



National School Climate Center

Educating Minds and Hearts...Because the Three Rs are Not Enough

National School Climate Center

School Climate Brief

Number 5, November 2012

Violence Prevention and School Climate Reform¹

by Kathleen Nader, D.S.W.



National School Climate Center

Educating Minds and Hearts...Because the Three Rs are Not Enough

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS

INTRODUCTION

Pathways to Aggression

THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

Leadership Style

School Size

Interpersonal Conflict Levels

Achievement

School burnout

Multiculturalism

SAFETY

Bullying

Prevalence and Impact

Bisexual and Transgender Youth

Bullying Outcomes

Cyber Bullying

Prevention

Threat Assessment

RELATIONSHIPS

Attachment: Parent-child relationships and aggression

Support

Structure and Support

Support and Outcomes

INTERVENTIONS

CONCLUSIONS

REFERENCES



SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS

THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

Although the pathways to aggression and other negative outcomes are multiple (Nader, 2008), positive school climate influences emotional and behavioral outcomes for youth, including the likelihood of aggression, personal and academic performance, and mental/emotional well being.

Leadership Style

Evidence suggests that principal and teachers' supportive leadership traits—such as valuing and developing people (e.g., recognizing, encouraging, affirming)—and their treating youth equally have been highly correlated with perceptions of a positive school climate. In contrast, allowing one group of students to maintain the behavior of other students increases the likelihood of violent behavior (e.g., bullying, threatened with weapons).

School Size

Findings regarding school size have varied by research methods used. Although small school size may benefit some populations and age groups more than others, research demonstrates that small schools have other qualities of school climate—e.g., greater parent participation, better student engagement in school, more positive school climates, warmer relationships between adults and students, more opportunity for school involvement, better school achievement—that influence aggression levels in a desirable direction.

Interpersonal Conflict Levels

Schools with high rates of student–student and teacher–student conflict show greater student oppositional, attentional, and conduct problems than well-organized schools that emphasize learning.

Achievement

Poor academic achievement has been related to increased risk of violence. School burn-out is correlated with poor school climate, which is related to increased risk of aggression and other negative outcomes.

Multiculturalism

Value of and emphasis on cultural diversity in the school setting is associated with more positive outcomes such as better academic achievement and psychosocial well being. Positive school climate has predicted behavioral and academic outcomes for ethnic groups.

SAFETY

Research consistently demonstrates the importance of environments that make individuals feel safe, valued, and valuable. Repeated intense stressors, like bullying, may increase neurobiological reactivity, which in turn may express as aggressive or self-destructive behaviors. Although their profiles vary, most youth who have committed targeted school shootings or barricaded situations have been victims of bullying, persecution, or injury by others prior to their attacks. Repeated victimization may lead to humiliation and rage that ultimately erupt in violence or in self-destructive behaviors.

Bullying

Bullying may be physical (threatening or committing physical injury) and/or relational (threatening to or committing injury to social standing and increasing risk of exclusion).

Prevalence and Impact

A high prevalence of bullying (physical, verbal, relational, and cyber bullying) has been documented both nationally and internationally. Cross-cultural research suggests that bullying has detrimental and long-lasting effects for both bullies and victims.

Bisexual and Transgender Youth

Although decreased since 1999, severe forms of bullying and harassment have remained relatively constant for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students. Although supportive staff and/or comprehensive antibullying/harassment laws alone do not eradicate problems for all LGBT students, supportive staff and strong laws reduce victimization levels and negative outcomes.

Bullying Outcomes

Although even occasional physical violence victimization has contributed negatively to well-being and behavior (e.g.,



National School Climate Center

Educating Minds and Hearts...Because the Three Rs are Not Enough

suicidality, aggression) and outcomes vary by victim characteristics, Carbone-Lopez et al. (2010) found that only intermittent (for boys) or repeated (for girls) teasing or harassment was related to negative outcomes. The multiple adverse outcomes associated with bullying include, for example, poor school adjustment, higher levels of loneliness, poor interpersonal relating, depression, school avoidance, suicidal ideation or suicides, externalizing and disruptive behaviors (e.g., violence), and hyperactivity as well as lower self-esteem than nonbullied peers.

Cyber Bullying

Studies suggest that one third to almost one half of students have reported being cyberbullied. The results of cyber bullying are similar to those of other forms of bullying.

Prevention

Specific methods that employ classroom/student, parent, and teacher training have proven successful in the U.S. for reducing bullying and other negative outcomes and increasing positive outcomes. The Virginia Threat Assessment method is also associated with decreased bullying.

Threat Assessment

While threat assessment methods have proven successful in reducing bullying and deterring school violence, zero tolerance policies have not proven effective.

RELATIONSHIPS

The quality of relationships, at home and at school, influences youth in important ways. Successful violence prevention methods have included open communication between adults and students.

Attachment: Parent-child relationships and aggression

Attachment security increases youth resilience and reduces vulnerability to a variety of woes. Insecurely attached youth, on the other hand, are more likely be victimized or to victimize, to use less effective coping methods in response to stress, to demonstrate poor school adjustment, and to exhibit internalizing or externalizing problems.

Support

For the sake of youth's safety, emerging independence, and well-being, an appropriate blend of structure and support are important at school and at home. Higher levels of support are associated with better mental health outcomes following adversities and with reduced levels of problem behavior.

INTERVENTIONS

In addition to the benefits of threat assessment methods, the overlap of violence prevention with improvements in social-emotional learning, positive connection, and school climate has been demonstrated repeatedly after implementing school-based training in social emotional learning (SEL) or similar programs (see Nader, 2012). SEL programs are associated with multiple positive outcomes including improvements in school climate and youth skills and behaviors for different age groups.

CONCLUSIONS

Safety is enhanced by mutually positive, respectful, and supportive relationships as well as by the active, vigilant and visible presence of caring adults. Some experts have observed that increasing youth-adult connection is at the heart of antiviolence and anti-bullying methods. Research on averted school shootings helps to support the importance of connection. Intervention programs that focus on the entire student body rather than only on individual bullies and that include parents have proven effective in the U.S.



INTRODUCTION

VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND SCHOOL CLIMATE REFORM

Research has demonstrated that a positive school climate is an essential part of violence prevention (Allen, Cornell, Lorek, & Sheras, 2008; Cornell, Sheras, Gregory, & Fan, 2009; Daniels, Royster, Vecchi, & Pshenishy, 2010a; Daniels, Volungis, Pshenishy, Gandhi, Winkler, Cramer, & Bradley, 2010b; Gregory, Cornell, Fan, Sheras, Shih, & Huang, 2010). Many factors influence the association between school climate and behavioral outcomes. Positive school climate alone cannot prevent all variables that may contribute to the expression of aggression. Nevertheless, positive school climates influence behavioral outcomes (e.g., lower rates of aggression, victimization, and dropout), may add to youth's resilience factors, and can provide conditions that foster proactive behaviors and well-being. For example, schools may influence youth's exposure to aggression such as bullying. After a brief discussion of the multiple associations of aggression, this article specifically addresses the role of aspects of school climate—school environment, safety, and relationships—in the prevention of violence. As will be shown, factors discussed in this article may influence each other. For example, safety influences relationships as well as performance and behaviors. Relationships affect safety, performance, and behaviors.

Pathways to Aggression

Multiple variables and varying pathways lead to violence or aggression (Cornell, 1990; Cornell, Benedek, & Benedek, 1987; Henry, 2009; Klein & Cornell, 2010; Nader, 2008, 2012). It is likely that the variables that influence aggression and other problem behaviors combine in complex fashion to affect outcomes (Cerda, Sagdeo, Johnson, & Galea, 2010; Nader, in press, 2012). For example, child traits (e.g., resilience or vulnerability) in combination with experiences (e.g., adversity or success), home and school environments (e.g., supportive versus nonsupportive; violent versus nonviolent), and skills (e.g., coping, social, self-regulatory skills) influence a youth's behaviors and reactions to his/her environment/stimuli (Nader, 2012).

Among factors that may lead to aggression are genetic factors, trauma/adversity, parenting, mental health, and

community environments (see Nader, 2008, chapter 3, for a summary). Examining past events of violence against school children on campus (e.g., shootings, hostage takings) suggests that, in some cases, appropriate mental health interventions (e.g., for traumas and losses, for mental health disturbances) are indicated (Nader & Nader, 2012). Giebels et al. (2005) identify emotionally disturbed as one of the three types of hostage takers—emotionally disturbed, criminal, and ideologically motivated hostage takers (Daniels et al., 2007). Aggressors have often been exposed to aggression. Trauma literature confirms that a number of school shooters have been previously traumatized by aggression (see Nader, 2012 for a summary). Traumatic experiences (e.g., abuse; bullying victimization) and mental health issues are well represented among other youth violent offenders as well (Bacchinni, Esposito, & Affuso, 2009; Daniels, Royster et al., 2010; Greenwald, 2002; Nader, 2008). Although trauma, in general, and its relationship to aggression (see Nader, 2008) is not discussed in detail in this article, bullying, which can cause traumatic reactions, is discussed.

Individual child factors such as genetics likely contribute complexly to behavior and emotion (e.g., aggression, anxiety). For example, although some evidence suggests that certain genetic polymorphisms are linked more often to externalizing or linked more often to internalizing behavior problems, the two (internalizing and externalizing) are not mutually exclusive. As demonstrated in studies of targeted or rampage shooters (Newman & Fox, 2009; Vossekuil, Fein, Reddy, Borum, Modzeleski, 2002), depression and suicidality may precede aggression. Shame and humiliation, which include self-condemnation as well as at least the perception of condemnation by others, are associated with negative outcomes such as depression (Abramson et al., 2002; Coffey, Leitenberg, Henning, Turner, & Bennett, 1996; Feiring & Cleland, 2007; Fletcher, in press; Whiffen & MacIntosh, 2005). As shown by school shooters and prison inmates, shame and humiliation may erupt into violence (Fletcher, in press; Gilligan, 2003).

THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

School environments contribute to students' behavioral expression in schools and to their academic achievement (Nader, 2012). Multiple school-related factors influence behavior,



National School Climate Center

Educating Minds and Hearts...Because the Three Rs are Not Enough

academic performance, and emotional health (Werblow, Robinson, & Duesbery, 2010). Among the factors linked to outcomes such as school violence are leadership style, school size, location, demographic make-up, social atmosphere or climate, student-teacher relationships, teacher morale, the cycle of victimization and aggression, and bullying and an atmosphere that condones it (Gregory et al., 2010). To follow are discussions of some of these issues.

Caring school communities in which youth feel safe and secure contrast with school environments that lack respect, open communication, and/or value for individuality or that demonstrate ineffective methods of identifying risk and taking appropriate and swift action to ensure safety (Borum et al., 2010; Cornell et al., 2009; Fein et al., 2002; Gregory et al., 2010; Nader & Pollack, 2012; Pollack, Modzeleski, & Rooney, 2008). Studies of school shooters (O'Toole, 2000; Vossekul et al., 2002; Borum et al., 2010) and averted school shootings (Daniels et al., 2007, 2010a, b) have demonstrated the link between positive school climate and violence prevention (see Table 1). For example, the visible and supportive presence of caring adults in hallways and classrooms is part of a positive school climate and a characteristic of schools where planned violence has been averted (Daniels et al., 2010a, b). School engagement is associated with positive academic outcomes (e.g., achievement, persistence in school) (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004; Ma, Phelps, Lerner & Lerner, 2009). Disengagement is associated with learning and behavior problems. Engagement is higher in classrooms with supportive teachers and peers, sufficient structure, challenging and authentic tasks, and opportunities for choice (Ma et al., 2009) and with supportive leadership (Black, 2010). Among the antecedents for school engagement are the need for relatedness, the need for autonomy, and the need for competence (Fredricks et al., 2004; Adelman & Taylor, 2011).

LEADERSHIP STYLE

A number of studies have focused on leadership style and outcomes at schools. Greenleaf (1970) described a leader style that puts serving others before self, assumes a non-focal position within teams, and provides resources and support without expecting acknowledgment (Black, 2010). Research has demonstrated a relationship between this style and teachers' and principals' perceptions of a positive school organizational

climate (Black, 2010; Ehrhart, 2004; Lambert, 2004). Black found that the supportive, intimate, collegial, builds community, values people, and displays authenticity constructs were the most important contributors in the association between measures of organization and school climate. The traits of valuing and developing people (e.g., recognizing, encouraging, or affirming) were most highly correlated with perceptions of a positive school climate suggesting that schools where the traits of valuing and developing people are seen to be demonstrated by teachers and principals are more likely to be perceived as supportive and collegial.

Equality in the treatment of students is also an important aspect of leadership style. Hurford et al. (2010) assessed five school climate factors emerging in the use of a school violence scale—*school participation* (e.g., fit into a group, participation in extracurricular or sponsored activities; knowledge of classmates), *social sensitivity-school* (e.g., value of others, respect for others, feeling safe at school), *demographic information* (e.g., grade, age, view toward bullying), *group control* (one group of students has more power than others), and *social sensitivity-culture* (valuing and feeling valued by teachers; equal treatment of students). *Group control*, characterized by favoritism and unequal treatment of students, was associated with feeling unsafe, bullying, and threats with a weapon at school. That is, when administrators and teachers allowed one group of students to maintain the behavior of other students, the likelihood of violent behavior (e.g., bullying, witnessing students being threatened with weapons) increased.

SCHOOL SIZE

Perhaps because of differences in research methods and school populations, findings related to the importance of school size to violence are mixed (Klein & Cornell, 2010; Nader, 2012). For example, whether studies control for demographics (e.g., socioeconomic status [SES], parent education levels), school characteristics (e.g., ethnic make-up), and community characteristics (e.g., organization, poverty levels, violence rates) may influence outcomes (see Klein & Cornell, 2010 for a summary). Although not discussed in detail here, private schools generally have smaller populations than public schools. While there may be a higher number of bullying offenses in larger schools, there may be a lower percentage rate of such offenses (Klein & Cornell, 2010). School size may be associ-



ated with different outcomes for different youth populations. For example, some evidence suggests that smaller schools are particularly beneficial for low SES populations, at least academically (Stevenson, 2006). Proponents of small schools have suggested limits in school size adjusted for age groups: (1) for elementary schools, the recommended range is 300 to 400 students; and (2) for secondary schools, the range is 400 to 800 (Cotton, 1996; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2009; Werblow & Duesbery, 2009). Research has demonstrated that small schools have other qualities of school climate found to influence aggression levels in a desirable direction—greater parent participation, better student engagement in school, more positive school climates, warmer relationships between adults and students, more opportunity for school involvement, better school achievement (Cotton, 1996; Klein & Cornell, 2010; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2009; Werblow & Duesbery, 2009).

Although a large nationally representative longitudinal study of *elementary school* children demonstrated a link between school size and increased risk of being victimized by bullying (Bowes et al., 2009), in a large Virginia statewide study of *high school* size and victimization, the relationship between school size and recorded bullying, threat, and attack violations was negative (Klein & Cornell, 2010). Differences may be related to age group or to study methods. Research is needed that controls for percentage rates of bullying versus numbers of offenses and for other appropriate variables (e.g., age, demographics, ethnic diversity, and local crime rates).

INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT LEVELS

A body of evidence has demonstrated that schools with high rates of student–student and teacher–student conflict show greater student oppositional, attentional, and conduct problems than well-organized schools that emphasize learning (Kasen, Berenson, Cohen, & Johnson, 2004; Kasen, Cohen, & Brook, 1998; Kasen, Johnson, & Cohen, 1990). Students at high conflict schools have demonstrated increased risk of alcohol abuse and criminality (Kasen et al., 1998; Swearer, Espelage, Vaillancourt, & Hymel, 2010). In an examination of the impact of school climate (Kasen et al., 2004), in contrast to schools that emphasized learning, students in high conflict schools—where teachers were ineffective in maintaining order and student defiance and fighting and vandalism were high—had an increase in verbal and physical aggression over

time, even after controlling for baseline aggression (e.g., bullying, physical/verbal aggression, deviance, rebelliousness, etc). Positive school bonding, on the other hand, has been associated with lower risk of student substance abuse, truancy, and other misconduct (Hawkins, Catalano, & Miller, 1992) even when family and neighborhood environments were not a positive influence. In addition, higher levels of bullying and victimization have been associated with fewer positive peer influences and fewer parent–child relationships that were perceived as caring from the students’ perspective (Espelage & Swearer, 2010; Swearer et al., 2010).

ACHIEVEMENT

The relationship between positive school climate and student achievement has been well established internationally (Ad-eogun, 2011). A link also exists between failure of achievement and violence. Youth who perform poorly academically and consequently feel rejected may become alienated from school and act out aggressively. In turn, aggression may result in rejection from peers, which then may increase alienation (Henry, 2009). Strong and Cornell (2008) found that special education class students and youth who had failed at least a year were well represented among those who threatened violence in Memphis City Schools. Poor academic achievement has been among traits found in school shooters (Nader & Nader, 2012).

School Burnout

School burnout refers to exhaustion related to school demands, a cynical and detached attitude toward school, and feelings of inadequacy as a student (Salmela-Aro, Kiuru, Pietikäinen & Jokela, 2008). In a study of Finnish schools, for adolescent school students, negative school climate was positively related to burnout. Support from school and positive motivation from teachers were negatively related to burnout. Girls and youth with lower GPA experienced higher levels of school burnout than boys and youth with higher GPA. Inter-generational bonding between students and teachers seemed to be related to a lower level of school burnout. The more negative a youth’s experience of the school climate, the greater the burnout experienced. The greater a youth’s expectation of support from school and positive motivation from the teachers, the less burnout individual adolescents experienced.



MULTICULTURALISM

Multiculturalism—the perception of the value and emphasis on cultural diversity in the school setting—is associated with more positive outcomes (Chang & Le, 2010). Controlling for SES, Brand and colleagues (2003) demonstrated that perceived multiculturalism is a convincing predictor of minority youth outcomes such as higher academic aspirations and better psychosocial adjustment. For Latino students, evidence suggests increased school connection and optimism when there are similar minority peers in school (Goldsmith, 2004). Latino students have reported less school belonging and increased absenteeism when their ethnic group became smaller in high school (Benner & Graham, 2009; Espinoza & Juvonen, 2011).

Ethnic minority groups experience a number of factors (e.g., discrimination) that contribute to reduced educational attainment, such as higher dropout rates and lower achievement, social satisfaction, and self-worth (Chang & Le, 2010). Although more study is needed, some evidence suggests that compared to other ethnic groups, Latino students are particularly sensitive to school climate as it relates to their school conduct (Espinoza & Juvonen, 2011; Han, 2008). Espinoza and Juvonen (2011) found that, unlike their White classmates, Latino students' (grades 4-7) views of school social climate predicted their self-reported academic compliance and rule breaking. The perception of academic compliance among grade-mates, increased the likelihood of class participation, listening to teachers, and compliance with teacher instructions. In contrast, the perception of rule-breaking, increased the likelihood of behavior problems such as damaging school property and/or relational aggression. Research by Chang and Le (2010) suggests that fostering a school climate supportive of multiculturalism may improve empathy toward ethnic out-groups and may achieve better academic outcomes among Hispanic youth. Specifically ethnocultural empathy, which encourages more favorable perceptions of ethnic groups different from one's own was related to empathetic feelings toward an out-group, which in turn was positively related to academic achievement for Asian and Hispanic Americans. This and other findings point to the value of promoting social and emotional learning in schools (Chang & Le, 2010; Schonert-Reichl, 2012; Zins et al., 2004).

SAFETY

The Center for Social and Emotional Education (CSEE, 2010) suggests that socially, emotionally, intellectually and physically feeling safe is a fundamental human need. In fact, safety is a biological imperative repeatedly demonstrated in the body's automatic neurochemical and behavioral responses to danger. Repeated activation of the stress response system is associated with a number of adverse effects including increased stress reactivity, which in turn may express as aggressive or self-destructive behaviors (Dodge et al., 1995; Nader, in press, 2008; van der Kolk & Sapporta, 1991).

Positive school climate is associated with reduced aggression and violence (Brookmeyer, Fanti, & Henrich, 2006; CSEE, 2010; Goldstein, Young, & Boyd, 2008) including reduction in the varying forms of bullying aggression (CSEE, 2010; Kosciw & Elizabeth, 2006; Meyer-Adams & Conner, 2008; Yoneyama & Rigby, 2006; Birkett et al., 2009; Meraviglia, Becker, Rosenbluth, Sanchez, & Robertson, 2003). The creation of a caring community in which youth feel safe and secure is the foundation for a safe school (Cornell, 2006). Research consistently demonstrates the importance of environments that make individuals feel safe, valued, and valuable (Cohen et al., 2009; Eller, 2012; Nader, 2012). School safety is important to learning as well as to well being (Allen et al., 2008; American Psychological Association [APA] Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008; Nader, 2012; Robers, Zhang, Truman, & Snyder, 2010). Safe environments include caring, responsive, and goal oriented climates that consequently promote healthy development as well as academic achievement (Hopson & Lawson, 2011).

Although they did not find a specific profile that fit a student likely to commit targeted school shootings or barricaded situations, the Safe School Initiative (Vossekuil, et al., 2002) found that most of such students had been victims of bullying, persecution, or injury by others prior to their attacks. In addition, they exhibited suicidal attempts or thoughts, and had difficulty coping with significant losses or personal failure.

BULLYING

Students may assume bully, victim, bully-victim, and/or various bystander roles that permit or perpetuate bullying



(Cunningham, 2007; Espelage & Horne, 2008; Graham, 2010). Bullying is a significant public health concern (Espelage & Low, 2012) and is associated with a number of adverse outcomes (Nader, 2012; Swearer et al., 2010; see *Bullying Outcomes*, to follow).

When measured as physical violence, boys are more likely than girls to commit bullying. However, both physical bullying and relational bullying (e.g., maligning or exclusion) are forms of aggression (Nader, 2008). Some evidence suggests that, by middle adolescence, although girls are more inclined to harm others by indirect means (e.g., gossip, exclusion), boys tend to use equal amounts of physical and relational aggression (Peeters, Cillessen, & Scholte, 2010; Putallaz et al., 2007). Studies to date generally support the idea that youth who bully, especially boys, report lower levels of both cognitive and affective empathy (Schonert-Reichl, 2012). In contrast, students high in empathy have reported negative attitudes toward bullying (Espelage et al., 2004). Bullying has multiple associations, including school climate issues (Cohen et al., 2009; Eller, 2012) and community factors (e.g., higher exposure to community violence; Bacchinni et al., 2009).

Victims of bullying are differentially vulnerable to forms of bullying. For middle school children, Carbone-Lopez, Esbensen, and Brick (2010) found that the correlates/outcomes of bullying were influenced by type and frequency of bullying. Although even occasional physical violence victimization contributed negatively to well-being and behavior, only repeated teasing or harassment was related to such outcomes. For boys, intermittent relational victimization and, for girls, repeated relational victimization was associated with delinquency. For adolescents, gender findings suggest more overt physical aggression toward boys and more indirect/relational aggression and sexual harassment toward girls (Carbone-Lopez et al., 2010). Other differences (e.g., ethnicity, appearance, poverty) are associated with increased risk of victimization. In addition, outcomes may vary by victim characteristics (Carbone-Lopez et al., 2010; Gruber & Fineran, 2008). Some research indicates that girls may suffer a broader range of and more negative consequences of bullying than boys (e.g., more negative psychological effects, more severe health problems) (Gruber & Fineran, 2008). However, repeated bullying has corresponded to suicidality or aggression in boys as well. Although one study suggests that racial bullying is strongly related to gender and race rather than to school climate—i.e.,

boys and Canadian African Americans were more likely than others to engage in racial bullying—the same study suggested that increased school support was associated with decreased racial bullying to a greater degree when there was greater teacher diversity (Larochette, Murphy, & Craig, 2010).

Prevalence and Impact

Both national and international studies have documented a high prevalence of bullying (Bacchini et al., 2009). U.S. and international studies suggest that indirect forms of bullying are more prevalent than direct physical aggression (Hilton, Anngela-Cole, & Wakita, 2010; Wang, Ionnatti, & Nansel, 2009). In a U.S. nationally representative sample of 6th to 10th graders, Wang et al. (2009) found that 12.8% of students reported being physically bullied, 36.5% of verbal bullying, 41.0% reported being relationally bullied, and 9.8% cyber bullied. However, Cassidy, Jackson, and Brown (2009) found that approximately one-third of students report having been cyber bullied but that many do not report the offense for fear of retaliation.

Bully-victim relationships emerge as early as age 5 or 6 (Vermande, Van Den Oord, Goudena, & Rispen, 2000). Although the connections between bullying, victimization, and psychosocial difficulties may reflect causes, consequences, or concomitant correlates of bullying and/or victimization (Swearer et al., 2010), cross-cultural research suggests that bullying has detrimental and long-lasting effects for both bullies and victims (Hilton et al., 2010; Ma et al., 2009; Swearer et al., 2010). As early as preschool, relational victimization is associated with serious adjustment problems (e.g., in academics, problematic relationships, depression, loneliness, low self-esteem, and emotional distress) (Crick et al., 1998). The Internet is frequently used as a social media tool (Mishna et al., 2010). Lenhart et al. (2011) found that 95% of studied 12-17 year olds used social media (e.g., twitter) and/or social networking sites (e.g., facebook, MySpace). In their study, although 69% of youth reported that peers are mostly kind to one another online (20% say that peers are mostly unkind), 88% had seen someone be mean or cruel to another on a social network site. Of those, 12% said that they see cruelty frequently (18% sometimes; 47%, only once in a while). Fifteen percent of youth reported being the recipients of some form of harassment. As noted, cyber bullying may be under-reported. The results of cyber bullying are similar to other



forms of bullying, including the possibilities of suicidal or aggressive/retaliatory behaviors (Cassidy et al., 2009). Statistics for a subgroup of often bullied youth demonstrate higher percentages of victimization for specific groups.

Bisexual and Transgender Youth

Homophobia is among common instigators of bullying behavior (CSEE, 2010). From 1999 to 2009, the frequency of verbalized homophobic epithets in schools decreased; however, more severe forms of bullying and harassment have remained relatively constant for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students (Kosciw, Greytak, Diaz, & Bartkiewicz, 2010). In a large 2009 sample of 6th – 12th graders, the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) found that close to 85% of LGBT students were verbally harassed (e.g., threatened or called names) at school. In addition, large percentages were physically harassed (e.g., pushed, shoved), physically assaulted (e.g., punched, kicked, injured with a weapon), and/or cyberbullied (e.g., through text messages, emails, instant messages or postings on Internet sites). Most did not report the harassment (64.4%). Of those who did report, 33.8% said that staff did nothing. Associated with these findings, harassed students had approximately ½ grade point lower, less often planned to pursue post-high school education, and reported more depression and anxiety than less often harassed youth. School type and climate influences LGBT victimization levels. Students in non-religious private schools were less likely to hear negative remarks about someone's gender expression and less likely to be harassed or assaulted because of sexual orientation or gender expression than in public or religious schools. Across schools, when curriculums included positive representations of LGBT individuals, history, and events, harassment was reduced and LGBT student's felt safer and had an increased sense of school connectedness. Although having supportive staff alone does not eradicate problems for all LGBT students, with supportive staff fewer youth feel unsafe, absenteeism is lower, and there are increases in grade point averages and sense of school connection among these youth (Kosciw et al., 2010). Evidence suggests that, compared to other states, states with comprehensive antibullying/harassment laws have less student victimization related to sexual orientation.

Bullying Outcomes

Bullying is directly and indirectly associated with multiple adverse outcomes—such as poor school adjustment, higher levels of loneliness, poor interpersonal relating, depression, school avoidance, suicidal ideation, externalizing and disruptive behaviors, and hyperactivity as well as lower self-esteem than nonbullied peers (Espelage & Low, 2012; Harlow & Roberts, 2010; Klomek, Sourander, & Gould, 2010; Nader & Nader, 2012). A large body of evidence suggests that victims of violence may become perpetrators of violence (Henry, 2009; Larkin, 2009; Nader, 2008). As noted, a large percentage of rampage/targeted school shooters were bullied prior to their rampages (Vossekuil et al., 2002). Bully-victims and victims report the most negative perceptions of their relationships with classmates (Bacchini et al., 2009). Teachers and peers rate victims as lowest in social status (Graham, 2010). On the other hand, some evidence suggests that bullies report more negative perceptions of their relationship with teachers (Bacchini et al., 2009).

In addition to directly related outcomes, some of the other associations of bullying are in turn associated with aggression. As noted, being victimized by bullying (i.e., relational or overt aggression) has been associated with low self-esteem. In contrast to high self-esteem, which is associated with increased life satisfaction, positive emotions, and resilience as well as with reduced likelihood of pathology such as anxiety or depression (Nader, 2008; Twenge & Campbell, 2001), low self-esteem has been linked to psychopathology (e.g., suicidality, substance abuse, personality disorders, posttraumatic stress disorders, childhood social withdrawal, and eating disorders) including aggression under conditions of perceived threat (Fletcher, 2003; Heinonen, Räkönönen, & Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2003; Nader, 2008; Rubin, Burgess, Kennedy, & Stewart, 2003; Twenge & Campbell, 2001).

A review of extant literature reveals a clear association between bullying and suicide for children and adolescents (Klomek, Sourander, & Gould, 2010). School violence and suicide are linked variables (Hurford, 2010; Nader, 2012). Bullies and victims both are at increased risk for suicidal ideation and attempts (Nickerson & Slater, 2009), and suicidal ideation was found among the majority of targeted school shooters (Vossekuil et al., 2002). One study suggests differences by gender—i.e., above and beyond other risk factors, frequent victimizations lead to suicidality for females, while,



among males, frequent bullying leads to suicidality when accompanied with conduct problems (Klomek, Sourander, Niemelä, et al., 2009). Bonanno and Hymel (2010) found that social hopelessness rather than general hopelessness reported by victims of bullying was related to suicidal ideation. Social hopelessness increased with increased victimizations, and was linked to a greater risk for suicidal thoughts. These findings additionally underscore the need for social support. Studies suggest that social support is a proven protective factor against pathology (e.g., traumatic reactions, suicidality) (Bonanno & Hymel, 2010; Nader, 2008; see Support, this article).

Cyber Bullying

Cyber bullying is a significant problem that is difficult to contain. It is a form of relational aggression—i.e., it attempts harm indirectly/socially, e.g., by maligning, intimidating, excluding, or sexually harassing individuals—via electronic media (e.g., Internet, texting) by sending cruel or harmful information about or images of a person to peers (Jackson, Cassidy, & Brown, 2009; Nader & Nader, 2012). What is sent may include false information or images. Victims may be a part of the group doing the cyber bullying or, like many other bullying victims, may be different in some way (Cassidy et al., 2009). In a study of 6 – 9th graders, Cassidy et al. (2009) found that approximately one-third of students reported having been cyber bullied. In a large study of high school students, Mishna, Cook, Gadalla, Daciuk, and Soloman (2010) found that 49.5% of youth reported victimization via cyber bullying, and 33.7% admitted committing cyber bullying. Those youth, who experienced online bullying, reported subsequent anger, sadness, and depression. Although many reported feeling guilty afterward, those who bullied others online indicated that it made them feel as though they were funny, popular, and powerful.

The Internet is public domain, and consequently, cyber bullying, by its nature, is repetitive (Mishna et al., 2010). As noted, repeated victimization may lead to humiliation and rage that ultimately erupt in violence or in self-destructive behaviors (Nader, 2012). As a consequence of cyber bullying, studies have found a number of problems for victims, including reports of sadness, anxiety, fear, and an inability to concentrate which affected grades (Beran & Li, 2005), greater likelihood of skipping school, having detentions or

suspensions, or having carried a weapon to school (Ybarra, Diener-West, & Leaf, 2007), and higher levels of depression, substance use, and delinquency (Mitchell, Ybarra, & Finkelhor, 2007).

Prevention

Although not all European bullying interventions have proven effective in the U.S. (Espelage & Low, 2012), in 44 Swedish bullying intervention studies (Tofsi, Farrington, & Baldry, 2008), reductions in bullying and victimization were associated with training classroom rules and management, parent training, increased playground supervision, communication between home and school, and the use of training videos. Evidence suggests the successful use in the U.S. of methods that employ some of these same tools as well as teach youth specific skills (Espelage & Low, 2012; Nader, 2012). With more of the elements included in a program, the greater the likelihood of reduced bullying. In addition, use of the Virginia Threat Assessment method is associated with decreased bullying (Cornell et al., 2009).

THREAT ASSESSMENT

Threat assessment methods determine the likelihood of the implementation of threats as well as put into place the teams and guidelines employed for prevention, assessment, and crisis response (Cornell, 2006; Williams & Cornell, 2006; O'Toole, 2000). Zero tolerance policies—that emphasize severe sanctions (e.g., suspension or expulsion) over interactional methods—have not proven to be effective violence prevention methods (Allen et al., 2008; APA Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008; Borum et al., 2010). Threat assessment methods have been more effective and have received greater endorsement. For example, schools using the Virginia Threat Assessment Method have reported less bullying, greater willingness to seek help related to threats of violence or bullying, more positive perceptions of school climate, and fewer long-term suspensions than other schools (Cornell et al., 2009). Effective prevention methods include efforts to establish a positive school climate (e.g., increased rapport and mutual respect between and among adults and youth) and threat assessment methods (e.g., watchfulness, crisis planning, community liaison, encouraging reporting of rumors or concerns about weapons or planned attacks, visible presence of school



personnel, and a trained school resource officer) (Daniels et al. 2010a, b). Of course, bullying prevention is a part of violence prevention because bullying is a form of aggression and because targeted school shootings, suicides, and other adverse effects are among its associations (Brunner & Lewis, 2006; Eller, 2012; Espelage & Low, 2012; Olweus, 1993; Vossekuil, et al., 2002).

RELATIONSHIPS

The quality of relationships, in and outside of schools, influences youth. In addition, effective school styles, in some ways, mimic effective parenting styles. From the beginnings of life the connection of parent to child and the child's feelings of comfort and safety help to shape a youth's perceptions, coping, personal style, behaviors, skills, and general well-being (Nader, 2012). Infants and children who are valued and sensitively cared for develop qualities such as good self-confidence and self-esteem, reasonable trust, empathy, and the capacity for self-reflection and self-soothing that, in turn, enhance other personal and interpersonal competencies and resilience (i.e., the facility to do well in the face of adversity; Cassidy & Shaver, 1999; Fosha, 2003; Knox, 2003a,b; Moss et al., 2012; Nader, 2008). That is, securely attached children are more resistant to stress, more likely to thrive, and less likely to engage in problem behaviors and other psychopathology (Fosha, 2003; Moss et al., 2012; Nader, 2012).

The importance of relationships also is reflected in both adult-student and peer relationships at schools. For example, many school shooters exhibited warning signs or communicated their intentions before their rampages (Daniels, Volungis et al., 2010; O'Toole, 2000). Consequently, it is essential to maintain an atmosphere of open communication with students so that they feel free to report threats (see Threat Assessment, this article). Successful violence prevention methods have included open communication between adults and students.

ATTACHMENT: PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS AND AGGRESSION

Evidence suggests that early attachment relationships become working models for a child's self-regulation system (behavior and emotion regulation) (Moss et al., 2009) as well as shape interpersonal styles (Bureau & Moss, 2010; Granot &

Maysless, 2001; Nader & Nader, 2012). Although genetic factors may influence a youth's susceptibility to parenting behaviors (Bakermans-Kranenburg & van IJzendoorn, 2006, 2007, 2010), a substantial body of evidence has confirmed the importance of sensitive parenting to a youth's well-being (Breidenstine, Bailey, Zeanah, & Larrieu, 2011; Cassidy & Shaver, 1999; Munafo, Yalcin, Willis-Owen, & Flint, 2008). As noted, such qualities enhance a youth's ability to be productive, capacity to be personally and interpersonally competent, and facility to do well in the face of adversity as well as increase resistance to stress and reduce vulnerability to problem behaviors and other psychopathology (see Moss et al., 2012; Nader, 2012). In contrast, attachment insecurity is associated for some with relationship difficulties (e.g., increased helplessness and anger) and reluctance to function independently and for others with increased likelihood of behavior problems including aggression (Moss et al., 2012). Inconsistent caregiving, for example, corresponds to an insecure ambivalent attachment relationship with a caregiver and an ongoing style of interacting and learning (Moss et al., 2012; Svanberg, Mennet, & Spieker, 2010). The ambivalent school age child excessively emphasizes his or her relationship with the caregiver to the detriment of exploration (Moss et al., 2012). Consequently, the youth may exhibit immature and dependent behaviors with adults and peers in and out of school. Other insecure or disorganized attachment styles have been linked to aggression and other mental health outcomes (Moss et al., 2012; Nader & Nader, 2012).

Researchers have found a negative correlation between secure parental attachment and bullying (victimization and bullying aggression) (Hilton et al., 2010; Ozen & Atkan, 2010; Walden & Beran, 2010). In addition, evidence suggests that insecurely attached individuals tend to use cognitive and behavioral avoidance coping strategies more often than securely attached peers (Mikulincer & Florian, 1995; Ozen & Atkan, 2010), which, in turn, may increase bullying victimization (Ozen & Atkan, 2010). Insecurely attached youth are more likely to experience peer rejection (Dykas, Ziv, & Cassidy, 2008). Additionally, as Nickerson, Mele, and Princiotta (2008) found, children with self-reported higher quality attachment to their mothers have been more likely to report standing up for victims of bullying than those with reported lower quality attachments. Parenting factors associated with youth who bully include lack of affection and warmth from



primary caregivers, lack of consistent discipline when a youth displays aggressive behavior, and parents' use of aggressive child-rearing practices (e.g., physical punishment) (Hilton et al., 2010).

Youth with insecure attachments are more likely to exhibit increased hostility or rejection sensitivity as well as more internalizing and externalizing problems (Bureau & Moss, 2010; Dykas et al., 2008; Moss et al., 2009). They are less likely to demonstrate better school adjustment or effective coping and interaction styles than securely attached youth. Disorganized attachment is associated with the greatest risk of internalizing and externalizing problems (Moss et al., 2004, 2009, 2012). Some intervention programs include student, teacher, and parent components (Nader, 2012). Intervention studies have demonstrated that improved parental use of positive discipline is associated with decreased externalizing behaviors and reduced cortisol levels in genetically vulnerable young children (Bakermans-Kranenburg, van IJzendoorn, Pijlman, Mesman, & Juffer, 2008a, b). The relationship of cortisol, a stress hormone, to behavior varies among age groups (see Nader & Weems, 2011 for a summary). Specifically in preschool age children, cortisol is positively related to externalizing problem behavior (Alink et al., 2008).

SUPPORT

Ample research suggests that perceptions of lack of teacher and peer support (e.g., lack of respect, perceived friction) are associated with low self-esteem, increased depression, and problem behaviors (e.g., cutting class or skipping school, misconduct) (Espinoza & Juvonen, 2011; Wang, 2009; Way, Reddy, & Rhodes, 2007).

School Structure and Support

Gregory and Cornell (2009) suggest that, like good parents, schools must use an appropriate blend of structure (e.g., monitoring, behavioral control, rule enforcement) and support (e.g., warmth, acceptance, and respect; assistance with academic and nonacademic problems). Adolescents need enough structure to feel safe, but not so much structure that it interferes with their emerging independence and self-direction. Overprotective parenting or too much school structure may interfere with a youth's opportunity to learn problem solving, negotiation, and conflict resolution skills (Gregory

& Cornell, 2009; Hilton et al., 2010; Hoover et al., 2003). A body of evidence suggests that structure is more accepted/effective when support is perceived. Gregory et al. (2010) found that high schools with higher structure and support were safer and more secure—i.e., had lower rates of student victimization (aggression and theft) and a more welcoming and less hostile peer culture (reported by both teachers and students). After controlling for school size/enrollment and proportion of ethnic minority and low-income students, structure and support were associated with less bullying and victimization.

Support and Outcomes

Regardless of personality, individuals need a good support system (Nader, 2012). Moreover, the opinions of others form an important initial basis on which youth judge themselves (Harter et al., 1998). Consequently, validation support may be particularly important to youth. The relationship of shame/humiliation to negative outcomes, noted earlier, demonstrates some of the consequences of the perception of lack of support and value.

Support systems in and out of schools are important to youth (Bruyere & Garbarino, 2012; Cohen et al., 2009; Nader & Pollack, 2012). Research has demonstrated better mental health outcomes following adversities when levels of social support were higher (Bonanno & Hymel, 2010; Espalage & Low, 2012; Gladstone, Beardslee, & O'Connor, 2011; Kilpatrick et al., 2007; Scheeringa, in press). As can be inferred from the preceding section, evidence also suggests that teacher emotional support is negatively related to levels of youth deviant behaviors and poor mental health outcomes (Wang, 2009). Peer and teacher support have been lacking for victims of bullying (Hurford et al., 2010; Newman & Fox, 2009). Hurford suggests that strong social support might serve as prevention and intervention for bullying. In addition, research has demonstrated that support-seeking, support-accepting, and support giving vary by attachment style (see Nader & Nader, 2012 for a summary). Such findings underscore the need for interventions at home as well as at school.

INTERVENTIONS

As described, low levels of personal skills (e.g., social, coping, self-regulation) and increased victimizations (e.g., being



bullied, traumatized) have been associated with youth's increased behavioral and psychological problems (Mello & Nader, 2012; Moss et al., 2012; Schonert-Reichl, 2012). For example, Gibson, Miller, Jennings, Swat, and Gover (2009) found that, before joining, gang members demonstrated higher levels of delinquency, showed less self-regulation (i.e., more impulsivity, risk-taking), and had more prior violent victimizations compared to those who did not join a gang. Such associations suggest the need for proven interventions.

The overlap of violence prevention with improvements in social-emotional learning, positive connection, and school climate has been shown repeatedly in the results of implementing school-based training in social emotional learning (SEL) or similar programs (see Nader, 2012). These programs have been associated with increases or improvements in academic performance, test scores, social-emotional competence, prosocial behavior and attitudes, coping skills, problem solving and conflict resolution, attention, and antibullying (Devine & Cohen, 2007; Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011; Durlak, Weissberg, & Pachan, 2010; Edwards, Hunt, Meyers, Grogg, & Jarrett 2005; Espalage & Low, 2012; Jones, Brown, & Aber, 2011; Merrell, Juskelis, Tran, & Buchanan, 2008; Merrell, 2010; Ragozzino & O'Brien, 2009; Schonert-Reichl & Scott, 2009; Schonert-Reichl, Smith, Zaidman-Zait, & Hertzman, 2011a; Zins et al., 2004) as well as in decreases in internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors including decreased aggression and hostile attribution biases (Caldarella, Christensen, Kramer, & Kronmiller, 2009; Kramer, Caldarella, Christensen, & Shatzer, 2010; Durlak et al., 2010, 2011; Jones et al., 2011; Schonert-Reichl, 2012; Schonert-Reichl et al., 2011a; Schonert-Reichl & Stewart Lawlor, 2010; Schonert-Reichl et al., 2011b). SEL programs have also been associated with reduced destructive bystander behavior related to bullying for elementary school children (Frey, Hirschstein, Edstrom, & Snell, 2009). SEL studies have reported significant increases in children's assessments of classroom supportiveness, caring school community, commitment to democratic values, and a sense of belonging and in teacher assessments of their emotional ability and classroom quality (Brown, Jones, LaRusso, & Aber, 2010; Schonert-Reichl, 2012). Results also include decreases in peer and student-adult negative interactions (Schonert-Reichl, 2012). For some programs, optimism and

willingness to face challenges also increased (Schonert-Reichl & Stewart Lawlor, 2010; Schonert-Reichl et al., 2011b).

SEL programs are successfully implemented by teachers and other school personnel (Durlak et al., 2011). Programs often include separate training segments for students, for teachers, and for parents. Trained teachers have reported improvements in school climate (Hoffman, Hutchison, & Reese, 2009). Meta-analysis of research indicates that SEL programs are most effective when they include established skill training practices: planned activities to sequentially develop skills; active learning—such as role play or behavioral rehearsal with feedback; and sufficient classroom time devoted to skill development—including targeting of social emotional skills (Payton, et. al. 2008). School training programs (e.g., to enhance social and coping skills, increase mutual respect) that include long-term coordinated efforts involving parents as well as children and schools are more effective than short-term isolated efforts (Cohen, 2006; Conoley & Goldstein, 2004; Resnick et al., 1997; Zins, et al., 2004).

CONCLUSIONS

Although more study is needed that controls for appropriate variables (e.g., demographic), in order to reduce school violence, the extant literature generally suggests the need for positive school climates including providing a safe environment (e.g., prevention of bullying, vigilance, crisis preparedness), enhancing respect and open communication between and among adults and youth, enhancing parenting, increasing support, and improving youth skills (e.g., social, coping, problem-solving). In addition to safety, all humans, perhaps especially children, need to be cared for and valued. Safety is enhanced by mutually positive, respectful, and supportive relationships as well as by the active, vigilant and visible presence of caring adults. Some experts have observed that increasing youth–adult connection is at the heart of anti-violence and anti-bullying methods (Cohen, 2001; Pollack, 2004a, b; Nader & Pollack, 2012; Pollack et al., 2008). Research on averted school shootings helps to support the importance of connection.

A supportive adult presence is associated with less school burnout, lower aggression levels, and better academic performance. Youth thrive when they feel valued and valuable. In line with this, some evidence suggests that failure is associated



with aggression (among other negative effects). Successful learning is, therefore, important to safety as well as to the ability to be productive.

Studies of Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) have found that SEL improves behavior, discipline, safety, and academics. In addition, SEL helps youth become more self-aware, manage their emotions, build skills important to social interaction (e.g., empathy, perspective-taking, respect for diversity), and improve decision-making skills (Espelage & Low, 2010; Nader, 2012; Zins et al., 2004). From an ecological perspective, interventions must take into account family, peer, school, and community factors (Espelage & Swearer, 2004; Nader, 2012; Nickerson et al., 2008; Walden & Beran, 2010). Programs that focus on the entire student body rather than only on individual bullies and that include parents have proven effective in the U.S. (Espelage & Low, 2012).

FUTURE STUDIES

A number of issues need additional study that includes careful study design, controlling for a wide range of variables in addition to assessing a main variable such as bullying or other aggression.

It is clear from studies of the perpetrators of targeted school shootings and hostage takings that effective interventions are important for victims of violence—whether bullying, abuse, assault, or other violence—in order to help prevent eruptive violence (Nader, 2008, 2012; Vossekuil et al., 2002). Future studies must examine both group and individual interventions that assist with the associations of aggression. For example, more research is needed that examines the enhancement of individual skills (e.g., skills for dealing with bullies, coping skills, social skills) as well as school based and interpersonal methods (e.g., for reducing/preventing bullying, increasing positive school climate, providing supportive assistance). That is, both giving youth individual skills for dealing with aggressors and using group interventions to reduce the likelihood of aggression are important for prevention. Preliminary evidence suggests the potential for a couple of methods that target the victim's behavior in response to bullying. One program provides practice in the responses of victims to bullies that might decrease the likelihood of persistence of bullying (Kalman, 2012; McNamara, submitted). Another program used successfully in the UK employs

a virtual learning method to assist children in learning to escape bullying (Sapouna, Wolke, Dieter & Vannini, 2010). More study is needed to determine their effectiveness across schools.

Some topics need additional and more comprehensive elaboration and study. Although there are important findings related to leadership style and school climate, additional and more comprehensive study comparing school characteristics might be of interest. Methods of containing and reducing cyberbullying are greatly needed. Numerous studies have elaborated the importance of attachment relationships to ongoing resilience and the relationship of insecure attachments to vulnerability and problematic behaviors and emotional states. The study of attachment in school age children is newer and is evolving. This study suggests differences in learning needs and interactional styles related to attachment classification (Moss et al., 2012; Nader, 2012). More study is needed to confirm or expand findings for school age youth. In addition, knowledge of the effects of specific genetic polymorphisms suggests that some youth are more vulnerable to the quality and nature of their environments than others and that different youth may react differently to prolonged or severe adversity (Nader, in press b). An examination of these findings and their application to school climate, learning style, and violence prevention will likely become important in the future.



REFERENCES

- Abramson, L., Alloy, L., Hankin, B., Haefel, G., MacCoon, D., & Gibb, B. (2002). Cognitive vulnerability-stress models depression in a self-regulatory and psychobiological context. In I. Gotlib & C. Hammen (Eds.), *Handbook of depression* (pp. 268–294). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Adelman, H. & Taylor, L. (2011). School engagement, disengagement, learning supports, & school climate. Los Angeles: Center for Mental Health in Schools at UCLA. Access at: <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/schooleng.pdf>
- Adeogun, A. (2011). Influence of School Climate on Students' Achievement and Teachers' Productivity for Sustainable Development. *US-China Education Review*, 8(4), 552-557.
- Alink, L., van IJzendoorn, M., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M., Mesman, J., Juffer, F., & Koot, H. (2008). Cortisol and externalizing behavior in children and adolescents: Mixed meta-analytic evidence for the inverse relation of basal cortisol and cortisol reactivity with externalizing behavior. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 50, 427–450.
- Allen, K., Cornell, D., Lorek, E., & Sheras, P. (2008). Response of school personnel to student threat assessment training. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 19(3), 319–332.
- American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations. *American Psychologist*, 63(9), 852–862.
- Bacchini, D., Esposito, G., & Affuso, G. (2009). Social Experience and School Bullying. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 19, 17–32.
- Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & Van IJzendoorn, M. (2006). Gene–environment interaction of the dopamine D4 receptor (DRD4) and observed maternal insensitivity predicting externalizing behavior in preschoolers. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 48, 406–409.
- Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & Van IJzendoorn, M. (2007). Genetic vulnerability or differential susceptibility in child development: The case of attachment. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 48, 1160–1173.
- Bakermans-Kranenburg, M.J., & van IJzendoorn, M. (2008). Oxytocin receptor (OXTR) and serotonin transporter (5-HTT) genes associated with observed parenting. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 3, 128–134.
- Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J. & van IJzendoorn, M. (2010). Parenting matters: Family science in the genomic era. *Family Science*, 1(1), 26-36.
- Bakermans-Kranenburg, M.J., van IJzendoorn, M., Pijlman, F., Mesman, J., & Juffer, F. (2008b). Differential susceptibility to intervention: Dopamine D4 Receptor Polymorphism (DRD4 VNTR) moderates effects on toddlers' externalizing behavior in a randomized control trial. *Developmental Psychology*, 44, 293–300.
- Beran, T. & Li, Q. (2007). The relationship between cyberbullying and school bullying. *Journal of Student Wellbeing*, 1, 15–33.
- Berson, I. R., Berson, M., & Ferron, J. (2002). Emerging risks of violence in the digital age: Lessons for educators from an online study of adolescent girls in the United States. *Meridian: A Middle School Technologies Journal*, 5, 1–32.
- Benner, A. & Graham, S. (2009). The transition to high school as a developmental process among multiethnic urban youth. *Child Development*, 80(2), 356–376.
- Birkett, M., Espelage, D., & Koenig, B. (2009). LGB and questioning students in schools: The moderating effects of homophobic bullying and school climate on negative outcomes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38(7), 989-1000.
- Black, G. (2010). Correlational analysis of servant leadership and school climate. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 13(4), 437–466.
- Bonanno, R. & Hymel, S. (2010). Investigating why some victims of bullying are at greater risk for suicidal ideation. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 56(3), 420-439.
- Borum, R., Cornell, D., Modzeleski, W., & Jimerson, S. (2010). What can be done about school shootings? A review of the evidence. *Educational Researcher*, 39(1), 27–37.
- Bowes, L., Arseneault, L., Maughan, B., Taylor, A., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. (2009). School, neighborhood, and family factors are associated with children's bullying involvement: A nationally representative longitudinal study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 48(5): 545–53.
- Brand, S., Felner, R., Shim, M., Seitsinger, A., & Dumas, T. (2003). Middle school improvement and reform: Development and validation of a school-level assessment of climate, cultural pluralism, and school safety. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95, 570–588.
- Breidenstine, A., Bailey, L., Zeanah, C., & Larrieu, J. (2011). Attachment and trauma in early childhood: A review. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Trauma*, 4(4), 274-290.
- Brookmeyer, K., Fanti, K., & Henrich, C. (2006). Schools, parents, and youth violence: A multilevel, ecological analysis. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*. 35(4). 504–514.



- Brown, J., Jones, S., LaRusso, M., & Aber, J. (2010). Improving classroom quality: Teacher influences and experimental impacts of the 4Rs Program. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102, 153–167.
- Brunner, J., & Lewis, D. (2006). Telling a “red flag” from the real threat with students of today. *Education Digest*, 72(4), 33–36.
- Bruyere, E. & Garbarino, J. (2012). A continuum of youth violence. In Nader, K. (Ed.). *School Rampage Shootings and Other Youth Disturbances: Early Preventive Interventions*, (pp. 83-100). New York: Routledge.
- Bureau, J-F. & Moss, E. (2010). Behavioural precursors of attachment representations in middle childhood and links with child social adaptation. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 28, 657–677.
- Caldarella, P., Christensen, L., Kramer, T., & Kronmiller, K. (2009). The effects of Strong Start on second grades students’ emotional and social competence. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 37(1), 51–56.
- Carbone-Lopez, K., Esbensen, F., & Brick, B. (2010). Correlates and consequences of peer victimization: Gender differences in direct and indirect forms of bullying. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* 8(4) 332-350.
- Cassidy, W., Jackson, M., & Brown, K. (2009). Students’ experiences with cyber-bullying: Sticks and stones can break my bones, but how can pixels hurt me? *School Psychology International*, 30(4), 383–402.
- Cassidy, J. & Shaver, P. (Eds.). (1999). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Center for Social Emotional Education (2010). School climate research summary. 1(1), Downloaded 9/15/11 from www.school-climate.org
- Cerda, M., Sagdeo, A., Johnson, J., & Galea, S. (2010). Genetic and environmental influences on psychiatric comorbidity: A systematic review. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 126, 14–38.
- Chang, J., & Le, T. (2010). Multiculturalism as a dimension of school climate: The impact on the academic achievement of Asian American and Hispanic youth. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 16(4), 485–492.
- Cobbold, T. (2006). *The Interaction of School Size and Socio-Economic Status on Student Performance: A review of research evidence*.
- Coffey, P., Leitenberg, H., Henning, K., Turner, T., & Bennett, R. (1996). Mediators of the long-term impact of child sexual abuse: Perceived stigma, betrayal, powerlessness, and self-blame. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 20, 447–455.
- Cohen, J. (Ed.). (2001). *Caring classrooms/intelligent schools: The social emotional education of young children*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cohen, J. (2006) Social, emotional ethical, and academic education: Creating a climate for learning, participation in democracy, and well-being. *Harvard Educational Review*, 76(2), 201–237.
- Cohen, J., McCabe, E., Michelli, N., & Pickeral, T. (2009). School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 111(1), 180–213.
- Conoley, J. & Goldstein, A. (Eds.) (2004). *School violence intervention: A practical handbook* (2nd edition). New York: Guildford Press.
- Cornell, D. (1990). Prior adjustment of violent juvenile offenders. *Law and Human Behavior*, 14, 569–578.
- Cornell, D. (2006). The Virginia model for student threat assessment: From the Public Entity Risk Institute (PERI). Downloaded 4/19/11 from www.policeone.com.
- Cornell, D., Benedek, E., & Benedek, D. (1987). Juvenile homicide: Prior adjustment and a proposed typology. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 57, 383–393.
- Cornell, D., Sheras, P., Gregory, A., & Fan, X. (2009). A retrospective study of school safety conditions in high schools using the Virginia threat assessment guidelines versus alternative approaches. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 24, 119–129.
- Cotton, K. (1996). Social Benefits of Small-Scale Schooling. ERIC DIGEST ED401088 1996-12-00 Retrieved 6/19/08 from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2/content_storage_01/0000000b/80/2a/27/0c.pdf.
- Crick, N., Werner, N., Casas, J., O’Brien, K., Nelson, D., Grotpe-ter, J., & Markon, K. (1998). Childhood aggression and gender: A new look at an old problem. In D. Bernstein et al. (Eds.), *Gender and motivation. Nebraska symposium on motivation* (Vol. 45, pp. 75–141). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Cunningham, N. (2007). Level of bonding to school and perception of the school environment by bullies, victims, and bully victims. *The Journal of Early Adolescence* 27(4), 457–478.
- Daniels, J., Bradley, M., Cramer, D., Winkler, A., Kinebrew, K., & Crockett, D. (2007). The successful resolution of armed hostage/barricade events in schools: A qualitative analysis. *Psychology in the Schools*, 44, 601-613.
- Daniels, J., Royster, T., Vecchi, G., & Pshenishy, E. (2010a). Bar-



ricaded captive situations in schools: Mitigation and response. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25, 587–594.

Daniels, J., Volungis, A., Pshenishy, E., Gandhi, P., Winkler, A., Cramer, D., & Bradley, M. (2010b). A qualitative investigation of averted school shooting rampages. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 38(1), 69–95.

Devine, J., & Cohen, J. (2007). *Making your school safe: Strategies to protect children and promote learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dodge, K., Bates, J., Pettit, G., & Valente, E. (1995). Social information-processing patterns partially mediate the effect of early physical abuse on later conduct problems. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 104(4), 632–643.

Durlak, J., Weissberg, R., Dymnicki, A., Taylor, R., & Schellinger, K. (2011). Enhancing students' social and emotional development promotes success in school: Results of a meta-analysis. *Child Development*, 82, 405–432.

Durlak J., Weissberg R., & Pachan M. (2010). A meta-analysis of after-school programs that seek to promote personal and social skills in children and adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 45(3-4), 294–309.

Dykas, M., Ziv, Y., & Cassidy, J. (2008). Attachment and peer relations in adolescence. *Attachment & Human Development*, 10(2), 123–141.

Edwards, D., Hunt, M., Meyers, J., Grogg, K., & Jarrett, O. (2005). Acceptability and student outcomes of a violence prevention curriculum. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 26 (5), 401–418.

Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(1), 61–94.

Eller, J. (2012). The school environment, school rampage killings, and other forms of school violence. In Nader, K. (Ed.). *School Rampage Shootings and Other Youth Disturbances: Early Preventive Interventions* (pp. 71–82). NY: Routledge.

Espelage, D. & Horne, A. (2008). School violence and bullying prevention: From research based explanations to empirically based solutions. In S. Brown & R. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology*, 4th edition (pp. 588 – 598). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Espelage, D. & Low, S. (2012). Bullying Among Children and Adolescents: Social-emotional learning approaches to prevention. In Nader, K. (Ed.). *School Rampage Shootings and Other Youth Disturbances: Early Preventive Interventions* (pp. 205–220). NY: Routledge.

Espelage, D., Mebane, S., & Adams, R. (2004). Empathy, caring, and bullying: Toward an understanding of complex associations. In D. Espelage & S. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention* (pp. 37–61). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Espelage, D. & Swearer, S. (Eds.) (2010). *Bullying in North American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention* (2nd Edition). New York: Routledge.

Espinoza, G. & Juvonen, J. (2011). Perceptions of the School Social Context Across the Transition to Middle School: Heightened Sensitivity Among Latino Students? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103(3), 749–758.

Fein, R., Vossekuil, B., Pollack, W., Borum, R., Modzeleski, W., & Reddy, M. (2002). *Threat assessment in schools: A guide to managing threatening situations and to creating safe school climates*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Feiring, C. & Cleland, C. (2007). Childhood sexual abuse and abuse specific attributions of blame over 6 years following discovery. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 31, 1169–1186.

Fletcher, K. (in press). Understanding and assessing traumatic responses of guilt, shame, and anger among children, adolescents, and young adults. In Nader, K. (Ed.). *Assessment of Trauma in Youths: Understanding issues of age, complexity, and associated variables*. New York: Routledge.

Fletcher, K. (2003). Childhood posttraumatic stress disorder. In E. J. Mash & R. A. Barkley (Eds.), *Child Psychopathology* (2nd ed., pp. 330–371). New York: Guilford Press.

Fosha, D. (2003). Dyadic regulation and experiential work with emotion and relatedness in trauma and disorganized attachment. In M. Solomon & D. J. Siegel (Eds.), *Healing trauma* (pp. 228–281). New York: W. W. Norton.

Fredricks, J., Blumenfeld, P., & Paris, A. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74, 59–109.

Frey, K., Hirschstein, M., Edstrom, L., & Snell, J. (2009). Observed reductions in school bullying, nonbullying aggression and destructive bystander behavior: A longitudinal evaluation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101, 466–481.

Gibson, C., Miller, J., Jennings, W., Swat, M., & Gover, A. (2009). Using Propensity Score Matching to Understand the Relationship between Gang Membership and Violent Victimization: A Research Note. *Justice Quarterly*, 26(4), 625–643.

Giebels, E., Noelanders, S., & Vervaeke, G. (2005). The hostage experience: Implications for negotiation strategies. *Clinical Psychol-*



- ogy and Psychotherapy, 12, 241-253.
- Gilligan, J. (2003). Shame, guilt, and violence. *Social Research*, 70(4), 1149-1180.
- Gladstone, T., Beardslee, W., & O'Connor, E. (2011). The prevention of adolescent depression. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 34, 35-52.
- Goldsmith, P. A. (2004). Schools' racial mix, students' optimism, and the Black-White and Latino-White achievement gaps. *Sociology of Education*, 77(2), 121-147.
- Goldstein, S., Young, A., & Boyd, C. (2008). Relational aggression at school: Associations with school safety and social climate. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, 37(6), 641-654.
- Granot, D. & Maysel, O. (2001). Attachment security and adjustment to school in middle childhood. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, 25(6), 530-541.
- Graham, S. (2010). What educators need to know about bullying behaviors. *Kappan*, 92(1), 66-69.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis, IN: Robert K. Greenleaf Center.
- Greenwald, R. (Ed.). (2002). *Trauma and juvenile delinquency: Theory, research, and interventions*. New York: Haworth Press.
- Gregory, A. & Cornell, D. (2009). "Tolerating" adolescent needs: Moving beyond Zero Tolerance policies in high school. *Theory Into Practice*, 48, 106-113.
- Gregory, A., Cornell, D., Fan, X., Sheras, P., Shih, T., & Huang, F. (2010). Authoritative school discipline: High school practices associated with lower bullying and victimization. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(2), 483-496.
- Gruber, J. & Fineran, S. (2008). Comparing the impact of bullying and sexual harassment victimization on the mental and physical health of adolescents. *Sex Roles*, 59, 1-13.
- Han, W.-J. (2008). The academic trajectories of children of immigrants and their school environments. *Developmental Psychology*, 44(6), 1572-1590.
- Harlow, K. & Roberts, R. (2010). An exploration of the relationship between social and psychological factors and being bullied. *Children & Schools*, 32(1), 15-26.
- Harter, S., Waters, P., & Whitesell, N. (1998). Relational self-worth: Differences in perceived worth as a person across interpersonal contexts among adolescents. *Child Development*, 69(3), 756-766.
- Hawkins, J., Catalano, R., & Miller, Y. (1992). Risk and protective factors for alcohol and other drug problems in adolescence and early adulthood: Implications for substance abuse prevention. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 64-105.
- Heinonen, K., Räikönen, K., & Keltikangas-Järvinen, L. (2003). Maternal perceptions and adolescent self-esteem: A six-year longitudinal study. *Adolescence*, 38(152), 669-687.
- Henry, S. (2009). School violence beyond Columbine: A complex problem in need of an interdisciplinary analysis. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52(9), 1246-1265.
- Hilton, J., Anngela-Cole, L., & Wakita, J. (2010). A cross-cultural comparison of factors associated with school bullying in Japan and the United States. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 18(4) 413-422.
- Hoffman, L., Hutchinson, C., & Reiss, E. (2009). On improving school climate: reducing reliance on rewards and punishment. *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, 5(1), 13-24.
- Hoover, J., Noll, M., & Olsen, G. (2003). School violence and bullying: Implications for home and school partnerships. In G. Olsen & M. Fuller (Eds.). *Home-school relations: Working successfully with parents and families*, (pp. 342-361). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Hopson, L. & Lawson, H. (2011). Social Workers' leadership for positive school climates via data-informed planning and decision making. *Children & Schools*, 33(2), 106-118.
- Hurford, D., Lindsog, R., Cole, A., Jackson, R., Thomasson, S., & Wade, A. (2010). The role of school climate in school violence: A validity study of a web-based School Violence Survey. *Journal of Educational Research & Policy Studies*, 10(1), 51-77.
- Jackson, M., Cassidy W., & Brown, K. (2009). You were born ugly and you'll die ugly too: Cyber-bullying as relational aggression, submitted to the *Journal of School Violence*.
- Jones, S., Brown, J., & Aber, J. (2011). Two-year impacts of a universal school-based social-emotional and literacy intervention: An experiment in translational developmental research. *Child Development*, 82(2), 533-554.
- Kalman, I. (2012). A quick, fun method for teaching kids how to stop being victims. In Nader, K. (Ed.). *School Rampage Shootings and Other Youth Disturbances: Early Preventive Interventions* (pp. 221-244). NY: Routledge.
- Kasen, S., Berenson, K., Cohen, P., & Johnosn, J. (2004). The Effects of school climate on changes in aggressive and other behaviors related to bullying. In D. Espelage, & S. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in American schools*, (pp. 187-210) New Jersey: Mahwah.
- Kasen, S., Cohen, P., & Brook, J. (1998). Adolescent school experi-



ences and dropout, adolescent pregnancy, and young adult deviant behavior. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 13, 49–72.

Kasen, S., Johnson, J., & Cohen, P. (1990). The impact of school emotional climate on student psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 18, 165–177.

Kilpatrick, D., Koenen, K., Ruggiero, K., Acierno, R., Galea, S., Resnick, H. et al. (2007). Serotonin transporter genotype and social support and moderation of posttraumatic stress disorder and depression in hurricane-exposed adults. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 164(11), 1–7.

Klein, J. & Cornell, D. (2010). Is the link between large high schools and student victimization an illusion? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102, 933–946.

Klomek, B., Sourander, A., & Gould, M. (2010). The association of suicide and bullying in childhood to young adulthood: A review of cross-sectional and longitudinal research findings. *La Revue canadienne de psychiatrie*, 55(5), 282–288.

Klomek, B., Sourander, A., Niemelä, S., et al. (2009). Childhood bullying behaviors as a risk for severe suicide attempts and completed suicides. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 48(3), 254–261.

Knox, J. (2003a). Archetype, attraction, analysis: Jungian psychology and the emergent mind. New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Knox, J. (2003b). Trauma and defenses: Their roots in relationship, an overview. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 48, 511–530.

Kosciw, J. & Elizabeth M. (2006). The 2005 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools. New York: GLSEN.

Kosciw, J., Greytak, E., Diaz, E., & Bartkiewicz, M. (2010). The 2009 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools. New York: The Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network.

Kramer, T., Caldarella, P., Christensen, L., & Shatzer, R. (2010). Social-emotional learning in kindergarten classrooms: Evaluation of the Strong Start curriculum. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 37(4), 303–398.

Lambert, W. E. (2004). Servant leadership qualities of principals, organizational climate, and student achievement: A correlational study. *Dissertations Abstracts International*: 66(02), 430.

Larkin, R. (2009). The Columbine legacy: Rampage shootings as political acts. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52(9), 1309–1326.

Larochette, A-C., Murphy, A., & Craig, W. (2010). Racial bullying and victimization in Canadian school-aged children. *School*

Psychology International, 31(4), 389–408.

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2009). Review of empirical Evidence about school size effects: A policy perspective. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(1), 464–490.

Lenhardt, A., Madden, M., Smith, A., Purcell, K., Zickuhr, K., & Rainie, L. (2011). Teens, kindness and cruelty on social network sites: How American teens navigate the new world of “digital citizenship”. Washington, D.C.: Project of the Pew Research Center's Internet & American Life Project. <http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2011/Teens-and-social-media.aspx>

Ma, L., Phelps, E., Lerner, J., & Lerner, R. (2009). Academic competence for adolescents who bully and who are bullied. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 29(6), 862–897.

McCowan, C. D. (2004). Leading before, during, and after a major organizational transition. *Dissertation Abstracts International*: 65(01), 53.

Media Awareness Network. (2005). Young Canadians in a wired world. Retrieved April 11, 2009, from http://www.media-awareness.ca/english/research/ycww/phaseII/key_findings.cfm

Mello, C. & Nader, K. (2012). Teaching Coping and Social Skills to Elementary School Children. In Nader, K. (Ed.) *School Rampage Shootings and Other Youth Disturbances: Early Preventive Interventions*, (pp. 103–126). New York: Routledge.

Meraviglia, M., Becker, H., Rosenbluth, B., Sanchez, E., & Robertson, T. (2003). The expect respect project: Creating a positive elementary school climate. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(11), 1347–1360.

Merrell, K. (2010). Linking prevention science and social and emotional learning: the Oregon Resiliency Project. *Psychology in the Schools*, 47(1), 55–70.

Merrell, K., Juskelis, M., Tran, O., & Buchanan, R. (2008). Social and emotional learning in the classroom: Evaluation of Strong Kids and Strong Teens on students' social-emotional knowledge and symptoms. *Journal of applied school psychology*, 24(2), 209–224.

Meyer-Adams, N., & Conner, B. T. (2008). School violence: Bullying behaviors and the psychosocial school environment in middle schools. *Children & Schools*, 30(4), 211–221.

Mikulincer, M., & Florian, V. (1995). Appraisal of and coping with a real-life stressful situation: The contribution of attachment styles. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 406–414.

Mishna, F., Cook, C., Gadalla, T., Daciuk, J., Soloman, S. (2010). Cyber Bullying Behaviors Among Middle and High School Students. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 80(3), 362–374.



- Mitchell, K., Ybarra, M., & Finkelhor, D. (2007). The relative importance of online victimization in understanding depression, delinquency and substance use. *Child Maltreatment*, 12, 314–324.
- Moss, E., Bureau, J.-F., Béliveau, M.-J., & Lépine, S. (2009). Links between children's attachment behavior at early school-age, their attachment related representations, and behavior problems in middle childhood. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 1, 1–12.
- Moss, E., Cyr, C., & Dubois-Comtois, K. (2004). Attachment at early school age and developmental risk: Examining family contexts and behavior problems of controlling–caregiving, controlling–punitive, and behaviorally disorganized children. *Developmental Psychology*, 40(4), 519–532.
- Moss, E., Pascuzzo, K., & Simard, V. (2012). Treating insecure and disorganized attachments in school-aged children. In Nader, K. (Ed.) *School Rampage Shootings and Other Youth Disturbances: Early Preventive Interventions*, (pp. 127-158). New York: Routledge.
- Munafò, M., Yalcin, B., Willis-Owen, S., & Flint, J. (2008). Association of the dopamine D4 receptor (DRD4) gene and approach-related personality traits: Meta-analysis and new data. *Biological Psychiatry*, 63, 197–206.
- Nader, K. (in press). Assessing exposure and reactions to trauma in children and adolescents. In Clements, P. & Seedat, S. (Eds.). *Mental health issues of child maltreatment*, St Louis, MO: STM Learning, Inc.
- Nader, K. (Ed.) (2012). *School Rampage Shootings and Other Youth Disturbances: Early Preventive Interventions*. New York: Routledge.
- Nader, K. (2008). Understanding and assessing trauma and children and adolescents: Measures, methods, and youth in context. New York: Routledge.
- Nader, K. & Nader, W. (2012). Youth at risk: Targeted shootings, other school violence, and suicides. In Nader, K. (Ed.) *School Rampage Shootings and Other Youth Disturbances: Early Preventive Interventions*, (pp. 33-70). New York: Routledge.
- Nader, K. & Pollack, W. (2012). Early Interventions: Preventing Aggression; Enhancing Connection among Youth and Adults. In Nader, K. (Ed.) *School Rampage Shootings and Other Youth Disturbances: Early Preventive Interventions*, (pp. 245-263). New York: Routledge.
- Nader, K. & Weems, C. (2011). Understanding and Assessing Cortisol Levels in Children and Adolescents. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Trauma*, 4(4), 318-338.
- Newman, K. & Fox, C. (2009). Repeat tragedy: Rampage shootings in American high school and college settings. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52(9), 1286-1308.
- Nickerson, A., Mele, D., & Princiotta, D. (2008). Attachment and empathy as predictors of roles as defenders or outsiders in bullying interactions. *Journal of School Psychology*, 46, 687-703.
- Nickerson, A. & Slater, E. (2009). School and community victimization as predictors of adolescent suicidal behavior. *School Psychology Review*, 38(2), 218-232.
- Olweus, D. (1993). Bully/victim problems among schoolchildren: Longterm consequences and an effective intervention program. In S. Hodgins (Ed.), *Mental disorder and crime* (pp. 317–349). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- O'Toole, M. (2000). *The school shooter: A threat assessment perspective*. Quantico, VA: Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- Ozen, D. & Aktan, T. (2010). Summary: Attachment and being in bullying system: Mediation role of coping strategies. *Turkish Journal of Psychology*, 25 (65), 114-115.
- Payton, J., Weissberg, R., Durlak, J., Dymnicki, A., Taylor, R., Schellinger, K., & Pachan, M. (2008). The positive impact of social and emotional learning for kindergarten to eighth-grade students: Findings from three scientific reviews. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.
- Peeters, M., Cillessen, A., & Scholte, R. (2010). Clueless or powerful? Identifying subtypes of bullies in adolescence. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 39, 1041–1052.
- Pollack, W. (2004a). Parent-child connections: The essential component for positive youth development and mental health, safe communities, and academic achievement. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 103, 17–30.
- Pollack, W. (2004b). “Real” boys, “real” girls, “real” parents: preventing violence through family connection. In R. Rozenky, N. Johnson, C. Goodheart, & W. Hammond (Eds.), *Psychology builds a healthy world* (pp. 35–47). Washington: American Psychological Press.
- Pollack, W., Modzeleski, W., & Rooney, G. (2008). Prior knowledge of potential school based violence: information students learn may prevent a targeted attack. Washington: United States Department of Education and United States Secret Service.
- Putallaz, M., Grimes, L., Foster, J., Kupersmidt, J., Coie, J., & Dearing, K. (2007). Overt and relational aggression and victimization: Multiple perspectives within the school setting. *Journal of School Psychology*, 45, 523–547.



- Ragozzino, K., & O'Brien, M. (2009). *Social emotional learning and bullying prevention*. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.
- Resnick, M., Bearman, P., Blum, R., Bauman, K., Harris, K., Jones, L. et al. (1997). Protecting adolescents from harm: Findings from the National Longitudinal Study on Adolescent Health. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 278, 823–832.
- Robers, S., Zhang, J., Truman, J., & Snyder, T. (2010). Indicators of school crime and safety: 2010. (NCES 2011-002/NCJ 230812). National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, and Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, DC. Available from <http://nces.ed.gov> or <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov>.
- Rubin, K., Burgess, K., Kennedy, A., & Stewart, S. (2003). Social withdrawal in childhood. In E. Mash & R. Barkley (Eds.), *Child psychopathology* (2nd ed., pp. 372–406). New York: Guilford Press.
- Salmela-Aro, Kiuru, Pietikäinen & Jokela, (2008). Does school matter? The role of School context in adolescents' school-related burnout.
- Sapouna, M., Wolke, D., & Vannini, N. (2010). Virtual learning intervention to reduce bullying victimization in primary school: A controlled trial. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 51(1), 104–112.
- Scheeringa, M. (in press). PTSD in children younger than the age of 13: Toward developmentally sensitive assessment and management. In Nader, K. (Ed.). *Assessment of Trauma in Youths: Understanding issues of age, complexity, and associated variables*. New York: Routledge.
- Schonert-Reichl, K. (2012). Promoting Empathy in School-Aged Children: Current State of the Field and Implications for Research and Practice. In Nader, K. (Ed.) *School Rampage Shootings and Other Youth Disturbances: Early Preventive Interventions*, (pp. 159-203). New York: Routledge.
- Schonert-Reichl, K. & Scott, F. (2009). Effectiveness of the "Roots of Empathy" program in promoting children's emotional and social competence: A summary of research findings. In M. Gordon (Ed.), *Roots of empathy: Changing the world child by child* (pp. 239–262). Toronto, Ontario: Thomas Allen Publishers.
- Schonert-Reichl, K., Smith, V., Zaidman-Zait, A., & Hertzman, C. (2011a). Promoting children's prosocial behaviors in school: Impact of the "Roots of Empathy" program on the social and emotional competence of school-aged children. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Schonert-Reichl, K. & Stewart Lawlor, M. (2010). The effects of a mindfulness-based education program on pre- and early adolescents' wellbeing and social and emotional competence. *Mindfulness*, 1, 137–151.
- Schonert-Reichl, K., Oberle, E., Lawlor, M., Abbott, D., Thomson, K., Oberlander, T., Diamond, A. (2011b). Enhancing cognitive and social emotional development through a simple to administer school program. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Stevenson, K. (2006). School size and its relationship to student outcomes and school climate: A review and analysis of eight South Carolina state-wide studies. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities. www.edfacilities.org
- Strong, K. & Cornell, D. (2008). Student Threat Assessment in Memphis City schools: A descriptive report. *Behavioral Disorders*, 34 (1), 42-54.
- Svanberg, P., Mennet, L., & Spieker, S. (2010). Promoting a secure attachment: A primary prevention practice model. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 15(3) 363–378.
- Swearer, S., Espelage, D., Vaillancourt, T., & Hymel, S. (2010). What Can Be Done About School Bullying? Linking Research to Educational Practice. *Educational Researcher*, 39(1), 38–47.
- Ttofi, M., Farrington, D., & Baldry, A. (2008). Effectiveness of programmes to reduce school bullying. Stockholm: Swedish Council for Crime Prevention, Information, and Publications.
- Twenge, J. & Campbell, W. (2001). Age and birth cohort differences in self-esteem: A crosstemporal meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, 321–344.
- van der Kolk, B. A., & Sapporta, J. (1991). The biological response to psychic trauma: Mechanisms and treatment of intrusion and numbing. *Anxiety Research*, 4, 199–212.
- Vermande, M., Van Den Oord, E., Goudena, P., & Rispen, J. (2000). Structural characteristics of aggressor-victim relationships in Dutch school classes of 4- to 5-year-olds. *Aggressive Behaviors*, 26, 11-21.
- Vossekuil, B., Fein, R. A., Reddy, M., Borum, R., & Modzeleski, W. (2002). The final report and findings of the Safe School Initiative: Implications for the prevention of school attacks in the United States. Washington, DC: U.S. Secret Service and U.S. Department of Education.
- Walden, L., & Beran, T. (2010). Attachment quality and bullying behavior in school aged youth. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology* 25(1) 5–18.
- Wang, J., Ionnatti, R., & Nansel, T. (2009). School bullying among



National School Climate Center

Educating Minds and Hearts...Because the Three Rs are Not Enough

adolescents in the United States: Physical, verbal, relational, and cyber. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 45, 368–375.

Wang, M-T (2009). School climate support for behavioral and psychological adjustment: Testing the mediating effect of social competence. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 24(4), 240–251.

Way, N., Reddy, R., & Rhodes, J. (2007). Students' perceptions of school climate during the middle school years: Association with trajectories of psychological and behavioral adjustment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 40, 194–213.

Werblow, J. & Duesbery, L. (2009). The impact of high school size on math achievement and dropout rate. *The High School Journal*, 92, 14–23.

Werblow, J., Robinson, Q., & Duesbery, L. (2010). Regardless of School Size, School climate matters: How dimensions of school climate affect student dropout rate regardless of high school size. In Hoy, W. & DiPaola, M. (Eds.). *Analyzing school contexts: Influences of principals and teachers in the service of students*, (pp. 191–208). Greenwich, CT: IAP Information Age Publishing.

Whiffen, V. & MacIntosh, H. (2005). Mediators of the link between childhood sexual abuse and emotional distress: A critical review. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse*, 6, 24–39.

Williams, F. & Cornell, D. (2006). Student willingness to seek help for threats of violence. *Journal of School Violence*, 5, 35–49.

Ybarra, M., Diener-West, M., & Leaf, P. (2007). Examining the overlap in Internet harassment and school bullying: Implications for school intervention. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41, S42–S50.

Yoneyama, S., & Rigby, K. (2006). Bully/victim students & classroom climate. *Youth Studies Australia*, 25(3), 34–41.

Zins, J., Weissberg, R., Wang, M., & Walberg, H. (Eds.) (2004). *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* New York: Teachers College Press.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Kathleen Nader's national and international consultations, training, and specialized interventions include school training and intervention programs following shootings, bombings, disasters, and war or terrorism. Dr. Nader has written and co-authored books, journal articles and book chapters, assessment scales, and videotapes regarding youth trauma, treatment, and school interventions. Her books include *Honoring Differences: Cultural Issues in the Treatment of Trauma and Loss* (1999), *Understanding and Assessing Trauma in Children and Adolescents: Measures, Methods, and Youth in Context* (2008), *School Rampage Shootings and Other Youth Disturbances: Early Preventive Interventions* (2012), and *Assessment of Trauma in Youths: Understanding Issues of Age, Complexity, and Associated Variables* (in press). (drknader.2suns@earthlink.net)

¹Suggested citation: Kathleen Nader, D.S.W. (2012), *Violence Prevention and School Climate Reform*, School Climate Brief, No. 4. Available online at: <http://www.schoolclimate.org/climate/schoolclimatebriefs.php>



Table 1. The Overlap of School Climate standards and Averted/Reduced School Violence

Aspects of School Climate	Methods Associated with Averted/Reduced School Violence
<p>Safety</p> <p>A school environment in which all members feel socially, emotionally, intellectually and physically safe.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining a safe and positive school climate • Maintaining order (i.e., relating and enforcing clear rules, boundaries, and expectations) • Creating a safe environment conducive to trusting and open communication between students and staff • Encouraging and openness to student communication of rumors, concerns, or weapons • Preventing bullying • Maintaining visible staff presence throughout school • Maintaining watchful alertness (e.g., school monitoring; awareness of suspicious occurrences or something out of place; awareness of worrisome changes in behavior) • Including a trained uniformed resource officer • Utilizing threat assessment methods (e.g., using a threat assessment team; active assessment and intervention; communication with suspects) • Crisis planning (including, e.g., liaison with the community, law enforcement, and mental health; a crisis intervention plan; training in communicating with shooters or hostage takers) • Training in crisis response and preventing escalation of a threatening individual or situation
<p>Relationships</p> <p>A school environment in which all members are welcomed and supported.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentrating efforts on establishing good relationships (e.g., promoting mutual respect) between adults and all students and between students and their peers • Student-teacher connectedness: establishing positive connections with students (e.g., treating students with dignity, respect, and compassion; accentuating youths' strengths) • Connection between schools and families; promotion of positive connection between students and their caregivers • Teacher supportiveness (helpfulness, listening, personal interest in students, providing an enjoyable learning atmosphere) • Supportiveness and respect among staff members
<p>Learning</p> <p>The school community prioritizes and supports (a) student learning and positive social, emotional, ethical and civic development, (b) engagement in teaching, learning, and school activities; (c) removal of barriers to learning and teaching, and (d) reengaging the disengaged.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing conditions that ensure safety and promote the best possible learning environment • Teacher support/assistance for students after absence • Teacher training (e.g., safety, behavior management; learning style) • Addressing the need for success (e.g., in learning, achievement) • Value for diversity and diverse learning needs (e.g., reflected in teaching, attitudes, behaviors)



National School Climate Center

Educating Minds and Hearts...Because the Three Rs are Not Enough

Environment The school develops and sustains an appropriate operational infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Physical presence of school administrators and staff in hallways• School-wide preventive intervention strategies (see Safety)• Creating a nurturing environment (see Relationships)• Visible signs of valuing all individuals (e.g., signs of value for multiculturalism, non-acceptance of bullying, individual differences)
References	References
CSEE, 2010; Cohen et al., 2009; National School Climate Council, 2007	Chang & Le, 2010; Cohen et al., 2009; Cornell, 2006; Daniels, 2007; 2010a, b; Eller, 2012; Nader, 2012; Strong & Cornell, 2008