educated at such institutions.	Bad: • State law that requires private schools to comply with its requirements. A *bad* law expressly provides that it applies to private schools, or fails to include a provision limiting it to public schools. Applying anti-bullying laws that mandate instruction on bullying to private schools is problematic, as they would infringe on the schools' rights to set their own curriculum, and on parents' rights to have their children educated according to a non-public-school program.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS ARLINGTON

NEWS CENTER

Youth more likely to be bullied at schools with anti-bullying programs, UT Arlington researcher finds

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Media Contact: Bridget Lewis, Office:817-272-3317, Cell:214-577-9094, blewis@uta.edu

News Topics: education, environment, liberal arts, mental health, students

Anti-bullying initiatives have become standard at schools across the country, but a new UT Arlington study finds that students attending those schools may be more likely to be a victim of bullying than children at schools without such programs.

Seokjin Jeong

The findings run counter to the common perception that bullying prevention programs can help protect kids from repeated harassment or physical and emotional attacks.

"One possible reason for this is that the students who are victimizing their peers have learned the language from these anti-bullying campaigns and programs," said Seokjin Jeong, an assistant professor of criminology and criminal justice at UT Arlington and lead author of the study, which was published in the *Journal of Criminology*.

"The schools with interventions say, 'You shouldn't do this,' or 'you shouldn't do that.' But through the programs, the students become highly exposed to what a bully is and they know what to do or say when questioned by parents or teachers," Jeong said.

The study suggested that future direction should focus on more sophisticated strategies rather than just implementation of bullying prevention programs along with school security measures such as guards, bag and locker searches or metal detectors. Furthermore, given that bullying is a relationship problem, researchers need to better identify the bully-victim dynamics in order to develop prevention policies accordingly, Jeong said.

Communities across various race, ethnicity, religion and socio-economic classes can benefit from such important, relevant

Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice research, said Beth Wright, dean of the UT Arlington College of Liberal Arts. "This important discovery will result in improvements in health, in learning, and in relationships, with unlimited positive impact," Wright said.

A growing body of research shows that students who are exposed to physical or emotional bullying experience a significantly increased risk of anxiety, depression, confusion, lowered self-esteem and suicide. In addition to school environmental factors, researchers wanted to know what individual-level factors played a key role in students who are bullied by peers in school.

For their study, Jeong and his co-author, Byung Hyun Lee, a doctoral student in criminology at Michigan State University, analyzed data from the Health Behavior in School-Aged Children 2005-2006 U.S. study. The HBSC study has been conducted every four years since 1985 and is sponsored by the World Health Organization. The sample consisted of 7,001 students, ages 12 to 18, from 195 different schools.

The data preceded the highly publicized, 2010 "It Gets Better" campaign founded by syndicated columnist and author Dan Savage and popularized by YouTube videos featuring anti-bullying testimonials from prominent advocates.

The UT Arlington team found that older students were less likely to be victims of bullying than younger students, with serious problems of bullying occurring among sixth-, seventh- and eighth-graders. The most pervasive bullying occurred at the high school level.

Boys were more likely than girls to be victims of physical bullying, but girls were more likely to be victims of emotional bullying. A lack of involvement and support from parents and teachers was likely to increase the risk of bullying victimization. These findings are all consistent with prior studies.

Notably, researchers found that race or ethnicity was not a factor in whether students were bullied.

The University of Texas at Arlington is a comprehensive research institution of more than 33,000 students and more than 2,200 faculty members in the heart of North Texas. It is the second largest institution in The University of Texas System. Visit www.uta.edu to learn more.

###

The University of Texas at Arlington is an Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action employer.

News Topics

admissions alumni architecture Arlington art astronomy awards biology business chemistry classes College Park Center commencement communications community service computer science economics education employment energy engineering environment faculty film food genetics geology giving global Greek Life health and fitness history humanities immigration innovation Internet labs lectures liberal arts manufacturing Maverick Speakers Series medicine mental health music nursing physics politics psychology recreation religion research robotics science social work sports staff student life students sustainability transportation urban and public affairs visual arts volunteer weather

Events

Maverick Boot Camp
Tue, Feb 3 – 6:30 am

Walk-In Hours - The Career Development Center - 9:00AM - 11:45AM
Tue, Feb 3 – 9:00 am

The Price of Manifest Destiny: Maps relating to Wars in the Southwest
Tue, Feb 3 – 9:00 am

Art Exhibition in The Gallery at UTA: Sylvia Plachy & Gyorgy Beck
Tue, Feb 3 – 10:00 am

Intro to Weight Training
Tue, Feb 3 – 10:00 am

Pop-Up Advising: Blackboard How-To
Tue, Feb 3 – 12:30 pm

Renew, Relax, Revive
Tue, Feb 3 – 12:45 pm

Maverick PowerLifting: Building the Foundation for Total Strength
Tue, Feb 3 – 1:00 pm

Census date
Wed, Feb 4 – All Day

A Quick Look at Engineering Student and Faculty Achievements
Wed, Feb 4 – 7:00 am

→ All Events
News Resources
News Release Archive
In The News Archive
Video
Publications
Internal Communications
For The Media
Contact Media Relations
Office of the President
Fast Facts
Maps
University Communications

Hindawi Publishing Corporation
Journal of Criminology
Volume 2013, Article ID 735397, 10 pages
http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/735397

Hindawi

Research Article

A Multilevel Examination of Peer Victimization and Bullying Preventions in Schools

Seokjin Jeong[1] and Byung Hyun Lee[2]

[1] *Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, University of Texas at Arlington, P.O. Box 19595, Arlington, TX 76019, USA*
[2] *Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA*

Correspondence should be addressed to Seokjin Jeong; sjjeong@uta.edu

Received 4 March 2013; Revised 20 May 2013; Accepted 28 May 2013

Academic Editor: Christopher Schreck

The goal of this study is twofold: (i) to develop an explanatory model to examine the relationship between school environment/climate and peer victimization and (ii) to determine whether previous models of preventive strategies in a single school or district could be expanded to the nationally representative sample of adolescents across multiple schools. The analyses in the current study are based on data from the Health Behavior in School-Aged Children (HBSC) 2005-2006 US study, and the sample consists of 7,001 students from 195 different schools. The findings reveal that students attending schools in which bullying prevention programs are implemented are more likely to have experienced peer victimization, compared to those attending schools without bullying prevention. Study limitations and implications for future research are discussed.

1. Introduction

Although many studies suggest that there is a decline in various types of peer victimization among school children [1, 2], bullying remains a serious problem in schools today [3–5]. Approximately 1.5 million school-aged adolescents (i.e., ages 12 to 18) report that they have been victimized by violence while at school [6]. Furthermore, 75 percent of public school principals in the United States indicate that their schools reported one or more violent incidents to the police, and 25 percent of public schools reported school bullying on a daily or weekly basis [6].

A growing body of research has supported the premise that experiencing school violence has devastating effects on youth [7–13]. For example, victims have experienced a significantly increased risk of internalizing and somatic symptoms, such as anxiety, depression, confusion, lowered self-esteem, and suicidal ideation [7, 10, 11]. Further, they are more likely to perceive a lack of support from peers and parents and tend to be isolated from social interaction with others [10]. In light of this reality, a variety of bullying prevention and intervention programs have been implemented and examined for their effectiveness [14–16]. Although these studies have examined varying levels of strategies, targets, and participants, the majority of them have demonstrated that comprehensive and whole-school efforts yield promising results for reducing bullying within school grounds.

The conditions of school environment, prevention/intervention programs, and situational factors complement or interact with individual-level characteristics to influence peer victimization [17, 18]. Despite a range of ecological and contextual factors that are accountable for bullying involvement among adolescents (e.g., individual empathy, peer influence, family environment, teacher support), it still remains important to understand victim characteristics that are predictive of peer victimization. Previous studies of peer victimization, mostly based on a single dimension (i.e., individual-level or school-level predictor), have been limited in assessing the impact of bullying prevention because they ignore possible contributions of other ecological contexts in the surrounding environment. Relative to our concern about peer victimization and the need for promoting a safe school environment, only a small number of studies have examined the different ecological contexts of victimization (e.g., individual, peer, family, school) simultaneously. Thus,

the main purpose of the current study is to examine the impact of multiple levels of ecological influence on peer victimization. Few researchers have examined individual- and school-level predictors' influence on different forms of peer victimization. To date, the current study examines whether these predictors (i.e., demographic characteristics, parental or peer support, school climate, and implementation of prevention programs) show a significant effect on multiple forms of peer victimization (i.e., physical, emotional, or both physical and emotional).

2. Prior Research on Peer Victimization

2.1. School Bullying and Peer Victimization. Bullying can be difficult to conceptualize given the multifaceted nature of the violence involved. There is no simple explanation for which factors contribute to bullying [12, 19]. A number of studies have relied on Olweus' (1993) [11] conceptual definition, in which bullying occurs whenever a student "is exposed repeatedly, over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students" [11, page 9]. Using this definition, bullying may be further characterized as the presence of (i) a power imbalance; (ii) intense intimidation; and (iii) a harmful effect on the victim [11, 19]. Thus, school bullying may be defined as physical and/or emotional harm inflicted by other students within the geographical boundaries of a school ground [11]. The forms of school bullying range from teasing, taunting, or calling names to hitting, kicking, or taking/destroying others' belongings [11]. Studies of school bullying suggest that a significant number of students have been victims of school bullying [11, 20–22]. Approximately 8 percent to 41 percent of students reported being teased in a mean way or being hit, kicked, and/or pushed.

Bullying has detrimental effects on victims' well-being. First, the association between school bullying and victims' physical/psychological well-being and academic maladjustment is well documented [23–29]. For example, victims of school bullying are more likely to suffer psychological maladjustment, including sadness, depression, loneliness, and low self-esteem [23, 24, 26, 29]. In addition, a significant association is found between peer victimization and extreme emotional responses such as suicidal ideation and suicide attempts [25, 29]. Lastly, victimization can lead to interpersonal and academic difficulties at school. Bullied victims are more likely to experience relational problems with their peers, to be rejected by their peers, to feel aversion toward school, and to receive lower academic grades [23, 27].

2.2. Individual-Level Risk and Protective Factors. Among a number of risk and protective factors, a myriad of studies found that individual-level characteristics (i.e., age and race) are important sources of influence associated with peer victimization [24, 30–35]. With respect to race, minority youth are more frequently victimized by peers at school than are members of dominant racial groups [24, 32]. Research also supports the notion that risk of peer victimization decreases with age [30, 32, 35]. Specifically, high-school students are less vulnerable to bullying victimization compared to elementary- and middle-school students. Further, the study by Graham et al. (2003) [24] examined the effect of gender and found that girls are more likely than boys to be bullied at school and to identify themselves as victims. However, types of victimization differ between boys and girls. While boys are more susceptible to physical victimization, girls are more susceptible to emotional or verbal victimization (e.g., rumor-spreading or gossiping) [36]. Finally, considerable research suggests that family and peer group contexts can be risk or protective factors in bullying victimization; both family and peer group contexts are significantly associated with students' experience of peer victimization [26, 37]. For example, students who are strongly rejected by their peers are seen as easy targets of school bullying [37]. The results from several prior studies also indicate that students who lack parental supervision and support tend to be more victimized than those who do not [26].

2.3. School-Level Risk and Protective Factors. In addition to individual-level characteristics, there is a growing body of literature suggesting that school-level characteristics (i.e., school security, school climate, and preventive education/intervention) are influential in predicting the likelihood of peer victimization [17, 18, 38]. Assuming that school-related victimization is similar to other types of criminal victimization, the predictors of criminal victimization would be associated with, or explanative of, school-related victimization. Miethe and Meier (1994) [39] stressed that security and physical guardianship (i.e., locks, gates, alarm systems, and adult presence) have significant effects on victimization. Although the conclusions of studies on school-level security and its impact on the extent of school bullying victimization have been mixed [40], a significant relationship has been found between school security and physical guardianship and bullying victimization at school [17, 18, 41]. These studies found that students are less likely to be bullied when schools increase staff supervision, metal detectors, security cameras, locked entrances, visitor sign-in, visible student badges, and routine/random locker checks. Furthermore, students attending schools whose teachers are aware of school policies on bullying victimization and whose school professionals handle victimization problems adequately tend to be victimized less frequently [18].

2.4. Effects of Preventive Strategies on Peer Victimization. These findings clearly show that school violence and peer victimization require changes in school culture and climate in order to improve the safety of adolescents at school. Accordingly, many scholars and policy makers are paying increased attention to various preventive strategies that have been employed by schools [42]. Do these prevention strategies reduce the probability of school violence and peer victimization? Since prevention strategies (i.e., reactive/proactive responses, comprehensive approaches, and curriculum interventions) and their study designs show varying degrees of effectiveness [43], a number of empirical studies have reported mixed findings on strategies for reducing school violence and peer victimization [11, 19, 44]. One of the most widely used preventive strategies involves the implementation of new curricula and whole-school multidisciplinary

interventions that aim to increase awareness of school violence, social cognitive skills, conflict resolution, and policy development [44]. For instance, Teglasi and Rothman (2001) [45] reported on a study examining the impact of 15 weeks of training and preventive education by using a quasiexperimental design. The authors found that participants of a new curriculum for social problem-solving skills were less likely to engage in aggressive behaviors. However, other researchers found that there was no statistically significant difference between an intervention curriculum group and a control group in decreasing bullying and victimization [46, 47].

Aside from a new curriculum, the main goal of whole-school multidisciplinary interventions program (i.e., the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program) is to generate an effective, comprehensive response to and consequences for school violence [44]. Olweus (1993) [11] found that a comprehensive approach is effective in decreasing bullying victimization and antisocial behavior through improving school climate. As part of a broader outcome evaluation of the comprehensive approach, researchers reported supportive outcomes including decreased discipline referrals and suspension rates [48, 49]. In sum, these prior studies have been evaluating the effectiveness of interventions into bullying and victimization by using experimental or quasiexperimental designs. Although these studies used different designs, samples, and statistical techniques, they have been generally supportive of the idea that whole-school interventions or a comprehensive approach is more effective than curriculum-based interventions based on classroom modules.

Despite reviews of the comprehensive prevention approach that reported on the effectiveness of programs in addressing school bullying, only a small number of studies found that school bullying prevention programs have no effect or little effect on reducing school violence [50, 51]. Based on meta-analysis, Ferguson and colleagues (2007) [50] reported that school antibullying programs show little discernible effect on violence and victimization of children in school settings. Payne and colleagues (2003) [51] conducted a study of the effects of communal school organizations (i.e., supportive and collaborative relations among administrators, teachers, and students) on school victimization. Of the 254 public secondary schools studied, they found that communal school organizations had no significant effect on reducing student victimization.

As programs designed to support vulnerable adolescents have significantly increased [52], a number of school programs have been developed to address safe environments and students' well-being. Safe Passage program is a model for reducing school problems by bringing together school staff members, parents, the local health department, the local social service agency, local youth organizations, and students [53]. Recently, by identifying best practices, Oakland, California, provided services targeted to vulnerable adolescents, including a violence-prevention curriculum, case management, mental health services, and after-school programs [54]. Results from studies on this comprehensive approach suggest that Safe Passage programs can be effective in delivering justice while increasing school safety compared to other school-based intervention programs. Specifically, violence-related suspension and overall suspension have been substantially decreased [54]. Although many of our public schools already implemented Safe Passage programs [53], only a small number of studies have evaluated its success.

3. Research Questions and Hypotheses

Despite the previous findings, few studies have tested the efficacy of intervention strategies on peer victimization. Furthermore, no study has examined the roles that intervention strategies and school climate play on different types of bullying victimization, particularly for distinct physical and emotional types of victimization. The current study seeks to address several issues that remain unresolved. First, this study focuses on developing an explanatory model to understand the relationship between school environment/climate and peer victimization. Second, it is evident from the literature review that research on prevention strategies of bullying is not rigorous enough. Existing research has tested the effectiveness of preventive strategies based on students in a single school site or district. Thus, little is known about whether these models could be expanded to a nationally representative sample of adolescents across multiple schools. Consequently, the current study suggests several research questions relevant to peer victimization.

(i) Did students' individual-level backgrounds (i.e., race, sex, age, parental support, peer support, and school pressure) affect the one's risk of vulnerability to peer victimization?

(ii) Did being minority, being male, being younger, having quality of parental support, having quality of peer support, and feeling higher level of school pressure increase the one's risk of vulnerability to peer victimization?

(iii) Did students' school-level characteristics (i.e., school security climate, implementation of safe passage program, implementation of Gang Prevention, and implementation of bullying prevention) affect the one's risk of vulnerability to peer victimization?

4. Methodology

4.1. Sample and Procedure. The analyses in the current study are based on data from the Health Behavior in School-Aged Children (HBSC) 2005-2006 U.S. study. Sponsored by the World Health Organization (WHO), the HBSC study has been conducted every four years since 1985 to examine school-based behaviors of adolescents from more than 40 different countries. Funded by the United States Department of Health and Human Services, the HBSC study collected data with a nationally representative sample of students in public, Catholic, and other private schools. The HBSC survey component asks respondents about health problems and school-related issues (e.g., bullying) through early adolescence. In addition, a school administrators' survey has been conducted to obtain school-level information on violence prevention policies and security practices. In order to obtain a nationally representative sample, data were collected from students

(from sixth to tenth grades) and school administrators in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Given that the purpose of the study is to understand school climate and violence prevention strategies related to peer victimization at school, the analyses were restricted to students attending schools whose administrators have completed a school-level survey. Among the 8,030 students who completed the survey through a multistate sampling, 2,226 students from 32 schools were excluded due to missing information of school-level indicators. Therefore, a total of 7,001 students from 195 different schools were eligible for the current study.

4.2. Dependent Variable. For the purpose of the present study, prevalence of peer victimization is operationalized as a dichotomous variable, with "0" indicating the student was not victimized and "1" indicating the student was victimized by other students on school grounds (we created the victimization item by summing seven items (i.e., how often got called names/teased, left out of things, hit/kicked/pushed, others lied about me, for race/color, for religion, and made sexual jokes to me) and dichotomizing them). A review of prior research suggests that certain characteristics of the victims increase the risk of different types of victimization. In response to these differences, victimizations are grouped into three categories: all victimization, physical victimization, and emotional victimization (peer victimization was based on Olweus' (1993) criteria: physical victimization and emotional victimization. Physical victimization was measured with one item, "I was hit, kicked, pushed, shoved around, or locked indoors." To measure emotional victimization, the following six items were used: "I was called mean names, was made fun of, or teased in a hurtful way," "other students left me out of things on purpose, excluded me from their group of friends, or completely ignored me," "other students told lies or spread false rumors about me and tried to make others dislike me," "I was bullied with mean names and comments about my race or color," "I was bullied with mean names and comments about my religion," "other students made sexual jokes, comments, or gestures to me." Similar to all types of victimization, we created each type of victimization by summing items and dichotomizing them so that each measure has a dichotomous (yes/no) response).

4.3. Individual-Level Variables. Three demographic background variables, *Race*, *Sex*, and *Age* (11 to 17), are included in the study. *Race* was originally incorporated as an exhaustive list from which respondents could select all categories that applied. Given the results, it was collapsed into a new dichotomous variable with 0 indicating non-white and 1 indicating White. *Sex* is also a dichotomous variable with 0 indicating female and 1 indicating male. Additional measures of individual characteristics were *parental support*, *peer support*, and *school pressure*. the *parental support* construct is measured by a combined scale of six items: parent helps me as much as I need; lets me do things I like doing; is loving; understands my problems; likes me to make my own decisions; and makes me feel better when upset. Responses were coded 1 to 3: almost never, sometimes, and almost always. Then they were collapsed into new continuous variables with a higher score indicating more warmth and support from parents (Alpha = .803). *Peer support* is measured as follows: students in my class enjoy being together; are kind and helpful; and accept me as I am. Responses were coded on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), then collapsed into new continuous variables with a higher score indicating more warmth and support from peers (Alpha = .704). *School pressure* is included to assess the role of negative emotions on peer victimization. This item has four categories from 1 (not at all) to 4 (a lot).

4.4. School-Level Variables. Several prior studies [18, 38, 55] suggest that school characteristics and climate have significant effects on victimization. In response, the current study examines two different domains of school characteristics to reflect school climate and preventive strategies based on a survey of administrators. Four predictors related to peer victimization are used as measures of school-level characteristics: *security climate, safe passage program, gang prevention program*, and *bullying prevention program*. Six items are used to construct the variable of *security climate*, which asks questions about whether the school requires visitor check-in; maintains a closed campus; has staff/adults monitor the halls; conducts routine bag/locker checks; uses metal detectors; and has uniformed police. These items are measured by a dichotomous response, with 0: no and 1: yes, and collapsed into a single construct. The high value means a higher level of security climate on school grounds. Three preventive measures, *safe passage, gang prevention*, and *bullying intervention*, are used to reflect whether a school has or participates in preventive programs. Each item is a dichotomous variable, with 0: no and 1: yes.

5. Analytic Strategy

To examine the empirical relationships among the variables described in the research question, the current study attempts to conduct multilevel modeling linking school-level contexts. Multilevel modeling (i.e., hierarchical linear modeling) is a powerful method of analysis for treating students as individual-level units and schools as school-level units [56]. This technique is appropriate for at least two reasons. First, it addresses the design effects that are inherent in the HBSC dataset, which utilizes a three-stage stratified design, with census divisions and grades as strata and school districts as primary sampling units [57]. Second, in order to address the research questions, we need to attend to the validity and model misfit due to hierarchically structured data. This technique allows researchers to resolve these problems while simultaneously investigating both within- and between-group variances [56]. Therefore, the multilevel modeling presented the current study's focus on school-level predictors of secure school climate and school-level prevention strategies, as well as the individual-level predictors. The two-level model consists of two submodels, one for each level (i.e., Level-1, the individual-level model and Level-2, the school-level model). While the Level-1 model represents the relationships among the individual-level predictors, the Level-2 model captures the influence of school-level covariates' effects.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of all variables (N = 7001).

	N (%)	Mean (St. deviation)	Minimum	Maximum
Individual-level variables				
Race: white (%)	3268 (46.7)		0	1
Sex: male (%)	3348 (47.8)		0	1
Age (mean)		13.67 (1.47)	11	17
Parental support (mean)		14.56 (2.76)	6	18
Peer support (mean)		10.49 (2.55)	3	15
School pressure: (mean)		2.56 (1.01)	1	4
School-level variables				
Security climate (mean)		4.04 (1.33)	0	6
Safe Passage: yes (%)	1593 (22.8)		0	1
Gang prevention: yes (%)	3115 (44.5)		0	1
Bullying prevention: yes (%)	4581 (65.4)		0	1
Peer victimization				
All victimization	3845 (54.9)		0	1
Physical victimization	962 (13.7)		0	1
Emotional victimization	3721 (53.1)		0	1

Due to the hierarchical nature of the current data (students nested within schools) and the nature of binary outcomes (victimized within school grounds), multilevel mixed-effects logistic regressions are conducted using STATA 12.0.

6. Results

6.1. Descriptive Statistics. Table 1 illustrates the descriptive statistics for the dependent and independent variables used in the current study. Of 7,001 students, approximately 55 percent reported experiencing some form of peer victimization during the school year. In particular, among those bullied students, slightly more than half (53.1%) of the students had been emotionally bullied (i.e., being called names, victims of rumors, or ignored), and about 14 percent of the students had experienced physical bullying (i.e., being hit, kicked, pushed, shoved around, or locked indoors). Table 1 also shows that the sample population was 47 percent white and 48 percent male, whose mean age was 14.67 (sd = 1.47), and who received warmth and support from their parents (mean = 15.56 and sd = 2.76) and peers (mean = 10.49 and sd = 2.55). However, students in the current study felt significant levels of stress regarding school work (mean = 2.56 and sd = 1.01).

School-level variables reported by a sample of 195 school administrators are also illustrated in Table 1. Of the six security measures listed under the security climate item, the mean number of security measures was 4.04 (sd = 1.33). The majority of schools have around four security measures among six possible strategies, such as visitor check-in, a closed campus, staff/adult hall monitors, bag/locker checks, metal detectors, and uniformed police. In terms of preventive school programs, the majority of schools have bullying prevention programs (65.4%). Approximately 45 percent of school administrators reported that their schools have implemented gang prevention programs, followed by Safe Passage programs (22.8%).

6.2. Bivariate Analysis. As a preliminary measure, bivariate correlations among individual-level and school-level variables are computed (Table 2). As expected, the individual-level characteristics (i.e., sex, age, parental support, and peer support) were negatively correlated with ever being victimized. In contrast, the level of stress about schoolwork was positively related to the experience of peer victimization. At the school level, although it was hypothesized that these security-related predictors would be related to victimization, there were no significant associations between security climates, Safe Passage program, gang prevention, and peer victimization. Unexpectedly, however, there was positive association between bullying-prevention programs and peer victimization.

6.3. Multilevel Models. Multilevel models are constructed to determine whether the prevalence of peer victimization, physical victimization, and emotional victimization varies according to school-level predictors (the basic unconditional model was first conducted to determine the proportion of the variance in outcome between the schools. An analysis of the intraclass correlations reveals that around 7 percent (ICC = .065) of the variance in peer victimization (both physical and emotional victimization) is accounted for by differences in the characteristics of the schools. Although most of the variance in student-level characteristics (around 90%) was attributed to within-school variance, the between-school variance was statistically significant). Table 3 presents the results of models that include the individual-level and school-level variables for all three types of victimization (Model 1) and for specific types of victimization (Models 2 and 3) from competing risks models (for interpretation, the estimated coefficients have been transformed into odds ratios). Level-1 of Model 1 shows the general pattern of individual-level differences in odds ratios for victimization cases. Specifically, male students were .67 times less likely than female students

Table 2: Correlations of individual-level and school-level covariates.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Individual-level variables											
(1) Race (1: white)	1										
(2) Sex (1: male)	.012	1									
(3) Age	**.057**	**.043**	1								
(4) Parental support	**.139**	**.032**	**−.049**	1							
(5) Peer support	.021	.011	.010	**.287**	1						
(6) School pressure	**.042**	**−.074**	**.080**	**−.138**	**−.088**	1					
School-level variables											
(7) Security climate	**−.181**	.006	.059	**−.069**	**−.049**	**−.040**	1				
(8) Safe Passage (1: yes)	**−.142**	−.013	**−.056**	**−.042**	.001	−.015	**.220**	1			
(9) Gang prevention (1: yes)	**−.151**	.001	**−.095**	−.012	−.005	**−.028**	**.236**	**.357**	1		
(10) Bullying prevention (1: yes)	**−.059**	.001	**−.259**	**.027**	**−.025**	**−.026**	**.158**	**.239**	**.544**	1	
Peer victimization											
(11) Victimization	.010	**−.103**	**−.111**	**−.139**	**−.214**	**.119**	−.010	−.011	−.014	**.046**	1

(1) Bolded coefficients denote $P < 0.05$.
(2) As a preliminary measure, only overall victimizations were included in bivariate analysis.

Table 3: Multilevel mixed-effects logistic regression ($N = 7001$).

	Model 1 (all)		Model 2 (physical)		Model 3 (emotional)	
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-1	Level-2	Level-1	Level-2
	β (OR)	β (OR)	β (OR)	β (OR)	β (OR)	β (OR)
Fixed effects						
Individual-level variables						
Race (1: white)	.037 (1.038)	.032 (1.033)	.015 (1.015)	.012 (1.013)	.044 (1.045)	.038 (1.038)
Sex (1: male)	**−.396 (.673)**	**−.399 (.671)**	**.776 (2.172)**	**.773 (2.167)**	**−.435 (.647)**	**−.438 (.645)**
Age	**−.169 (.845)**	**−.158 (.853)**	**−.250 (.778)**	**−.240 (.787)**	**−.158 (.854)**	**−.147 (.863)**
Parental support	**−.070 (.933)**	**−.071 (.931)**	**−.077 (.925)**	**−.078 (.925)**	**−.071 (.932)**	**−.072 (.930)**
Peer support	**−.168 (.845)**	**−.167 (.846)**	**−.147 (.864)**	**−.146 (.864)**	**−.168 (.845)**	**−.167 (.846)**
School Pressure	**.124 (1.132)**	**.124 (1.132)**	.059 (1.061)	.059 (1.061)	**.126 (1.135)**	**.126 (1.134)**
School-level variables						
Security climate		−.008 (.992)		.016 (1.016)		−.013 (.987)
Safe Passage (1: yes)		−.047 (.954)		−.008 (.992)		−.053 (.949)
Gang prevention (1: yes)		**−.184 (.831)**		−.213 (.808)		**−.202 (.817)**
Bullying prevention (1: yes)		**.212 (1.236)**		**.255 (1.290)**		**.215 (1.240)**
Constant	**5.315 (203.399)**	**5.176 (177.037)**	**3.561 (35.195)**	**3.287 (26.773)**	**5.121 (167.440)**	**5.007 (149.340)**
Goodness of fit						
AIC	8154.420	8155.049	4850.986	4855.718	8164.867	8163.984
BIC	8208.529	8242.976	4905.164	4943.756	8218.939	8251.852
−2 log likelihood	8138.420	8129.049	4834.986	4829.718	8148.867	8137.984

(1) Bolded coefficients denote $P < 0.05$.
(2) Null model (equivalent to a one-way ANOVA with schools as a random effect) for each dependent variable that is not reported.

to report victimization. In addition, older students were 15 percent less likely than younger students to be victims of school bullying. Those with more warmth, parent support, and peer support were less likely to be victims of school bullying (OR = .933 and OR = .845, resp.). In contrast, students with a higher level of stress about schoolwork were 1.13 times more likely to report victimization than those with a lower level of stress. After controlling for school-level variables, the results of individual-level effects were consistent with our predictions (see Model 1). As expected, the results show that gang prevention programs had significant effects on peer victimization. More specifically, students attending schools where gang prevention programs are provided were less likely to report victimization (OR = .831). For other school-level predictors such as security climate and Safe Passage programs, we proposed that students attending schools with Safe Passage programs or more secure climates were less likely to be victimized. This hypothesis was not supported.

Interestingly, bullying prevention programs were negatively related to peer victimization. That is, students attending schools with bullying prevention programs were more likely to have experienced peer victimization (OR = 1.236).

Model 2 in Table 3 shows the effects of individual-level predictors on physical victimization. Similar to Model 1 (all types of victimization), the effects of age, parental support, and peer support were also significant and in the predicted directions, indicating decreased risk of being physically victimized. The effect of the level of stress due to schoolwork was not significant in Model 2. However, being male was a significant predictor of physical victimization with a different direction compared to Model 1. That is, male students were 2.17 times more likely than female students to become victims of physical bullying. With the addition of school-level variables into the model, individual-level predictors were consistent with the individual-level model in Model 2. Notably, it was not expected that providing bullying prevention programs would be found as a significant predictor of physical victimization (OR = 1.290).

Model 3 presents results from a multilevel logistic regression for emotional victimization. In the Level-1 model with individual-level predictors, a number of predictors were significantly related to emotional victimization. Emotional victimization was negatively associated with being male, being older, and having more warmth, parental support, and peer support. With the addition of the school-level variables into the Level-2 model (see Level-2 model in Model 3), security climate and Safe Passage programs at the school level were not found to be significantly associated with emotional victimization. Contrary to our hypotheses, students attending schools with bullying prevention programs were more likely to have experienced peer victimization (OR = 1.240).

7. Conclusion and Discussion

The current study investigated individual- and school-level differences in bullying victimization among peers in school. With respect to individual-level factors, both age and gender were important predictors of different types of peer victimization. Age had a positive effect on all three types of peer victimization. This is consistent with the literature that peer victimization appears to decrease with age; older students were less likely to be victims of bullying than younger students [30, 35]. Gender also had an effect on all three types of peer victimization. Boys were more likely than girls to be victims of physical bullying, but girls were more likely to be victims of emotional bullying. These findings are consistent with prior studies' conclusions that the type of victimization varies according to gender [24, 36].

However, inconsistent with prior findings, race did not have an impact on peer victimization. The current study found no statistically significant difference across race. This is contrary to our prediction that minority adolescents are more likely to experience higher rates of bullying victimization, compared to Caucasian adolescents [31]. Given that more than half of the sample was in the non-white category, victimization directed toward minority students may not be apparent. Although existing bullying prevention programs address the factors that may increase the risk of bullying across race, they often do not take into account sociorelational contexts as important sources of adolescents' learning process that influence bullying behaviors. Spriggs et al. (2007) [33] argued that the effects of family, peer, and school relationships on bullying involvement differ according to race. Being able to recognize and address these differences across racial groups will help to develop a better understanding of the dynamics of bullying victimization and to produce effective bullying prevention and intervention tailored to the populations being served.

Both parental and peer support represent significant predictors of peer victimization. The finding that parental support was predictive of both types of peer victimization suggests that parent-child interaction has a considerable effect on the likelihood of peer victimization. While parental support may play a protective role against peer victimization, lack of involvement and support from parents is likely to increase the risk of bullying victimization [26]. Peer support also was predictive of peer victimization, both physical and emotional. Negative peer relationships and lack of peer support may pose as risk factors conducive to bullying in schools [33, 37]. On the other hand, having peer support reduces the likelihood of peer victimization [58]. Finally, school pressure had an effect on emotional victimization. Those facing a high level of school pressure are more likely to experience negative emotions and to be involved in bullying, as an aggressor and a victim, compared to those with a low level of school pressure [59].

Our prediction that students in schools with more security measures would be less likely to be victimized was not supported by the study findings. It must be noted that the security measure item contains elements that focus mainly on security on school grounds and the physical safety of students. In order to improve school safety, schools have implemented security measures such as video cameras, bag/locker searches, metal detectors, and other surveillance programs [42, 60]. Studies have found that peer bullying victimization is less likely to occur if schools increase the level of security and safety for students through adult monitoring [41, 61]. For instance, uniformed officers can be useful for deterring bullying behaviors, but the utility of the other components of security climate (e.g., visitor check-in, a closed campus) in preventing bullying is not well documented. Further, security measures are just one element of the school climate. Other elements, such as teachers' awareness of antibullying policies and strategies, can intervene to reduce peer victimization. Schools in which teachers are aware of school policies on bullying victimization tend to have fewer incidents of bullying victimization [18]. Peer and teacher relations as well as the degree of aggressiveness in a school climate are also associated with bullying offending and victimization [41]. By improving several aspects of the school climate, a comprehensive approach can be effective in reducing bullying victimization and antisocial behavior [11].

For the school-level predictors, gang and bullying prevention programs were found to be significant predictors of peer victimization. However, gang prevention had only a partial effect. Although gang prevention had an impact on emotional

victimization, it did not indicate any effect on physical victimization. One possible explanation is that strategies for school-based gang prevention (e.g., zero tolerance policies) may have proven to be ineffective in reducing physical victimization. Furthermore, whether or not school personnel are committed to implementing the program can be another important facet to consider. For example, the attitude of supervising teachers and staff members in supporting the prevention curriculum and communicating with the students can affect the overall effectiveness of these prevention programs [62, 63]. Teacher monitoring is considered to be an important protective factor against peer victimization because the likelihood of students reporting bullying incidents depends on teachers responsiveness [64].

Surprisingly, bullying prevention had a negative effect on peer victimization. Contrary to our hypothesis, students attending schools with bullying prevention programs were more likely to have experienced peer victimization, compared to those attending schools without bullying prevention programs. It is possible that bullies have learned a variety of antibullying techniques but chose not to practice what they have learned from the program. Sometimes, bullies maintain their dominant social status among peers in school. As a result, the preventive strategies may become ineffective.

The other preventive measure, the Safe Passage program, had no effect on the likelihood of peer victimization. As a program designed to support at-risk adolescents, the program's goal is to create a safe school environment by reducing various school problems [52]. However, we did not find any significant impact on peer victimization. Without knowing specific details of the program, it is difficult to assess the effectiveness of the Safe Passage program.

Although prior research suggests that school-level characteristics (such as school security or a preventive curriculum) may be influential in predicting the likelihood of peer victimization [17, 18, 38], it should be noted that the effectiveness of bullying prevention has yet to be proven. A meta-analysis indicates that bullying prevention programs specifically targeting at-risk youth were slightly effective in reducing bullying or violent behaviors on campus, but generally had a minimal effect on bullying and victimization [50]. Future direction needs to focus not merely on implementation of bullying prevention but rather on its effectiveness. Using a comprehensive approach (both an individual-level and a school-level approach), prevention efforts must move beyond individual risk factors and focus on systemic change within the schools. Furthermore, given that bullying is a relationship problem, researchers need to better identify the bully-victim dynamics in order to develop prevention strategies accordingly.

8. Limitations and Future Directions for Research

The current study used multilevel modeling to address the need to simultaneously examine the effect of individual- and school-level variables on peer victimization. This type of modeling allows one to determine the amount of variance in the dependent variable that is explained by the individual-level factors (e.g., age, parental support) as well as school-level factors (e.g., security climate, preventive measure).

A number of limitations in the current study must be addressed in future research. First, the cross-sectional nature of the study limits one from making a causal inference about the relationship between individual- and school-level factors and likelihood of peer victimization. Future studies need to utilize a longitudinal design in investigating the temporal ordering between the preventive measures and peer victimization in schools. Second, no specific information concerning the prevention measures, specifically bullying prevention and gang prevention programs, is provided. The HBSC data contain limited information about these bullying prevention programs. Future research needs to examine the specific components of the prevention programs. Because the preventive measures in the current study were dichotomous, it is limited in understanding the impact of preventive strategies on peer victimization. Lastly, while school bullying among adolescents can be categorized into different types (e.g., physical, verbal, relational, cyber) [65], the current study is limited to physical and emotional victimization. As a result, we are not able to examine the distinct nature of the different forms of bullying and their relations with other factors.

References

[1] D. Finkelhor, H. Turner, R. Ormrod, and S. L. Hamby, "Trends in childhood violence and abuse exposure: evidence from 2 national surveys," *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, vol. 164, no. 3, pp. 238–242, 2010.

[2] M. Molcho, W. Craig, P. Due et al., "Cross-national time trends in bullying behaviour 1994–2006: findings from Europe and North America," *International Journal of Public Health*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. S225–S234, 2009.

[3] F. DeVoe and K. Chandler, *Student Reports of Bullying: Results from the 2001 School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey*, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, DC, USA, 2005.

[4] D. C. Gottfredson, *Schools and Delinquency*, Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2001.

[5] B. Moon, H.-W. Hwang, and J. D. McCluskey, "Causes of school bullying: empirical test of a general theory of crime, differential association theory, and general strain theory," *Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 57, no. 6, pp. 849–877, 2011.

[6] R. Dinkes, E. F. Cataldi, G. Kena, and K. Baum, *Indicators of School Crime and Safety*, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC, USA, 2009.

[7] J. A. Dake, J. H. Price, and S. K. Telljohann, "The nature and extent of bullying at school," *Journal of School Health*, vol. 73, pp. 173–180, 2003.

[8] S. Greenbaum, B. Turner, and R. D. Stephens, *Set Straight on Bullies*, Pepperdine University Press, Los Angeles, Calif, USA, 1988.

[9] J. Isaacs, E. Hodges, and C. Salmivalli, "Long-term consequences of victimization: a follow-up from adolescence to young adulthood," *European Journal of Developmental Science*, vol. 2, pp. 387–397, 2008.

[10] R. Kaltiala-Heino, R. M. Rimpelä M, P. Rantanen, and A. Rimpelä, "Bullying at school—an indicator of adolescents at risk

for mental disorders," *Journal of Adolescence*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 661–674, 2000.

[11] D. Olweus, *Bullying at School*, Blackwell Publishers, Malden, Mass, USA, 1993.

[12] K. Rigby, *New Perspectives on Bullying*, Jessica Kingsley, London, UK, 2002.

[13] G. Salmon, A. James, E. L. Cassidy, and M. A. Javaloyes, "Bullying a review: presentations to an adolescent psychiatric service and within a school for emotionally and behaviourally disturbed children," *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 563–579, 2000.

[14] N. S. Bauer, P. Lozano, and F. P. Rivara, "The effectiveness of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program in public middle schools: a controlled trial," *Journal of Adolescent Health*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 266–274, 2007.

[15] A. Hallford, C. Borntrager, and J. L. Davis, "Evaluation of a bullying prevention program," *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 91–101, 2006.

[16] K. S. Whitted and D. R. Dupper, "Best practices for preventing or reducing bullying in schools," *Children and Schools*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 167–174, 2005.

[17] D. L. Espelage and S. M. Swearer, *Bullying in American Schools: A Social-Ecological Perspective on Prevention and Intervention*, Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ, USA, 2004.

[18] P. K. Smith and S. Shu, "What good schools can do about bullying: findings from a survey in English schools after a decade of research and action," *Childhood*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 193–212, 2000.

[19] P. R. Smokowski and K. H. Kopasz, "Bullying in school: an overview of types, effects, family characteristics, and intervention strategies," *Children and Schools*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 101–109, 2005.

[20] P. Orpinas, S. Kelder, R. Frankowski, N. Murray, Q. Zhang, and A. McAlister, "Outcome evaluation of a multi-component violence-prevention program for middle schools: the Students for Peace project," *Health Education Research*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 45–58, 2000.

[21] D. L. Silvernail, A. M. Thompson, Z. Yang, and H. J. Kopp, "A survey of bullying behavior among Maine third graders," 2000, http://usm.maine.edu/cepare/pdf/ts/br.pdf.

[22] P. K. Smith, L. Talamelli, H. Cowie, P. Naylor, and P. Chauhan, "Profiles of non-victims, escaped victims, continuing victims and new victims of school bullying," *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 74, no. 4, pp. 565–581, 2004.

[23] S. K. Egan and D. G. Perry, "Does low self-regard invite victimization?" *Developmental Psychology*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 299–309, 1998.

[24] S. Graham, A. Bellmore, and J. Juvonen, "Peer victimization in Middle school: when self- and peer views diverge," *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, vol. 19, pp. 117–138, 2003.

[25] D. S. J. Hawker and M. J. Boulton, "Twenty years' research on peer victimization and psychosocial maladjustment: a meta-analytic review of cross-sectional studies," *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 441–455, 2000.

[26] D. L. Haynie, T. Nansel, P. Eitel et al., "Bullies, victims, and bully/victims: distinct groups of at-risk youth," *Journal of Early Adolescence*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 29–49, 2001.

[27] T. R. Nansel, M. Overpeck, R. S. Pilla, W. J. Ruan, B. Simons-Morton, and P. Scheidt, "Bullying behaviors among US youth: prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, vol. 285, no. 16, pp. 2094–2100, 2001.

[28] J. Paul and A. Cillessen, "Dynamics of peer victimization in early adolescence: results from a four-year longitudinal study," *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, vol. 19, pp. 25–43, 2003.

[29] W. Troop-Gordon and G. W. Ladd, "Trajectories of peer victimization and perceptions of the self and schoolmates: precursors to internalizing and externalizing problems," *Child Development*, vol. 76, no. 5, pp. 1072–1091, 2005.

[30] J. F. DeVoe, K. Peter, P. Kaufman et al., *Indicators of School Crime and Safety*, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC, USA, 2004.

[31] L. D. Hanish and N. G. Guerra, "The roles of ethnicity and school context in predicting children's victimization by peers," *American Journal of Community Psychology*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 201–223, 2000.

[32] D. Olweus, "Bully/victim problems among school children: basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program," in *The Development and Treatment of Childhood Aggression*, D. J. Pelpler and K. H. Rubin, Eds., Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, USA, 1991.

[33] A. L. Spriggs, R. J. Iannotti, T. R. Nansel, and D. L. Haynie, "Adolescent bullying involvement and perceived family, peer and school relations: commonalities and differences across race/ethnicity," *Journal of Adolescent Health*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 283–293, 2007.

[34] M. S. Stockdale, S. Hangaduambo, D. Duys, K. Larson, and P. D. Sarvela, "Rural elementary students', parents', and teachers' perceptions of bullying," *American Journal of Health Behavior*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 266–277, 2002.

[35] I. Whitney and P. Smith, "A survey of the nature and extent of bullying in junior/middle and secondary schools," *Educational Research*, vol. 35, pp. 3–25, 1993.

[36] N. R. Crick and M. A. Bigbee, "Relational and overt forms of peer victimization: a multiinformant approach," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 337–347, 1998.

[37] P. C. Rodkin and E. V. E. Hodges, "Bullies and victims in the peer ecology: four questions for psychologists and school professionals," *School Psychology Review*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 384–400, 2003.

[38] A. Payne and D. Gottfredson, "Schools and bullying: school factors related to bullying and school based bullying interventions," in *Bullying: Implications for the Classroom*, C. Sanders and G. Phye, Eds., pp. 159–176, Elsevier Academic Press, San Francisco, Calif, USA, 2004.

[39] T. D. Miethe and R. F. Meier, *Crime and Its Social Context: Toward an Integrated Theory of Offenders, Victims, and Situations*, State University of New York Press, Albany, NY, USA, 1994.

[40] C. J. Schreck, J. M. Miller, and C. L. Gibson, "Trouble in the school yard: a study of the risk factors of victimization at school," *Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 460–484, 2003.

[41] C. M. Wienke Totura, C. MacKinnon-Lewis, E. L. Gesten et al., "Bullying and victimization among boys and girls in middle school: the influence of perceived family and school contexts," *Journal of Early Adolescence*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 571–609, 2009.

[42] J. Juvonen, *School Violence: Prevalence, Fears, and Prevention*, Rand, Santa Monica, Calif, USA, 2001.

[43] G. Sugai and R. Horner, "The evolution of discipline practices: school-wide positive behavior supports," *Child and Family Behavior Therapy*, vol. 24, no. 1-2, pp. 23–50, 2002.

[44] R. C. Vreeman and A. E. Carroll, "A systematic review of school-based interventions to prevent bullying," *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, vol. 161, no. 1, pp. 78–88, 2007.

[45] H. Teglasi and L. Rothman, "A classroom-based program to reduce aggressive behavior," *Journal of School Psychology*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 71–94, 2001.

[46] C. Kaiser-Ulrey, *Bullying in Middle School: A Study of BEST: An Anti-Bullying Program for Seventh Grade Students*, Florida State University Press, Tallahassee, Fla, USA, 2003.

[47] E. Sanchez, T. Robertson, C. Lewis, B. Rosenbluth, T. Bohman, and D. Casey, "Preventing bullying and sexual harassment in elementary schools: the expect respect model," in *Bullying Behavior: Current Issues, Research, and Interventions*, R. Geffner, M. Loring, and C. Young, Eds., pp. 157–180, Haworth Maltreatment and Trauma Press, New York, NY, USA, 2001.

[48] C. Metzler, A. Biglan, J. Rusby, and J. Sprague, "Evaluation of a comprehensive behavior management program to improve school-wide positive behavior support," *Education and Treatment of Children*, vol. 24, pp. 448–479, 2001.

[49] S. W. Twemlow, P. Fonagy, F. C. Sacco, M. L. Gies, R. Evans, and R. Ewbank, "Creating a peaceful school learning environment: a controlled study of an elementary school intervention to reduce violence," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 158, no. 5, pp. 808–810, 2001.

[50] C. J. Ferguson, C. S. Miguel, J. C. Kilburn Jr., and P. Sanchez, "The effectiveness of school-based anti-bullying programs: a meta-analytic review," *Criminal Justice Review*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 401–414, 2007.

[51] A. A. Payne, D. C. Gottfredson, and G. D. Gottfredson, "Schools as communities: the relationships among communal school organization, student bonding, and school disorder," *Criminology*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 749–777, 2003.

[52] M. J. Furlong, G. M. Morrison, and J. L. Greif, "Reaching an American consensus: reactions to the special issue on school bullying," *School Psychology Review*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 456–470, 2003.

[53] J. G. Dryfoos, *Safe Passage: Making It through Adolescence in a Rrisky Society*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY, USA, 1998.

[54] Safe Passages, *After-School Landscape, Analysis, & Recommendations for Sustainability*, Safe Passages, Oakland, Calif, USA, 2005, http://www.safepassages.org/PDF/afterSchoolSustainability_Oakland.pdf.

[55] M. K. Holt and D. L. Espelage, "A cluster analytic investigation of victimization among high school students: are profiles differentially associated with psychological symptoms and school belonging?" *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 81–98, 2003.

[56] S. W. Raudenbush and A. Bryk, *Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data Analysis Methods*, Sage Publications, Newbury Park, Calif, USA, 2nd edition, 2002.

[57] R. J. Iannotti, *Health Behavior in School-Aged Children (HBSC), 2005-2006. ICPSR28241-V1*, Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, Ann Arbor, Mich, USA, 2012.

[58] C. Salmivalli, "Bullying and the peer group: a review," *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 112–120, 2010.

[59] J. G. Freeman, O. Samdal, D. A. Klinger et al., "The relationship of schools to emotional health and bullying," *International Journal of Public Health*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. S251–S259, 2009.

[60] C. A. Garcia, "School safety technology in America: current use and perceived effectiveness," *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, vol. 14, pp. 30–54, 2003.

[61] S. Kasen, K. Berenson, P. Cohen, and J. G. Johnson, "The effects of school climate on changes in aggressive and other behaviors related to bullying," in *Bullying in American Schools: A Social-Ecological Perspective on Prevention and Intervention*, D. L. Espelage and S. M. Swearer, Eds., pp. 187–210, Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ, USA, 2004.

[62] J. F. Donnermeyer and T. N. Wurschmidt, "Educators' perceptions of the D.A.R.E. program," *Journal of Drug Education*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 259–276, 1997.

[63] D. Peterson and F.-A. Esbensen, "The outlook is G.R.E.A.T.: what educators say about school-based prevention and the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program," *Evaluation Review*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 218–245, 2004.

[64] B. Doll, S. Song, and E. Siemers, "Classroom ecologies that support or discourage bullying," in *Bullying in American Schools: A Social-Ecological Perspective on Prevention and Intervention*, D. L. Espelage and S. M. Swearer, Eds., pp. 161–183, Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ, USA, 2004.

[65] J. Wang, R. J. Iannotti, and T. R. Nansel, "School bullying among adolescents in the united states: physical, verbal, relational, and cyber," *Journal of Adolescent Health*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 368–375, 2009.