Berkman

The Berkman Center for Internet & Society
at Harvard University

Kinder & Braver World Project: Research Series
Bullying in a Networked Era:
A Literature Review

Nathaniel Levy, Sandra Cortesi, Urs Gasser
Edward Crowley, Meredith Beaton, June Casey, and Caroline Nolan

Bullying in a Networked Era:
A Literature Review

September 17, 2012

Nathaniel Levy, Sandra Cortesi, Urs Gasser,

Edward Crowley, Meredith Beaton, June Casey, and Caroline Nolan*

* Nathaniel Levy, Project Coordinator at the Berkman Center for Internet & Society. Sandra Cortesi, Director of the Youth and Media Project at the Berkman Center for Internet & Society. Urs Gasser, Executive Director of the Berkman Center for Internet & Society. Edward Crowley, Ph.D. student in Sociology at New York University and former Research Assistant at the Berkman Center for Internet & Society. Meredith Beaton, Research Assistant at the Berkman Center for Internet & Society. June Casey, Reference Librarian and the Coordinator of Pro Bono Research at the Harvard Law School Library. Caroline Nolan, Associate Director of the Berkman Center for Internet & Society.

Acknowledgments

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This research update presents an aggregation and summary of recent academic literature on youth bullying. The purpose of this document is to "translate" scholarly research for a concerned public audience, which may include but is not limited to parents, caregivers, educators, and practitioners. This translation highlights recent findings and developments in the literature and makes them accessible to the informed but non-expert reader.

The document's two guiding questions are "What is bullying?" (Section I) and "What can be done about bullying?" (Section II). Section I begins with a brief overview of key definitions and related research conversations and then addresses bullying's prevalence, the types of individuals involved in bullying, the characteristics of individuals involved and the consequences of their involvement, and community-level dynamics related to bullying. Section II covers four areas where action has been taken to address problems associated with bullying – school policy, curricula, school climate, and parents – and ends on a note about approaches that mix or cut across these areas. The purpose is to render lessons learned from research and assessment accessible to those interested in deepening or expanding their knowledge of bullying-related issues.

Both the online and offline contexts in which bullying occurs are the focuses of this research update. In research as well as popular discourse, bullying has been segmented into "cyberbullying" and "traditional bullying." Although the medium or means through which bullying takes place influence bullying dynamics, online and offline bullying are more similar than different. This dynamic is especially true as a result of the increasing convergence of technologies. Looking broadly at the commonalities as well as the differences between offline and online phenomena fosters greater understanding of the overall system of which each is a part and highlights both the off- and on-line experiences of young people – whose involvement is not typically limited to one end of the spectrum.

This document uses "traditional bullying" and "offline bullying" interchangeably, as it does "cyberbullying" and "online bullying." The second pair of terms are used to refer to bullying that occurs through information and communication technologies (ICTs) generally, which includes using mobile phones for phone calls and texting. The document tries to indicate when reviewed studies differentiate between bullying occurring only through the Internet, or through other technologies as well, in their

analyses. However, with the increasing convergence of technologies, mobile phones used by youth more frequently include Internet access, which at times can make it hard to distinguish between Internet use and mobile phone use.

The authors acknowledge that bullying represents just one part of the broader canvas of peer victimization and harassment for young people (e.g., fighting, sexual harassment, dating violence, etc.) and is related to other forms of bias-based discrimination (e.g., sexism, racism, heterosexism, gender normativity, discrimination based on ability levels, etc.). Notably, Finkelhor, Turner, and Hamby (2012) briefly review, but also challenge, the paradigm of separating bullying from peer victimization, proposing an alternative framework to better integrate the two. Other studies consider the two alongside or in relation to one another while noting definitional differences (e.g., Hong & Espelage, 2012). However, the distinct focus on bullying in this document offers fresh perspective on a term that has captured much public attention and the ways the term has informed and guided action.

The review process focused on studies published between 2008 and 2012 but also included some earlier, influential studies. It also focused primarily on U.S.-based data and young people from around the ages of American middle school to high school. However, some international data are included from certain notable studies, especially those that address narrower subtopics or notably contribute to theoretical or conceptual conversations. The document's scope is multi-disciplinary, drawing mainly from child and developmental psychology, education, criminology, public health, pediatrics, and Internet studies. With translation as the goal, the review sought to first establish common reference points among different bodies of research, using primary studies along with meta-analyses that aggregate and analyze other research findings to address large-scale or generalizable trends. At times, especially when comparing research definitions or changes in the field over time, the review draws on reviews or book chapters to provide summaries of themes and definitions.

The document's format is built around two levels of summaries that present important research findings. At the start of each numbered section, the research findings are summarized in an italicized paragraph. Shorter summary statements follow, which are supported by bulleted data points drawn from the literature. However, the authors do not attempt to arbitrate between conflicting or disputed research findings. Wherever possible, the authors qualify which findings are inconclusive or under debate and which have achieved some expert consensus.

Most important, this document is not intended to stand alone. Rather, it seeks to serve as a readers' introduction to a rich and growing body of research literature on online and offline bullying. Reviewing the citations used in supporting evidence and referring to the reference list provides the reader with a baseline of knowledge on bullying research and multiple, vetted entry points for further exploration.

I. WHAT IS BULLYING?

1. How is it Defined?

Definitions used in the field consistently describe "bullying" as a form of aggression with the following three characteristics: a) it is intentional; b) it involves a power imbalance between an aggressor (individual or group) and a victim; c) and it is repetitive in nature and occurs over time. Bullying can involve verbal or physical, proactive or reactive, and indirect or relational aggression. It can involve physical fighting between two or more people of unequal strength, name-calling, social exclusion, or the spreading of rumors and gossip. It can take place in face-to-face encounters, through written words (e.g., notes), or through other communication tools like cell phones and the Internet. Research has differentiated among these various types of bullying; more recently, as the Internet and mobile technologies have become more common among young people, research has also begun questioning whether new modes of communication are associated with new types of bullying.

1.1 Research Definitions

1.1.1 Bullying has a broadly accepted baseline definition among scholars. An act of bullying is defined as an aggressive act with three hallmark characteristics: a) it is intentional; b) it involves a power imbalance between an aggressor (individual or group) and a victim; c) it is repetitive in nature and occurs over time. This three-part definition was introduced by Olweus (1994) and to date has not changed significantly in the literature.

- "Intentional" has been used to distinguish bullying from acts of "mere conflict" or those that cause harm accidentally – for instance, teasing committed in a "friendly or playful way" would not be considered intentional. (Finkelhor et al., 2012; Smith, Mahdavi, Carvalho, Fisher, Russell, & Tippett, 2008).
- "Imbalance of power" can be broadly defined to include physical differences, social differences, or other differences that make it difficult for the victim to defend herself. Researchers have assessed the imbalance of power in terms of strength, popularity, and smarts (Olweus, 1993; Felix, Sharkey, Green, Furlong, & Tanigawa, 2011).
- "Repetition" means that intentional harm recurs, usually over a period of time. An early, influential researcher explains the idea of repetition to mean that when peers engage in an occasional argument or conflict, it does not constitute bullying (Olweus, 1994).

1.1.2 The baseline definition of traditional bullying accounts for multiple types of aggression that can be present in bullying situations.

- Physical contact, words, or faces or obscene gestures may be means of bullying (Olweus, 1994).
- "Proactive" aggression is usually unprovoked, instrumental, and goal-directed – for instance, a bully may want to gain power, property, or a certain affiliation or relationship status (Price & Dodge, 1989; Espelage & Swearer, 2003; Griffin & Gross, 2004).
- "Reactive" aggression can be a defensive or angry response to a threatening, angering, or frustrating event (Price & Dodge, 1989; Espelage & Swearer, 2003; Griffin & Gross, 2004).
- "Indirect" or "relational" aggression uses rumors, gossip, secrets, and social exclusion as means of harming (often humiliating) the victim. Stated simply, relational bullying occurs through relationships (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Espelage & Swearer, 2003; Griffin & Gross, 2004; Low, Frey, & Brockman, 2010; Mishna, Cook, Saini, Wu, & MacFadden, 2010).
- "Bias-based" bullying (also referred to as aggression or harassment) refers to bullying that co-occurs with discriminatory prejudice such as racism, sexism, and homophobic teasing. The term also reflects the understanding that bullying and such forms of discrimination often converge (Russell, Sinclair, Poteat, & Koenig, 2012).

1.1.3 In order to distinguish bullying from other forms of aggression online, researchers of online bullying often use the baseline definition for offline bullying by adopting one or more of its components with an additional explanation that it involves information and communication technologies (ICTs) or other types of Internet technologies. However, there is currently neither research-based consensus on the precise definition of online bullying nor scholarly agreement on how the three well-identified components of the offline definition should map onto such a definition.

- Definitions of cyberbullying contain either characteristics or the definition of traditional bullying and an enumeration of devices through which bullying occurs online (see Vandebosch & VanCleemput, 2009).
- Definitions of cyberbullying vary, and may treat the phenomenon as a type of bullying, an environment, or a communication (see Ybarra, boyd, Korchmaros, & Oppenheim, 2012).
- One example of a definition is "when someone repeatedly harasses, mistreats, or makes fun of another person online or while using cell phones or other electronic devices" (Patchin & Hinduja, 2012, p. 15).

- Another example is that "Cyberbullying is any behavior performed through electronic or digital media by individuals or groups that repeatedly communicates hostile or aggressive messages intended to inflict harm or discomfort on others." This definition has an addendum, which the authors suggest in particular suggest providing to participants in research studies. "In cyberbullying experiences, the identity of the bully may or may not be known. Cyberbullying can occur through electronically-mediated communication at school; however, cyberbullying behaviors commonly occur outside of school as well." (Tokunaga, 2010, p. 278).

1.2. *Other Definitions: Law and the Youth Perspective, Respectively*

1.2.1 Legal definitions of bullying vary and are often not identical with research-based definitions.
- For "Intentional": 16 states define bullying to encompass only behaviors that are "intended to harm another"; seven states "define bullying to encompass only behaviors that a 'reasonable person' should have known would harm another." (Sacco, Silbaugh, Corredor, Casey, & Doherty, 2012, p. 5).
- For "Imbalance of Power": four states "provide some treatment of power differential or imbalance between aggressor and target." (Sacco et al., 2012, p. 5).
- For "Repetition": eight states "define bullying only as encompassing behaviors that are repetitive, systematic, or continuous, while 5 states define bullying to encompass only severe or pervasive conduct." (Sacco et al., 2012, p. 5).
- Some state laws focus on specific types of actions, some on the intent of the aggressor, and others on the severity of harms inflicted on the victim. Many state laws address multiple factors. It is important to recognize how "minor language, omitted or inserted into laws, can significantly alter the way in which the behavior and circumstances are legally defined." (U.S. Department of Education [ED], 2011, p. 25).

1.2.2 Much of what adults conceive of as bullying, youth refer to as "drama" – particularly incidents or situations that play out through online social media as well as cell phone text messaging and offline interactions.
- Ethnographic data collected through 165 90-minute semi-structured interviews and discussions conducted over a five-year period with teens ages 13-19 suggest that most teens do not identify with the bullying or cyberbullying rhetoric used by parents, teen advocates, and mental health professionals. Rather, teens use the term "drama" as a means of blurring the line between serious and

non-serious social conflict, eliminating the need to identify either bully or victim (Marwick & boyd, 2011).

- Researchers have identified the defining characteristics of "drama." Marwick and boyd argue that drama is social and interpersonal; involves relational conflict; reciprocal; gendered; and, often performed for, in, and magnified by networked publics." (Marwick & boyd, 2011, p. 5). Others define drama as social interaction with the following attributes: 1) conflict; 2) excessive emotionality; 3) excessive time and attention; and 4) practices that overlap with bullying, gossip, and aggression. (Allen, in press).

2. How Does Research Compare Offline and Online Bullying?

A research comparison between traditional bullying and cyberbullying is complicated by a number of definitional issues. Few studies have expressly focused on how "Intentional," one of the three components of the baseline definition of bullying, applies to the online context. In the cases of research examining the other two components, "Imbalance of Power" and "Repetition," some studies have argued that the baseline definition does not fully account for the way online aggression really plays out. Researchers have interpreted or applied the baseline definition to test cases and data in varying ways, as conversations around issues such as the "anonymity", "repetition", and "retaliation" online illustrate. However, the literature has consistently shown that despite differences, online bullying is accounted for within the baseline definition of offline bullying. Moreover, the overlap between online and offline in the lives of those involved shows that the two types of bullying are often related in individuals' experiences, as demonstrated by the online victims who often know their bully from the offline world, for example.

2.1 *Applying the Definition of Offline Bullying to Online Bullying*

2.1.1 Cases of "imbalance of power" (a definitional component) in online bullying can be similar to or different from those found in offline contexts. The issue of bullies' anonymity, which is one factor in such power imbalances, has provoked debate about the extent of similarity between online and offline bullying.

- The anonymity of the bully is another way a power imbalance is created online. Anonymity can heighten the threatening nature of an act of cyberbullying, or the victim's resultant sense of powerlessness (Dooley, Pyzalski, & Cross, 2009).
- ICTs are not uniquely capable of enabling anonymous bullying; school environments can do so as well. In a national survey of over 1,000 teens ages 12-17, 12% who reported being bullied at school

said they did not "know" their bully, as did 22% of those who report being bullied on the way to and from school (Ybarra, Mitchell, & Espelage, 2012).

- Moreover, the anonymity of the bully is not as prevalent online as some research has suggested. One anonymous survey of over 1,400 teens ages 12-17 showed that 73% of participants who were victims of cyberbullying knew the identity of their bully (within this group, 43% from the Internet and 71% from offline – please note that participants were allowed to indicate multiple answers to the survey questions) (Juvonen & Gross, 2008).

- A nationally representative study of over 1,000 teens ages 12-17 notes a lower percentage – 54% of online victims who participated knew their bully's identity. An earlier nationally representative study looking more broadly at online harassment found 45% (Ybarra, Mitchell, & Espelage, 2012; Ybarra, Mitchell, Wolak, & Finkelhor, 2006).

2.1.2 The definitional component "repetition" applies to some cases of online bullying more easily than others. Particular cases have provoked debate about the term's meaning as well as its usefulness for understanding bullying dynamics online.

- Some incidents of cyberbullying can be repeated over time, just like their offline counterparts. For instance, aggressive emails or text messages can be written and sent repeatedly (Dooley et al., 2009).

- Yet in other cases, a single act can potentially cause harm that repeats over time. For example, an aggressive picture or video can be posted just once, but continue to harm the victim with each successive view, comment, or act of redistribution, thus making it difficult to determine if the act of bullying qualifies as "repetitive" under offline bullying's baseline definition (Dooley et al., 2009).

- Notably, however, a picture online can function similarly to a nasty note on a bathroom wall, in the sense that each can be created just once and then viewed repeatedly to cause harm over time. The literature has not traditionally viewed writing a note in a school bathroom as grounds for meeting the definitional component of "repetition" (Ybarra, boyd, Korchmaros, & Oppenheim, 2012).

- Research has also tried to shed light on the question of "repetition" by considering it together with that of the "audience" in bulling situations (i.e., the group of individuals who witness or observe an act of bullying, also known as "bystanders"; see Section I.3.5). Bystanders play a role in bullying situations (see Section 5, below), and can affect how much an aggressive act gets repeated (thus constituting bullying). The size of the "audience" (i.e., number of bystanders) is therefore a factor to consider when measuring or assessing the impact of repetition (Dooley et al., 2009; Ybarra, Mitchell, & Espelage, 2012).

2.2 Other Research Comparisons

2.2.1 Some studies have pointed to a "blurring" of the roles of bully and victim online as indication that online aggression may have new qualities that differentiate it from traditional bullying. For example, it appears that victims of online bullying commonly retaliate against their bullies. As with anonymity and repetition, however, retaliation has been and continues to be a factor in offline bullying, and is accounted for in bullying's baseline definition as a form of "reactive" aggression (see Section I.1.1.2).

- One study of 733 youth ages 11-18 found that when surveyed about online bullying alone, youths' reports distinguished more between methods (e.g., emails, messages, pictures, videos, or websites used to be mean, gossip, or embarrass, etc.), than roles (i.e., bully, victim, or witness). This was not the case for youths' responses to questions about physical, verbal, social, and cyber bullying in a related study of 17,551 students in the 8th-12th grades, which distinguished more between roles (Law, Shapka, Hymel, Olson, & Waterhouse, 2012).

- In the same survey of 733 youth (described above), along with interviews of a subset of 15 youth, researchers found that most reports of online bullying involved individuals who had been both bully and victim in related incidents. The study suggests that frequent "retaliation" was likely at play, thus blurring the line between bullying and more loosely defined aggression. The incidents that did meet the definition of bullying, such as creating hostile websites, presented less opportunity for retaliation (i.e., reactive aggression). (Law, Shapka, Domene, & Gagné, 2012).

- Notably, however, retaliation is not uniquely enabled by ICTs. For instance, in an anonymous survey of over 1,400 teens ages 12-17, 48% of victims of school-based bullying reported retaliating. Within this group, 60% said they were most likely to retaliate in school, whereas 12% said online. 28% indicated they were likely to retaliate in both settings (Juvonen & Gross, 2008).

2.2.2 Research shows most youth experience bullying victimization in just one setting, rather than both online and offline. Yet findings also suggest that there is an association between aspects of youths' offline environments (such as school, peer relationships, etc.) and the likelihood of their involvement in bullying online.

- Out of over 1,000 teens ages 12-17 surveyed nationally, most reported that they did not experience bullying both online and offline – though a troubling 5% reported being bullied and 2% reported bullying in four of the five "environments" they were asked about (i.e., "School, Internet, Cell phone text messaging, To and From school, Somewhere else) (Ybarra, Mitchell, & Espelage, 2012).

- Two studies of over 5,600 students in the 5th, 8th, and 11th grades found that online bullying, as with physical and verbal bullying, significantly related to negative school climate, lack of peer support, and the views of students that approved of bullying (Williams & Guerra, 2007).

3. How Common is Bullying?

Findings about the prevalence of bullying range widely, as they are linked to divergent research and data collection measures. Variations in research methods and design, such as whether or not a definition for "bullying" is provided and what that definition is, affects how survey or interview respondents will report experiences of bullying. Involvement in offline bullying through any role approaches roughly 20%-35%, which is more prevalent than online bullying. When looking at age, offline bullying appears to peak during middle school, whereas online bullying tends to peak during high school.

3.1 Measurements of Bullying

3.1.1 A number of factors complicate measuring bullying's prevalence, including variation in research methods, the relationship of bullying to other forms of peer victimization, and the language and conceptual gaps between researchers and youth. Varying methods include providing survey respondents with a definition of bullying versus behavioral metrics, and asking students to report their own involvement in bullying versus others' involvement ("self-report" vs. "peer-report").

- A factor that affects the measurement of bullying involves how to focus on and measure bullying as opposed to other kinds of peer victimization (Felix et al., 2011; Ybarra, boyd, Korchmaros, & Oppenheim, 2012).
- Youth self-reporting is a method typically used to measure bullying, whereas youth peer-reporting is used to measure broader forms of peer harassment. A comparison of the two types of measurement methods with 355 middle school students suggests it may be desirable to use both methods (Branson and Cornell, 2009).
- When measuring bullying, some scholars provide respondents with a definition of bullying similar to Olweus', while others instead provide only specific questions related to behavior, such as the frequency of name-calling or hitting (Hamburger, Basile, & Vivolo, 2011).
- In particular, one issue associated with data collection concerns whether youths' and researchers' understanding of key terms and definitions align or not. For instance, the word "bully" has personal and emotional associations for youth. Researchers have built this understanding into their data

collection measures in different ways (Felix et al., 2011, p. 237; Cornell & Brockenbrough, 2004; Vaillancourt, McDougall, Hymel, Krygsman, Miller, Stiver, & Davis, 2008).

3.2 *Prevalence of Bullying*

3.2.2 Given the variety of factors in measuring bullying, it is not surprising that the research offers a wide range of prevalence rates. The general prevalence of involvement in offline bullying across status groups – as a bully, victim, or both – is between 20-35%.

- In one national study of 2,400 6-17 year olds, between 34-42% of youths were bullied frequently in the past year (Ybarra, boyd, Korchmaros, & Oppenheim, 2012).
- Based on nationally representative 2001 data from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development of the National Institutes of Health, which surveyed 15,686 students in the 6th-10th grades, roughly 33% of students were involved in bullying as victims, bullies, or both (Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simons-Morton, & Scheidt, 2001).
- Based on 2005-2006 data from the School Survey on Crime and Safety, the U.S. Department of Education found that nearly 25% of public schools principals reported bullying to be a daily or weekly occurrence (Dinkes, Kemp, Baum, & Snyder, 2009).
- Out of a nationally representative sample of 113,200 students ages roughly 11-16, 30% reported involvement in bullying. Greater numbers of students reported involvement as both bullies and victims than involvement in only one role. (Nansel, Craig, Overpeck, Saluja, & Ruan, 2004).
- A survey of 202,056 11-15 year olds in 40 countries and found that 26% of adolescents have been involved in bullying with some regularity. Among the 3,755 U.S. youth in the sample, 22.2% of boys and 16.6% of girls reported regular involvement in bullying (Craig, Harel-Fisch, Fogel-Grinvald, Dastaler, Hetland, Simons-Morten, et al., 2009).
- In a sample of 1,391 students in the 5th-8th grades, 12% of males and 12% of females reported bullying others at least five times in the last 30 days (Espelage, Basile, & Hamburger, 2012).

3.2.3 Many of the most recent large-scale data on cyberbullying comes from studies that compare the online and offline contexts. Some primary studies report rates of online bullying similar to those for the offline context, but most of the recent comparative studies show that offline bullying remains more prevalent.

- A national survey of 2,400 teens ages 6-17 found that traditional, face-to-face bullying remains the dominant mode of bullying, consistent with data from across Europe (Ybarra, boyd, Korchmaros, & Oppenheim, 2012).

- In a national survey of over 1,000 teens ages 12-17, 40% of respondents reported being bullied across school, Internet, text messaging, and other offline environments altogether. 31% reported being bullied at school compared to 15% online; 14% said they bully at school as opposed to 6% online (Ybarra, Mitchell, & Espelage, 2012).
- A nationally representative study of 7,182 youth measured "physical, verbal, relational, and cyber" forms of bullying. The most common types of both bullying perpetration and victimization were verbal and relational. When combining reported rates of perpetration and victimization, the prevalence of bullying was 20.8% for physical, 53.6% for verbal, 51.4% for relational, and 13.6% for cyber (Wang, Iannotti, & Nansel, 2009, p. 370).
- Findings from a study of 2,186 Canadian middle school and high school students show that about 30% were involved in cyberbullying as either bullies or victims and about 26% were involved as both bully and victim (Mishna, Khoury-Kassabri, Gadalla, & Daciuk, 2011).

3.2.4. Looking more closely at the online context, research shows youth still bully more by using instant messaging than social networking sites. Overall, bullying now appears to occur more online than via phone calls and text messaging. Improved measurement methods and designs could collect better data on aspects of cyberbullying other than prevalence.
- A small sample of young people with ADHD and/or Asperger's Syndrome showed slightly greater prevalence of bullying via instant messaging than social networking sites. Although the two prevalence rates have grown closer together, this finding remains consistent with those of earlier studies (Kowalski & Fedina, 2011; Kowalski & Limber, 2007).
- A 2012 survey of 2,400 youth ages 6-17 found that 10% bullied online, 7% via phone call (cell or landline), and 8% via text messaging (Ybarra, boyd, Korchmaros, & Oppenheim, 2012).

3.2.5 Prevalence rates are higher when more broadly assessing for meanness or harassment online.
- Among 799 youth ages 12-17 surveyed in one study, 88% who use social media report witnessing other people being mean or cruel on social network sites. Meanness and cruelty were left undefined in the survey (Lenhart, Madden, Smith, Purcell, Zickuhr, & Rainie, 2011).

3.3 *Ages at Which Youth are Bullied*

3.3.1 Offline bullying appears to peak during middle school and decrease as youth get older.

- Bullying is more prevalent in middle schools than in high schools (Espelage & Horne, 2008; Nansel et al., 2001; Pellegrini & Bartini, 2000; Smith, Madsen, & Moody, 1999).
- In particular, the transition from primary to middle school marks a time of increased bullying for adolescents; notably, this number rises if youth change schools (Pellegrini, 2002).

3.3.2 By comparison, research on the ages at which cyberbullying is most prevalent is inconsistent or inconclusive. However, the ages of greatest vulnerability to victimization are better known.
- According to a meta-synthesis of quantitative studies on cyberbullying victimization, the majority of studies find no association between age and cyberbullying victimization. Most studies with that demonstrate a lack of association between age and victimization used research sample sizes with diverse or broad ranges of ages (Tokunaga, 2010).
- Teens ages 12-14 are most vulnerable to cyberbullying victimization (Tokunaga, 2010).

4. Who is Involved?

Youth play a variety of roles in the bullying dynamic. Bullying involvement can be characterized by four basic roles: a) bully, b) victim, c) bully-victim (actors who both bully and are victimized by others), and d) bystander. The role of the bully-victim shows that those of bullies and victims are not always clear-cut. Certain types of bullying, such as "relational" aggression (both online and offline), are more likely to involve bully-victims. Certain types of youth are more likely to be victimized, including lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) youth and youth with disabilities. Offline, boys are overall more involved than girls across multiple roles. Contrary to previous thinking, girls do not bully more by "indirect" or "relational" means. Research is inconclusive about the comparison of boys' and girls' respective experiences with online bullying. More recently, research has focused increasingly on the role of bystanders, those who witness acts of bullying but are neither the bully nor the victim.

This section addresses who is involved in online and offline bullying with regards to broader, contextual characteristics, such as demographics, social status, etc. The individual characteristics and associated qualities of those involved are discussed in further detail in Section I.4, "How are Youth Involved? (Characteristics and Consequences)".

4.1 General Observations Across Roles

4.1.1 Bullying and involvement in bullying fall on a continuum of roles.

- Bullying involvement can be characterized by the basic roles of: a) bully, b) victim, c) bully-victim, and d) bystander. Youth can be involved in multiple roles that are fluid over time and across different contexts. Some studies also include "non-involved" as a role on the spectrum of involvement. (Cook, Williams, Guerra, Kim, & Sadek, 2010; Holt & Espelage, 2003).
- Another continuum described in a recent study characterizes students who are involved in bullying as: a) bullies, b) assistants, c) reinforcers, d) defenders, and e) onlookers. Drawing on a sample of 6,764 Finnish students ages 9-11, the study found that about 40% of school-age children assume the roles of bully, assistant, and reinforcer, combined, and about 30% play the part of onlooker (Salmivalli, Voeten, & Poskiparta, 2011).

4.1.2 When looking at bullies, victims, and bully-victims offline, research shows that boys are, overall, more involved in bullying. On a more granular level, girls do not necessarily bully through "indirect" or "relational" aggression (e.g., gossip, social exclusion) as has previously been suggested. Yet research remains inconclusive about the role gender plays in youths' involvement in cyberbullying. More specifically, it is unclear if gender can be conclusively linked to the frequency of either perpetration or victimization of cyberbullying.

- Boys appear to be more involved in all bully-status groups offline (bully, victim, bully-victim) than girls, as suggested by a recent meta-analysis (Cook et al., 2010).
- A review of 31 cross-sectional and longitudinal studies found that females are less likely to bully frequently than males (Klomek, Sourander, & Gould, 2011).
- Despite earlier research to the contrary, a meta-analysis of 148 studies on aggression (defined more broadly than bullying) showed little difference between how much boys and girls respectively commit acts of indirect aggression such as harming a victim's relationships or social position. However, findings do suggest boys commit more acts of direct aggression, which include physical and verbal attacks (Card, Stucky, Sawalani, & Little, 2008).
- On the one hand, syntheses of research suggest that differences in how frequently boys and girls are involved in cyberbullying are negligible or inconclusive (Tokunaga, 2010; Patchin & Hinduja, 2012).
- On the other hand, certain primary literature, particularly that which focuses on older teens and undergraduates, finds that females are more often involved in cyberbullying activities, both as victims and bullies (Snell & Englander, 2010; Englander, 2012).

4.2 Bullies

4.2.1 Offline bullies are often popular, socially-dominant individuals who can socialize friends to engage in bullying or who are socialized by friends to bully. Friendships and friend groups play a role in this kind of socialization. Research has not produced a social profile of online bullies, or a description of the social processes by which they come to be bullies, as detailed as that of their offline counterparts.

- Looking more broadly at offline aggression, longitudinal findings from a study of approximately 400 middle school students show that individuals across all roles associate with peer groups that are similarly aggressive to themselves. Individuals' behaviors become reinforced and exaggerated among their peer groups ("reciprocal socialization"), enabling individuals to become more aggressive by association with friends (Espelage, Holt & Henkel, 2003; supported by Espelage, Green & Wasserman, 2007).

- On a similar note, a study of 526 students in the 4th-6th grades found that children in aggressive peer groups identified popular and aggressive peers as cool, while children in non-aggressive groups identified popular and non-aggressive peers as cool. Aggressive children may also "experience a comfortable, hospitable peer environment where they are supported most by their affiliates, but also have support in many corners of the peer ecology" (Rodkin, Farmer, Pearl, and Van Acker, 2006, p. 199).

- With a sample of 1,723 students in the 5th-10th grades, researchers identified an "instrumental" subtype of bullying behavior, which uses bullying for functional or gainful social purposes (Little, Brauner, Jones, Nock, & Hawley, 2003).

- Notably, however, the literature has also suggested that bullies may be popular (i.e., have high social status) but also disliked by their peers, as research sometimes measures the two qualities differently. This finding is shown in a study of 508 students in the 4th-5th grades and supported by an earlier study of 1,985 students in the 6th grade, which found that bullies had high social status but were avoided by their peers (see Rodkin & Berger, 2008; Juvonen, Graham, & Schuster, 2003).

- A meta-analysis of 153 studies identifies the capacity of certain characteristics of youths' contexts (e.g., their schools, communities, etc.) to accurately predict involvement in bullying. The two strongest "contextual predictors" are peer influence (i.e., the positive or negative influence of peers, including having negative behavior reinforced or engaging in prosocial group activities) and community factors (i.e., socioeconomic levels and rates of violence and crime) (Cook et al., 2010).

4.2.2 Offline bullies may also engage in homophobic peer victimization and sexual harassment.

- Homophobic teasing (using homophobic epithets) has been found to be highly correlated with offline bullying perpetration among middle and high school students, according to a survey of 191 students in

the 8th grade (Poteat & Espelage, 2005; supported by: Poteat & Espelage, 2007; Rivers & Noret, 2008).

- A recent study of over 1,300 middle school students identified a link between bullying and sexual harassment. As middle school bullies engaged in more interactions with peers of the opposite gender, they were more likely to engage in sexual harassment. Moreover, homophobic teasing perpetration was associated with co-occurring perpetration of bullying and sexual harassment (Espelage, Basile, & Hamburger, 2012).

4.3 Victims

4.3.1 Offline victims often have lower-social status than their bullies.

- A recent review of qualitative studies of school-based bullying or peer-harassment suggests that students often indicate that victims are "different or deviant in some way, such as having different clothes, appearance, behaviour or way of speaking," which the review attributes to having lower social status (Thornberg, 2011).

4.3.2 Although fewer studies have focused primarily or exclusively on this demographic of youth, some studies suggest that students with disabilities, ADHD, or Asperger's Syndrome experience greater levels of victimization than their peers.

- A recent study examined bullying perpetration and victimization among 7,331 middle school students and 14,315 high school students enrolled in general education and special education programs. As hypothesized, students in special education programs reported greater rates of bullying perpetration and victimization than general education students. In addition, students who were in separate ("self-contained") special education classrooms reported more perpetration and victimization than those in more inclusive settings (Rose, Monday-Amaya, and Espelage, 2011).
- A study of 42 students in the 5th-12th grades showed youth with ADHD and/or Asperger's Syndrome experienced greater victimization, both offline and online (Kowalski & Fedina, 2011).

4.3.3 When looking more at bullying along with harassment and peer victimization more broadly, LGBT students experience much higher levels of victimization.

- The 2009 National School Climate Survey of 7,261 middle school and high school students found that nearly 90% of LGB students experienced harassment at school during the past year, nearly 67% felt unsafe because of their sexual orientation, and nearly a third of LGBT students skipped at least

one day of school in the preceding month due to safety concerns (Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network [GLSEN], 2010).

- In a study of 350 LGB youth ages 21 and younger, 59% reported verbal abuse in high school because of sexual orientation, 24% were threatened with violence, 11% had objects thrown at them, 11% reported being physically assaulted, 2% were threatened with weapons, and 20% had been threatened with being outed (D'Augelli, Pilkington, & Hershberger, 2002).

4.4 Bully-Victims

4.4.1 Offline bully-victims are associated with qualities often shared by bullies and victims, respectively, along with other more at-risk characteristics pertaining to their academics, relationships, and psychological wellbeing.

- Based on a meta-analysis of 153 studies, one study offers a general characterization of bully-victims that portrays bully-victims as easily and negatively influenced by peers and spurned by classmates, similar to bullies and victims, respectively (Cook et al., 2010).

4.4.2 Several studies have identified the role of the bully-victim in online bullying, and reason for taking youths' involvement in this role seriously. Rates of youths' involvement in this role range from roughly one quarter to more than half of surveyed youth in localized studies.

- In a survey of 733 youth about online aggression, along with interviews of a subset of 15 youth, found most youth reported being involved as both aggressor and victim in related incidents that involved aggressive messaging, hostile websites, or embarrassing photos (Law, Shapka, Domene, & Gagné, 2012).
- Based on a survey of 283 undergraduate students, one study found that approximately 50% of bullies online were also victims of bullying online (Englander, Mills, & McCoy, 2009).
- About 26% of a Canadian sample of 2,186 middle school and high school students reported being involved in bullying incidents as both bully and victim (Mishna et al., 2011).
- Drawing from a study of 1,318 European youth ages 12-18, European researchers find that both perpetrating and being the victim of acts of cyberbullying predict one another (Walrave & Heirman, 2010).

4.5 Bystanders and Related Roles

4.5.1 In addition to bullies, victims, and bully-victims, individuals can be involved in acts of bullying through other roles. Those who simply watch and/or react to an act are considered to be involved. The literature provides several terms for such roles – including "onlooker," "observer," "passerby," "witness," "defender," "reinforcer," etc. – but "bystander" is often used to broadly refer to this role or group of roles. Rates of bystanders' prevalence vary.

- In reviewing multiple terms research has used to refer to bystanders, a 2012 meta-analysis offers a general definition of bystander (for the offline context) as "any student who witnessed a bullying episode…regardless of other characteristics." (Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott, 2012).

- A literature review finds that bystanders may encourage bullies or warn them if an adult is coming. Alternatively, bystanders may sympathize with the victim and disapprove of the bully (Hong & Espelage, 2012).

- Moreover, 85% to 88% of offline bullying episodes observed by researchers in the mid-to-late 1990s occurred in the presence of peers (see Pepler, Craig, & O'Connell, 2010; Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Craig & Pepler, 1995; Craig & Pepler, 1997; O'Connell et al., 1999).

- In one study of 526 students in the 4th-6th grades, bullying episodes were often witnessed by bystanders who most frequently reinforced the bully (Rodkin et al., 2006).

- About 30% of school-aged youth assumed the role of "onlooker" in bullying situations, according to data collected on 1220 Finnish students in the 4th-6th grades (Salmivalli, 2004).

- Relatively few U.S. studies focus specifically on the more detailed role and dynamics of bystanders' actions. For instance, a 2008 meta-analysis on bullying prevention and intervention programs found that only three of the sixteen identified programs targeted and evaluated bystander behavior (Merrell, Gueldner, Ross, & Isava, 2008; Hong & Espelage, 2012).

4.5.2 Bystanders in online bullying have become a subject of increasing research interest, yet more remains to be investigated about their specific characteristics. When looking more broadly at "meanness and cruelty" online, bystanders appear to often ignore observed instances of cyberbullying. That is, they less frequently report or actively confront the perpetrator; they also less frequently join in the perpetration of meanness.

- In a study of 799 youth ages 12-17, it was found that 90% of youth using social media say that when they witness online meanness, they ignore it. 8% of youth report having experienced some form of online bullying, such as through email, a social network site, or instant messaging. 80% say they have defended the victims. 79% say that have told the other person to stop being mean. About 67% of teens

who have witnessed online cruelty have also witnessed others joining in – and 21% say they have also joined in the harassment (Lenhart et al., 2011).

5. How are Youth Involved? (Characteristics and Consequences)

Experiencing involvement in bullying both online and offline, in multiple roles, is associated with certain negative psychological, social, and academic characteristics and/or consequences. Bullies, victims, and bully-victims possess poor social problem-solving skills and/or are not well adjusted to school – details vary by type of involvement. Bullies, moreover, are more likely to experience problems later in life. Victims' attitudes and behaviors are affected by experiences of bullying through "internalizing" behaviors that can continue or worsen as victimization continues; LGBT victims may experience more heightened effects than their counterparts. Bully-victims are similarly associated with "internalizing" behaviors; even bystanders experience related problems more than the non-involved.

5.1 General Observations Across Roles

5.1.1 Youth involved in offline bullying – whether as bullies, victims, or bully-victims — tend to be less academically successful, less well adjusted to school, and typically have poor social problem-solving skills. Details, particularly those concerning psychological characteristics, vary by type of involvement.

- According to a recent meta-analysis and partial literature review, multiple forms of involvement in bullying are associated with negative behaviors, psychological outcomes, and poor academic results. The meta-analysis showed victims and bully-victims to be particularly at-risk (Cook et al., 2010; Swearer, Espelage, Vaillancourt, & Hymel, 2010).
- Victims, bullies, and bully-victims among a study sample of middle school students were more negatively disposed toward the school climate compared to non-involved students; the study's authors suggest that bullying is directly related to the adjustment to middle school (Ikeda, Grimes, Tilly III, Allison, Kurns, & Stumme, 2002).
- A recent meta-analysis suggests that victims, bullies, and bully-victims possess poor social "problem-solving" skills, such as the ability to "negotiate confrontations skillfully," and may demonstrate this quality at younger ages before involvement in bullying begins (Cook et al., 2010, p. 77).

5.1.2 Youth involved in cyberbullying across multiple roles are also associated with negative emotional or psychological characteristics – namely, low self-esteem – as well as certain types of behaviors using

computers and the Internet. Research is inconclusive about whether youth involved in online bullying across roles are all also more likely to be involved in offline bullying.

- After controlling for demographic variables, a study of 1,963 middle school students found that both victims and bullies online were associated with lower levels of self-esteem. The study suggests that low self-esteem can be an outcome of other emotional and psychological characteristics associated with involvement in online bullying (such as sadness, depression, etc.), although it may not have a causal relationship to the bullying acts (Patchin & Hinduja, 2010b).

- Findings from a study 2,186 Canadian middle school and high school students showed that online bullies, victims, and bully-victims spend more time on the computer per day and are more likely to share passwords with friends than the non-involved (Mishna et al., 2011).

- On the one hand, the same study reports that of the 2,186 youth involved in online bullying, all reported being involved in physical or verbal aggression at school "more significantly" than those not involved in bullying online (Mishna et al., 2011).

- On the other hand, a national survey of teens ages 12-17 found that for victims in multiple environments – school, the Internet, cell phone text messaging, on the way to or from school, and somewhere else – victimization in just one context was most common (Ybarra, boyd, Korchmaros, & Oppenheim, 2012).

5.2 Bullies

5.2.1 Bullies both online and offline are likely to have experienced strain, anger, frustration, or difficult life events. Offline bullies may also perceive their school climate negatively and may be more likely to experience problems later in life.

- Youth who experienced "strain" were more likely to participate in online and offline bullying, according to findings from a study of approximately 2,000 students in the 6th-8th grades. The study defines strain to come from the failure to achieve one's goals and a variety of negative relationships or experiences (e.g., physical abuse), or the loss of positive ones (e.g., the end of a romantic relationship). Similarly, angry and frustrated youth are more likely engage in cyberbullying compared to other individuals (Patchin & Hinduja, 2010a).

- Data collected on 162 French students ages 12-17 showed that offline bullies were likely to suffer from addictive behaviors – namely, smoking tobacco and drug use (Hourbe, Targuinio, Thuillier, & Hergott, 2006).

- Bullies of both sexes are likely to behave aggressively or otherwise experience difficulties in romantic relationships, according to a study of approximately 1,900 students in the 6th-12th grades (Pepler, Craig, Connolly, Yuile, McMaster, & Jiang, 2006).

- A 2010 meta-analysis suggests that most bullies feel negatively about themselves or others, have difficulty with conflict resolution, perceive school climate negatively, and can be negatively influenced by peers. Notably, however, they may also be socially competent. Bullies also come from family situations where conflict is present or parental monitoring is inadequate (Cook et al., 2010).

- Looking at broader forms of aggression, data drawn from 2,550 Scandinavian youth in the 7th-9th grades show that events associated with major life changes (e.g., parents' divorce) can result in increased aggression (Breivik & Olweus, 2006; also, Lamden, King, & Goldman, 2002).

- A recent longitudinal study of 411 British males, followed from ages 8-10 to 48-50, showed that persistently aggressive bullies are more likely to be convicted of crime when they are older than non-involved individuals (Farrington & Ttofi, 2011).

5.2.2 Offline bullies – and to a lesser extent, those online – are associated with suicidal thoughts (and less frequently, attempts).

- A 2011 literature review on bullying and suicide, drawing on the few longitudinal studies that exist on the topic as well as other types of primary literature, found that offline bullies experience greater likelihood of suicidal "ideation" (thoughts or plans, with no subsequent attempt) than the non-involved. The longitudinal studies in particular indicated that there is an association between bullying and suicidal behavior, although this relationship is mediated by other behavioral characteristics (Klomek et al., 2011).

- On a smaller scale, a survey distributed to 1,963 middle school students showed that bullies (along with victims) both online and offline experienced more suicidal ideation than others (Patchin & Hinduja, 2010c).

5.2.3 Among younger children, being victimized or being aggressive (in a broader sense than bullying) may contribute to aggression during later years.

- Using longitudinal methods over an approximately four-month period, a study of about 100 toddlers ages three-four indicated that both physical and relational victimization (as reported and observed by teachers) were associated with later acts of physical and relational aggression, respectively (Ostrov, 2010).

- Findings from a three-year study of 137 pre-schoolers and kindergarteners (on average five years old) at low risk for the development of antisocial behavior suggest that exposure to aggressive peers resulted in gender-specific responses among young children. Young girls exposed to peers who strongly projected or modeled their behavior ("externalizing") demonstrated higher levels of aggressive behavior, anxiety, and hyperactivity. Boys exposed to such peers showed higher resistance to changes in behavior (Hanish, Martin, Fabes, Leonard, & Herzog, 2005).
- A study of 170 children ages three-five found that commanding or displaying aggression toward peers ("dominance-related behaviors") is an antecedent for later aggression (Hanish, Sallquist, DiDonato, Fabes, & Martin, 2012).

5.3 *Victims*

5.3.1 Particular kinds of communication behavior online are risk factors for cyberbullying victimization.
- Risk factors related to Internet use include frequent use of online chatrooms and social networking sites and a willingness to disclose personal information online (see Biegler & boyd, 2010; Steeves & Webster, 2007; Mishna, Saini, & Solomon, 2009).
- The European TIRO project studied 1,318 teens ages 12-18 and found that those who publish personal information online, such as on a blog, are at higher risk of cyberbullying victimization. Other risk factors include chatting with older strangers or virtually known contacts and sharing passwords with online chat partners (Walrave & Heirman, 2010).

5.3.2 Both online and offline victims may be associated with or at risk for "internalizing" behaviors, which can have negative impact on their psychological well-being and effects on their social and academic lives, among other issues. Such behaviors are characterized by, but not limited to, withdrawal, depression, and anxiety.
- A 2010 meta-analysis of 153 studies provides a broad characterization of offline victims that portrays them as demonstrating "internalizing" behaviors (such as withdrawal, depression, or anxiety) and potential displays of uncontrolled, aggressive, or defiant behavior, thinking poorly of themselves, experiencing difficulty with social problem-solving, and coming from negative community, family, or school environments. Notably, academic performance was not found to be a strong predictor of victimization, but thinking poorly of oneself was (Cook et al., 2010).
- According to one study, which conducted a meta-analysis of 18 longitudinal studies on offline bullying and/or peer victimization (which analyzed data on 13,978 youth in total), a majority of victims display "internalizing" problems. Such problems include social withdrawal, sadness, and

anxiety, and can be both risk factors and consequences for bullying and peer victimization, constituting a "vicious cycle." (Reijntjes, Kamphuis, Prinzie, & Telch, 2010).

- As with their offline counterparts, victims of cyberbullying may experience a range of similar conditions prior to bullying victimization, from smaller levels of distress and frustration to "psychosocial" or "affective" behavioral disorders, according to a 2010 meta-synthesis of 25 articles on cyberbullying victimization (Tokunaga, 2010).

- According to a 2010 meta-synthesis, victims of cyberbullying may experience academic "disturbances" (including reduced grades, increased absences and truancy, cutting class, detentions, and suspensions), "psychosocial" or "affective" problems (including social anxiety, reduced self-esteem, and emotional distress, sadness, or anger targeted at bullies and/or bullying acts), and "social" problems (including detachment, hostility, and delinquency) (Tokunaga, 2010).

5.3.3 Youth bullied offline for their sexual orientation or gender identity face a greater likelihood of more severe consequences than other victims. Although fewer studies have compared bias-based bullying or harassment of multiple varieties, initial comparisons suggest that experiencing any kind of bias-based victimization can have a greater negative impact than other forms of bullying.

- Victimization and harassment based on bias can have a greater negative impact on the victim versus random bullying. Among recent data from Wisconsin and California, mental health status and substance use levels were worse among youths suffering bias-based harassment than among those suffering from other types of harassment (Russell et al., 2012, p. 495).

- A synthesis of literature on homophobic bullying found that sexual-minority youth younger than 17 experienced significantly greater negative outcomes of bullying than their older counterparts (Fedewa & Ahn, 2011).

- Boys who are bullied for being gay (regardless of actual sexual orientation) experience greater psychological distress, higher anxiety, more negative perceptions of their schools, and a feeling of not being in control than boys who were bullied for other reasons (Poteat & Espelage, 2007; Swearer, Turner, Givens, & Pollack, 2008).

- LGBT youth participating in a survey of 7,261 middle school and high school students were three times more likely to have missed school in the past month if they had experienced high levels of victimization related to their sexual orientation (57.7% vs. 18.0%) or gender expression (54.3% vs. 19.9%); these students had grade point averages almost half a grade lower than students who were harassed less often (Kosciw et al., 2010, page xvii)

5.3.4 Victims of both online and offline bullying are at greater risk for suicidal thoughts or behavior, although details vary by demographic characteristics and type of involvement.

- A 2011 literature review on bullying and suicide showed that victims (along with bullies) of traditional bullying and cyberbullying are at greater risk for suicidal ideation than the non-involved. Longitudinal studies indicate a stronger connection between victimization and ideation among girls in particular than do cross-section studies alone (Klomek et al., 2011).

- Among 1,963 middle school students, more victims of both online an offline bullying reported having suicidal thoughts than any group, other than bullies (Patchin & Hinduja, 2010c).

- Among girls victimized online, infrequent victimization has been associated with suicidal attempts, although only frequent drawing on the few longitudinal studies that exist on the topic as well as other types of primary literature, found that offline bullies experience greater likelihood of suicidal "ideation" (thoughts or plans, with no subsequent attempt) than the non-involved. The longitudinal studies in particular indicated that there is an association between bullying and suicidal behavior, although this relationship is mediated by other behavioral characteristics

5.4 Bully-Victims

5.4.1 Bully-victims offline experience psychological and social difficulties shared by bullies and victims, including externalized aggression and hostility or internalizing problems, respectively, along with academic problems. Observations of bully-victims' social roles and positions in particular suggest that, overall, this group may be more at risk than youth involved in other roles.

- One study undertaken to determine the relationship between bullying and being victimized during the first year of middle school, overall school adjustment, and perception of the school's culture found that victims, bullies, and bully-victims are generally less well-adjusted to school (both in the 6th-7th grades). The results of this study also revealed that victims and bully-victims are more negatively disposed toward the school climate than non-involved students (Ikeda et al., 2002).

- Based on individual- and context-level findings, a meta-analysis of 153 studies broadly characterizes bully-victims as having both "internalizing" problems (e.g., social withdrawal, anxiety, depression) and external displays of hostility or aggression, negative thoughts about themselves and others, poor social problem-solving skills, poor peer relationships, and low academic performance. (Cook et al., 2010).

- Moreover, the bully-victim may be socialized by friends and peer groups to bully others, like many bullies, but lack the high social status or popularity characteristic of most bullies, according to an examination of unique predictors by role conducted by the same meta-analysis (Cook et al., 2010).

- A study of 1,985 students in the 6th grade found that bully-victims' have a "unique risk profile" made up of characteristics that include "social avoidance" (fearing to reach out or connect with others), social anxiety, and academic problems (Juvonen, Graham, & Schuster, 2003).

5.5 Bystanders

5.5.1 Bystanders who defend victims in their school tend to have comfortable social positions, and may act in perceived accordance with the views of parents or friends and level of bullying they engage in with friends. Interestingly, both in-school and online bystanders are not necessarily more empathetic than bystanders who do not defend victims, but may be more engaged in moral reasoning. Bystanders who reinforce bullying behavior play a role in the frequency of bullying incidents.

- Researchers suggest that high social status individuals, as determined by popularity and social preference, are more likely to help the victim in a bullying situation, perhaps because they do not have a high risk of being victimized in turn (Salmivalli, Karna, & Pskiparta, 2010).
- Moreover, they assert that individuals who support the victims may also do so out of positive social expectations or pressures from their parents or peer groups (Salmivalli, Karna, & Pskiparta, 2010).
- In a recent social network study of a 346 middle school students, bullying perpetration within one's peer group was highly predictive of less individual willingness to intervene (suggestive of possibilities for intervention targeting peer groups) (Espelage, Green, & Polanin, 2011).
- Moreover, bystanders who intervened on behalf of the victim were associated more strongly with "perspective-taking" than empathy for the victim. "Perspective-taking" is more about cognitively adopting others' point of view, whereas empathy is more about affectively being concerned for others (Espelage et al., 2011).
- Based on interviews with 41 youth ages 10-14, one study suggests that high-level moral reasoning through perspective-taking and using "moral absolutes" is associated with standing up for the victims of online bullying (i.e., upstanding, or being an upstander). Yet moral reasoning was not the sole factor associated with upstanders' behavior – gender played a role, as did the relationship of the bystander to the victim and the feelings associated with it (Graeff, 2012).
- Notably, however, a Finnish study of 6,764 students ages 9-11 suggests that defending victims does not necessarily reduce the likelihood of further bullying (Salmivalli et al., 2011).

5.5.2 Bystanders may experience emotional or psychological problems linked to their involvement in bullying, though not academic ones.

- Previous studies tell how bystanders have reported feeling discomfort in bullying situations or anxiety and insecurity as a result of them – bystanders' anxiety, moreover, has been linked to aggressive behavior. One study in the U.K. found that compared to victims, bystanders were more likely to have elevated levels of substance abuse (see Rivers et al., 2009).
- In a study of 5,391 students in the 7th, 9th, and 11th grades, bystanders were more likely to have better grades than victims (a one-point rise in grade point average correlated to a 10% reduction in likelihood of victimization) (Glew, Fan, Katon, & Rivara, 2008).

6. What are the Norms Around Bullying?

Bullying, like other forms of social interaction, is shaped by a variety of norms, including the social norms of youths and adults as well as the norms of schools and society at large. Youths' expectations and perceptions of their peers' behavior and their school climate, and their notions about identity and social difference, inform what they consider normal or acceptable behavior. Parents and school authorities have the capacity to influence youths' perceptions and tendencies to seek help for or report acts of bullying, online and offline – though adult and youth norms are not always perfectly aligned, due to differences in perception of bullying incidents and language used to describe them.

6.1 Perceptions, Attitudes, and Group Norms Related to Bullying

6.1.1 As with all social interactions, bullying takes shape in dialog with, and relation to, social norms. In school settings, students' perceptions of school norms correlate to their attitudes about bullying, and moreover, to their likelihood of engaging in bullying behavior. Simply regarding bullying to be more common and accepted within a school than it really is, for instance, can be associated with more perpetration of bullying acts or other negative characteristics that affect the entire student body (including those not directly involved in bullying). With respect to the online context, teens' attitudes about cyberbullying may predict their likelihood of bullying online. Such findings bear important implications for the design of anti-bullying programs.

- One study of 2,589 students across five middle schools found that students perceived social norms to be different than what data showed, as students believed that bullying perpetration, victimization, and pro-bullying attitudes were more frequent than was the case. Notably, variation in students' perceptions of peer norms was highly associated with students' perpetration of and attitudes towards bullying – as students perceive more bullying, they become more likely to bully, consistent with other high risk behaviors like drug and alcohol abuse (Perkins, Craig, & Perkins, 2011).

- In a study of 281 Virginia high schools, the level of bullying reported by students in the 9th grade was correlated with the schools' drop-out rates over four years. Although no causal effect was established, pervasive bulling and teasing may engender a variety of circumstances that ultimately contribute to dropping out, such as disengagement with school, disciplinary consequences, among others (Cornell, Gregory, Huang, & Fan, under review, p. 22-23).

- In a statewide sample of over 7,000 students in the 9th grade in Virginia, researchers found that individual students who perceive a "climate of bullying" in their school are generally less committed to their school, but not to school activities, than their peers. In schools where such a perception was the norm, however, both commitment to school and involvement in school activities was less than in other schools (Bandyopadhyay, Cornell, Fan, & Gregory, in press).

- Based the study of 1,318 European youth, researchers found that attitude toward bullying is a strong predictor of involvement, as about 25% of teens who do not "reject" cyberbullying are approximately four times more likely to engage in it (Walrave and Heirman, 2010, p. 44).

6.1.2 Social norms shared within peer groups factor into bullying and bystander behavior, as well.

- Numerous studies have found support for the hypothesis that bullies hang out with bullies, and become more like each other over time in their attitudes and behaviors (the "homophily hypothesis" of bully perpetration; see Hong & Espelage, 2012; Espelage et al., 2003, 2007, 2011; Rodkin, Farmer, Pearl, & Van Acker, 2000; Xie, Cairns & Cairns, 2004).

- Among boys in a sample of 346 middle school students, the higher the level of bullying within a peer group, the less likely boys were to intervene as bystanders in bullying situations. This finding did not apply to girls in the sample. Notably, however, attitudes towards bullying did not relate to boys' likelihood to intervene as bystanders (Espelage et al., 2011).

6.1.3 Conflict that teens refer to as "drama" often occurs between teen groups, or individuals from those groups, with different social norms. "Drama" also reinforces gender norms.

- A Facebook status update, a comment thread on a Facebook photo, or even a brief offline interaction, for instance, can escalate into "drama" when social norms from different social groups come into conflict, according to ethnographic data collected through interviews and discussions over a five-year period with teens ages 13-19 (Marwick & boyd, 2011).

- Because such "drama" often plays out through gossip, friendships, or other relationships (e.g., those involving dating), which are traditionally considered feminine issues in high school environments,

"drama" reinforces traditional gender norms, even if boys participate in it at times (Marwick & boyd, 2011).

6.2 Bullying and Homophobia

6.2.1 Boys' notions about "normal" masculinity play a role in offline bullying based on gender or sexual orientation, as well as how they respond to such bullying incidents as bystanders.

- Findings from a study of 251 students in the 9th-11th grades in an all-male preparatory school supported previous research on boys' experiences with bullying and perceptions of gender identity. Boys' social norms link any indication of vulnerability to femininity, which in turn is considered a sign of homosexuality. Social pressure to conform to "boy code" (normative masculinity) compels boys to denigrate the gender normativity of others, largely to affirm their own masculinity and avoid being targets (Swearer et al., 2008; Kimmel & Mahler, 2003;).

- A study of 253 high school students found that among those involved in bullying incidents, the bully is not the only one to use homophobic epithets. Those who reinforce or assist the bully use them as well. Across all roles of involvement, boys use such epithets more than girls (Poteat & Rivers, 2010).

6.3 Norms Around Help-Seeking, Reporting, and Responding

6.3.1 Norms fostered or imparted (or informed, even) by parents factor into how youth respond to various types of involvement in a bullying incident, online and offline.

- When adults teach children not to "tattle," they discourage youth from reporting bullying. Preliminary findings from an online survey of 11,893 youth in 12 states show that some types of youth are told not to "tattle" much more than others – students in special education, students of color (excluding Asian Americans), and boys were told this by parents more than other student demographics. Parents' disapprobation of "tattling" may well pertain to the online context as well, for which bystanders are unlikely to report bullying to adults based on religion, gender, race, or sexual orientation (Davis & Nixon, 2010; Davis & Nixon, 2012, p. 98).

- Parenting theories can serve as the basis for schools' approaches to foster a positive help-seeking environment – namely, the theory of "authoritative parenting," which posits that neither structure nor support alone are capable of maintaining an orderly home (or school) environment (Gregory, Cornell, Fan, Sheras, Shih, & Huang, 2010).

6.3.2 Most teens do not tell adults about incidents of offline bullying, except when physical violence is concerned. With regards to the online context, youth disclosure of online incidents of harassment, though not necessarily of bullying, is increasing.

- A national survey of 5,621 youth ages 12-18 found that 64% of all respondents who experienced offline bullying in various forms did not report it to teachers or school officials. Notably, however, over half of the youth respondents specified that they report bullying victimization that led to a physical injury, involved a physical threat, involved destroyed property, or involved physical aggression. Fewer victims of relational bullying reported to teachers or school officials (Petrosino, Guckenburg, DeVoe, & Hanson, 2010).

- Data from the Crimes Against Children Research Center's (CCRC) Third Youth Internet Safety Survey (YISS-3) from 1,500 youth show that youth disclosure of online harassment incidents to parents increased from 31% in 2005 to 40% in 2010 and disclosure to school staff increased from 2% in 2005 to 12% in 2010 (Jones, 2012).

- Among a sample of 636 Belgian students ages 10-11, reporting an incident of cyberbullying to an adult was associated with acts of deception, insults, or threats and was most often reported by bystanders rather than perpetrators or victims (Vandebosch & VanCleemput, 2009).

- Although youth in a British study of 533 young people recommended reporting cyberbullying to adults, most had not actually done so (Smith et al., 2008).

In response to cyberbullying, children and teens often consult friends or unilaterally confront cyberbullies, according to meta-synthesis of 25 studies on cyberbullying victimization. In rare instances, victims tell their parents or simply try to ignore the problem (Tokunaga, 2010).

6.3.3 Research indicates ways that schools can foster environments conducive to youth help-seeking, which in turn carries benefits for the individual as well as the school.

- Students are more willing to seek help from teachers or school officials when teachers intervene in students' peer conflicts, according to a study 148 high school students. Researchers shared two vignettes about school-based victimization to the students, then administered questionnaires and conducted follow-up analyses to measure their perceptions of teachers' behavior in the stories and the relationship of such perceptions to behavior (Aceves, Hinshaw, Mendoza-Denton, & Page-Gould, 2010).

- Students' perceptions that teachers care about them, believe in them, and treat them fairly and respectfully (e.g., perceptions of teachers' support) may encourage students to seek help and "be instrumental in increasing school safety," according to an investigation involving 7,318 students in the

9th grade across 291 high schools. Increased perceptions of support reduced gender discrepancies in help seeking, but did not reduce the discrepancy between African American students and students of other racial identities, as the former group remained less likely to seek help (Eliot, Cornell, Gregory, & Fan, 2010, p. 549).

- A recent study of over 7,300 students in the 9th grade and 2,900 teachers randomly selected from 290 high schools found that students who seek help for being bullied are less likely to be bullied again (Gregory et al., 2010, p. 485; also supported by: Ladd & Ladd, 2001; Smith, Talamelli, Cowie, Naylor, & Chauhan, 2004).

6.3.4 LGBT youth are less likely than heterosexual youth to disclose victimization of cyberbullying to their parents. LGBT teens also believe, as do LGBT allies of similar ages, that their peers – particularly bystanders – have more responsibility than other actors to combat and prevent cyberbullying, calling for a change in what is normal and acceptable for bystanders.

- A national survey of more than 400 11-to-22-year-olds drawn from 174 Gay Straight Alliances (GSAs) across the country found that 80% of participants stated that peers should do more to stop cyberbullying. 58% state it should be school administrators or teachers, 58% state it should be parents, and 48% state it should be the government who should do more to stop cyberbullying. Some respondents called out peer bystanders to "become empowered to interrupt and prevent such incidents (to become 'upstanders')" (Blumenfeld & Cooper, 2010, p. 128).

- A national survey of LGBT and allied youth ages 11-22 shows that the decision not to report cyberbullying to parents may be based on apprehension that parents will restrict technology use, the belief that parents cannot stop cyberbullying or that parents wouldn't believe the youth, and importantly, fear of disclosing their non-heterosexual identities to parents (Blumenfeld & Cooper, 2010).

6.3.5 Programs that aim to change how bystanders respond to bullying situations present opportunities to change school-wide social norms.

- Anti-bullying interventions that target bystanders present promising approaches for changing school norms, according to a partial review of the literature (Swearer, Espelage, Vaillancourt, & Hymel, 2010; also supported by: Aboud & Miller, 2007; Frey, Hirschstein, Edstrom, & Snell, 2009; Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Salmivalli, Karna, & Poskiparta, 2010; Stevens, Van Oost, & De Bourdeaudhuij, 2000).

- Such interventions may be more effective with elementary than secondary school students, according to findings from a school-based survey completed by 9,397 students in the 4th-8th grades (Trach, Hymel, Waterhouse, & Neale, 2010).

II. WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT BULLYING?

1. School Policy

School policies can guide prevention and intervention efforts by establishing a framework for action and communicating this framework, and the school's commitment to it, to the broader community. In most cases, schools develop policies to complement or expand on school district or state bullying policies. They can address elements of prevention and intervention efforts such as processes for reporting and responding to acts of bullying, and recognize the multiple forms of bullying that occur both online and offline[1]. In particular, school policies balance the goals of maintaining discipline and promoting a supportive school climate. "Zero tolerance" and other highly punitive disciplinary approaches have been shown not to work; a balance of consistent disciplinary action and support for students has been more effective. Professional development and other training for school staff can provide ways for teachers and staff to best support students.

1.1 Overview of School Policy as Related to Online and Offline Bullying

1.1.1 School policies establish a framework in which schools can organize their anti-bullying efforts and a means of signaling their anti-bullying intentions to the community. School policies can also address multiple issues salient to their prevention and intervention and explicitly recognize multiple forms of bullying – including online and offline bullying, bias-based bullying, etc.

- According to a review of 142 school bullying policies in England, school policies serve the purposes of: providing a "framework for signalling the school's commitment to anti-bullying work, organising its response (including both proactive and reactive strategies), and communicating this to all stakeholders in the school community." (Smith, Smith, Osborn, & Samara, 2008, p. 2).

- In particular, the majority of policies reviewed provided definitions of bullying and discussed ways to inform parents of bullying incidents or involve them in response efforts. However, most policies did not address the definitional complexity of bullying, the responsibility of all school personnel beyond teachers, processes for facilitating or receiving reports of incidents and managing such reports, or preventative measures (such as monitoring playgrounds), and also made little mention of LGBT-

---

[1] In Section II, What Can Be Done About Bullying?, the term "bullying" predominantly refers to offline bullying unless either "online" or "offline" are explicitly mentioned. As stated in the Introduction, the section reviews research of four areas where action has been taken to redress problems associated with bullying. Most research has evaluated prevention and intervention efforts in the offline context; as such, "bullying" most often refers to offline bullying here.

based or online bullying. The researchers identified all of these components as those that should be included in school policies (Smith, Smith, Osborn, & Samara, 2008).

1.1.2 Among the relatively little literature there is on how school policies should address online bullying, most of the literature prescribes what school policies should include, rather than describing or analyzing existing policies while also making suggestions (as does the study cited above). However, research has yielded lessons for schools about efforts to control students' access to technology in the attempt to reduce online bullying.

- Research has shown that schools have often attempted to restrict students' access to technology, including mobile phones and the Internet (with social networking sites or social media sites in mind), due to a number of concerns, which may include online bullying (see Ito et al., 2010; Shariff & Churchill, 2012)
- Notably, however, research has also extensively shown that schools' attempts to restrict or ban access to social technologies can often be subverted by youths' practices with technology. Teenagers are very capable of developing "workarounds" to institutional barriers to accessing technology. For example, a synthesis of ethnographic studies of teens' use of the internet shows that many youth use proxy servers to get online during school, and learn how to do so from their more skilled or knowledgeable peers (Horst, Stephenson, & Robinson, 2011).

1.2 Balancing Discipline and Support

1.2.1 "Zero-tolerance" policies implemented on the school and district level have not been effective at reducing offline bullying (or other forms of school-based violence); similarly, highly punitive policies have not been very effective at reducing online bullying. Research has even suggested that highly punitive policies can have a negative impact on individual youth as well as the overall school climate.

- Zero-tolerance emerged in the 1990s based on drug enforcement policies of the time. Zero-tolerance "has come to describe disciplinary philosophies and policies that are intended to deter disruptive behavior through the application of severe and certain punishments" according to a synthesis from the Zero Tolerance Task Force commissioned by the American Psychological Association. The goal of zero-tolerance policies is twofold: (1) to send a message that bad behavior will be universally punished, and (2) to remove troublemakers from the school environment. Among several problems with zero-tolerance, removing troublemakers from school deprives them of an opportunity to learn and can expose them to even more risk outside of school. The task force's review of such policies also

shows that removing disruptive students does not create a climate more conducive to learning (Skiba Reynolds, Graham, Sheras, Conoley, & Garcia-Vasquez, 2006, p. 19).

- In a study that compared Texas students' academic records to juvenile justice system records (drawing on data from 928,940 students in total, with 136,592 of those having at least one matching record in the juvenile justice database), researchers found that students who were suspended or expelled – for reasons that may have included, but not limited to, bullying – were more likely to repeat a grade, drop out, or come in contact with the juvenile justice system. The findings support the argument that removing students from the school environment does not improve their educational opportunities and likely corresponds to more behavioral problems and risk factors (Fabelo, Thompson, Plotkin, Carmichael, Marchbanks III, and Booth, 2011).

- Overly punitive school policies toward online bullying may potentially have unintended consequences, as well. Through research in Quebec schools, for instance, some researchers suggest that in schools with strict punitive policies against online bullying, educators were more likely to have reported low rates of online bullying among students, perhaps because they believed the school policy to be a sufficient deterrent. (Shariff & Churchill, 2010, based on unpublished data).

1.2.2 However, schools should not entirely neglect disciplinary action, but rather, strive to combine disciplinary policies with those that promote a supportive school climate. Schools can use professional development or other training programs to educate teachers and other school staff about how to foster such a climate, particularly by responding to or intervening in situations of offline bullying and in schools. Some state- or district-level policies require or encourage such training programs.

- Based on a Virginia-wide sample of 7,300 9th-grade students and 2,900 teachers, schools that provided both "structure" and "support" (i.e., consistent enforcement of school discipline and an available, caring adults) predicted both lower reported rates of bullying as well as lower perceived rates of bullying, compared to schools that provided less structure and support (Gregory et al., 2010).

- In one study, researchers surveyed 115 middle school teachers to see how they learn about and become involved in students' offline bullying situations, and how they felt about doing so. Teachers reported that they directly intervened in bullying situations less frequently than they provided students with prevention-oriented instruction. Yet the teachers were also more likely to respond to an incident – either when informed of or observing one – when they felt prepared to respond, indicating a role for training programs to provide such preparation (Novick & Isaacs, 2010).

- A review of professional development and other training programs' relations to schools' (or school districts') broader prevention and intervention efforts found that such training programs play a role in

the sustainability and success of anti-bullying efforts. Overall, many effective training programs reviewed were ongoing, received administrative support, had clear protocols, and used role-play or real cases (Kratochwill, Volpiansky, Clements, & Ball, 2007).

As of January 2012, 10 states required (and one encouraged) schools or school districts to provide school staff with professional development or training to better understand the relevant school district's bullying policy, many of which cover reporting and response processes. 16 states required and six encouraged that schools or school districts provide staff with professional development or training in bullying prevention, according to a recent overview of existing state anti-bullying laws (Sacco et al., 2012).

2. Curricula

School curricula are integral to anti-bullying efforts, particularly for the purposes of bullying prevention. They are often the mainstay of anti-bullying "programs"; research often refers to the two interchangeably. Curricula aimed at preventing bullying succeed most often when they are "evidence-based" and implemented effectively. Social-emotional learning is an important type of curriculum that can successfully prevent bullying. Schools can deploy curricula in combination with other school-wide efforts, such as those aimed at improving school climate or disciplinary practices, as part of broader prevention and intervention.

2.1 Evidence-based Curricula

2.1.1 Schools' programs that seek to combat or prevent bullying, both online and offline, should use curricula that are "evidence-based." For a curriculum to be "evidence-based," it must have been studied using rigorous evaluation methodology and demonstrated a positive impact, such as improved attitudes about bullying, improved bystander actions, or reduced rates of bullying victimization. Data collected about successful anti-bullying programs offer suggestions of best practices.

- Most importantly, "evidence-based" refers to programs that have used sound evaluations to test their success in achieving intended goals, according to a discussion paper on programs for youth online safety. "Evidence-based" programs can also be based on the well-defined objectives, strategies, and resources of related programs, particularly those with a proven record of success and/or evaluations that attest to their effectiveness (Jones & Finkelhor, 2011).

- To support the process of selecting an evidence-based curriculum, school officials can collect additional evidence (i.e., data) on the nature and frequency of bullying within their school. This can serve two purposes: (1) to ensure the chosen curriculum suits the school's particular needs, and (2) to

have data with which to continue evaluating the curriculum's evidence of effectiveness over time (Espelage & Poteat, 2012).

- Steps to Respect is one example of an anti-bullying program whose curricula is evidence-based, and whose record of success has been evaluated and shown to be successful. Steps to Respect targets older elementary school students, based on research showing an increase in bullying among that demographic. It focuses on adult supervision of school spaces where bullying occurs (namely, the playground), adult support for students, students' beliefs about bullying, and students' social-emotional skills. A two-year longitudinal evaluation of the program as implemented among students in the 3rd-5th grades, which observed 360 students on the playground and surveyed 624 students, found that Steps to Respect kept rates of bullying from increasing over time, which was observed among students who did not participate in the program. The program was especially effective for students who participated in the program for the full two years (Frey et al., 2009).

- For the purpose of reducing broader, bias-based forms of peer victimization, there are several evidence-based programs that have demonstrated effectiveness at decreasing prejudice and increasing appreciation for diversity among high school students, according to a an overview of school-based prevention efforts related to bullying, relational aggression, and prejudice. The authors emphasize that research points to common tactics that can address multiple forms of negative youth behavior (Espelage & Poteat, 2012).

2.1.2 "Evidence-based" programs are not only the most effective, but can also guard against unintended negative consequences. Cases of such negative consequences have been shown – but are not common – among anti-bullying programs, as well as broader forms of youth interventions.

- According to a 2008 meta-analysis of 16 anti-bullying programs (in both the U.S. and Europe) a minority of studies showed evidence of programs' negative or adverse effects on students. As a possible explanation, the meta-analysis refers to previous research showing that grouping high-risk youth together in an intervention might yield negative effects. The meta-analysis resolves that educators and policymakers should not assume programs cause harm, but should also recognize that they do not preclude harm (Merrell et al., 2008, citing Dishion, McCord, and Poulin, 1999).

- Research on curricular programs in other areas, such as youth substance abuse, underscore the importance of curricula being "evidence-based." Historically, some youth-oriented substance abuse prevention programs that were not "evidence-based" produced the opposite effects of those they desired, according to a review of public health interventions for youth (Jones-Ringold, 2002).

2.2. Social-emotional Learning

2.2.1 Curricula that focus on social-emotional learning (SEL) can play a critical role in schools' bullying prevention efforts, for students of all ages. SEL curricula seek to foster several social and emotional skills. Notably, they have been found to improve behaviors and perceptions related to bullying, as well as academic performance.

- SEL curricula seek to foster "interrelated" sets of competencies, including "self-awareness, self management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making." These competencies, in turn, can foster the skills to socially and emotionally adjust to new situations (e.g., by experiencing lower levels of distress) and to succeed academically (e.g., improved grades or test scores). Overall, scholars have suggested that perhaps mastering these competencies empowers students to take more initiative in and responsibility for their actions, which may play a role in improved academic performance (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011).

- A meta-analysis of 213 universal SEL programs – in kindergarten through high school – that reached a total of 270,034 students finds positive skill-building, perceptual, behavioral, and academic effects of SEL programs – especially those that are evidence-based and well implemented. These findings are notable in that the study was the first to focus exclusively on "universal" school-based SEL programs (i.e., for a school's entire student body) and to evaluate their impact on positive behaviors, problem behaviors, and academic performance (Durlak et al., 2011).

2.2.2 SEL curricula can effectively provide students with the skills to better establish and maintain positive relationships, both with peers and teachers. This aspect of SEL education is particularly important, as friendship can act as a protective factor against bullying. That is, studies have found that students with more friends are bullied less frequently.

- By combining a focus on both emotional and social skills, SEL programs have had success promoting prosocial behavior and students' capacities to establish and maintain positive relationships (Durlak et al., 2011).

- Notably, peer acceptance, popularity, and the quality of friendships are important protective factors for youth against bullying, according to a recent literature review. (Hong & Espelage, 2012; see also Bollmer, Milich, Harris, & Maras, 2005; Schmidt & Bagwell, 2007, and Demaray & Malecki, 2003).

- Underscoring the importance of friendships are findings from a study of Steps to Respect, a "universal" bullying prevention program that uses SEL curricula, among 544 elementary school students. For victims of relational aggression (including gossiping and social exclusion) on the

playground who said they were supported by friends, reported rates of victimization decreased over the course of the program (Low et al., 2010).

2.3 The Whole-school Approach

2.3.1 "Whole-school" programs for bullying prevention and intervention operate across multiple academic disciplines and levels of the school environment. Such programs have a mixed record of success; evaluations point to the importance of effective implementation.

- Whole-school programs may combine classroom curriculum and conflict resolution training with school-wide rules and sanctions, teacher training, and individual counseling, according to a review of such efforts' evaluations. The review further distinguishes whole-school programs from those that only employ curricula and/or focus on skill-development (Vreeman & Carroll, 2007).
- For example, the Steps to Respect program "works on a schoolwide level," in that it first works with school administrators, then all school staff, and finally, students. Steps to Respect seeks to change students' attitudes, skills, and behavior through curricula, in addition to training school staff to better monitor students and intervene in bullying situations. (http://www.cfchildren.org/steps-to-respect.aspx; Swearer, Espelage, Vaillancourt, & Hymel, 2010).
- Overall, however, whole-school programs stills struggle to redress bullying in all context effectively. One literature review suggests five reasons for why this might be: 1) problems related to measuring bullying and program efficacy; 2) programs may lack a theoretical framework; 3) programs may fail to address students' "social ecology," which includes peers, families, etc.; 4) programs may not address factors associated with students' changing demographics; and 5) programs may not sufficiently target perpetrators' behavioral tendencies (Swearer, Espelage, Vaillancourt, & Hymel, 2010).

2.4 Implementing Curricula

2.4.1 Even with curricula that are evidence-based and/or are part of a whole-school approach, the *implementation* of such curricula nonetheless remains critical to their success. Implementation is also critical for making later evaluation possible, which is necessary to demonstrate and validate success. Research has more recently focused on identifying characteristics of effective curricular implementation.

- The intensity and duration of programs' implementation are associated with effectiveness (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011).
- Multiple studies indicate that curricular programs that facilitate active learning, promote skill development, and rely on well-trained staff show the most effectiveness (Kerns & Prinz, 2002;

Nation, Crusto, Wandersman, Kumpfer, Seybolt, Morrisey-Kane, & Davino, 2003; Durlak, Weissberg, & Pachan, 2010).

- A meta-analysis of SEL programs found that those whose implementation was "sequenced, active, focused, and explicit" were successful. The study refers to this set of qualities as the SAFE model. Programs following the SAFE model "use a sequenced step-by-step training approach, use active forms of learning, focus sufficient time on skill development, and have explicit learning goals" (Durlak et al., 2011, p. 408).

- Implementation procedures should follow high quality standards and should be transparent in order to facilitate evaluation, according to a meta-analysis of evaluations of 44 anti-bullying programs (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011).

- "Fidelity," or the process of adhering to program protocol, is essential for the evaluation of program's effectiveness, according to a review of youth violence prevention programs (Kerns & Prinz, 2002, p. 149).

3. School Climate

The climate, or culture, of a school can have an impact on the prevalence of bullying and students' comfort levels – and likelihood – of reporting acts of bullying to adults in school. Students' feelings of being connected to and supported by school are prime characteristics of positive school climate, which are associated with lower levels of bullying. Positive relationships with peers and adults within school, and a sense of being treated fairly by teachers, are in turn important aspects of a connected and supportive school climate. Social norms (such as students' expectations and perceptions regarding their peers' involvement in bullying, or likelihood to engage in positive bystanding behavior) are also important elements of school climate, which can be addressed or improved through intervention efforts.

3.1 Connected and Supportive School Climates

3.1.1 Educators, school administrators, and school staff should aim to cultivate a school climate that makes students feel connected to and supported by their school; not doing so may increase the likelihood of students' involvement in bullying. Alongside other school personnel, teachers play a particularly important role in cultivating school climate, as they can influence students' likelihood to seek help related to bullying, and in turn, potentially reduce future bullying.

- Students' who feel connected to their school can reduce the risk of being involved in bullying or peer victimization, according to a recent literature review of risk factors of bullying and peer victimization.

The converse is true as well – youth with lower levels of school connectedness were more likely to be involved in bullying and peer victimization. The review drew from research conducted in the U.S. and abroad. One particular study reviewed, which surveyed 866 students in the 5th-12th grades, found that bully-victims indicated lower levels of school connectedness than victims or the non-involved (see Hong & Espelage, 2012; You, Furlong, Felix, Sharkey, Tanigawa, & Green, 2008).

- Students may feel connected to school if they feel that teachers treat them fairly, have close relationships with peers (or others) at school, and feel like they are part of their school, according to data on 12,118 students in the 7th-12th grades from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Resnick et al., 1997).

- Students' perceptions of feeling supported – that is, being cared for and treated fairly – by teachers and school staff has become one of the most frequently used markers of positive school climate, according to a study of school climate across 97 high schools (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002).

- Moreover, a study of 7,318 students in the 9th grade found that students who perceive teachers or school staff to be supportive are more likely to feel positively about seeking help for bullying or threats of violence. Notably, seeking help in the face of a bullying incident can help prevent re-victimization (Eliot et al., 2010).

3.2 Social Norms

3.2.1 Social norms research suggests that if students perceive bullying as acceptable, they are more likely to bully. A similar dynamic has been observed in studies of other risky youth behaviors, including alcohol and drug use. Research has shown that interventions that target social norms around bullying, including those around bystanders' actions, can result in more positive, prosocial behavior among youth, and reduce bullying.

- Working with over 2,000 students in New Jersey middle schools, researchers disseminated print media displaying data about students' perceptions of bullying within schools. The researchers then found that students' perceptions of their peers' attitudes towards school bullying were changing; this change was accompanied by lower rates of bullying and higher rates of reporting incidents to adults in school and family members (based on rates reported by students) (Perkins et al., 2011).

A recent meta-analysis of 12 school-based programs involving a total of 12,874 students found that some bullying prevention programs can effectively increase bystanders' positive intervention in bullying situations. In addition to educating students about ways bystanders can take action, programs can address attitudes towards bystanding and intervening on the level of school climate (Polanin et al., 2012).

4. Role of Parents

Parents can play a role in youths' involvement in bullying in multiple ways. Within the family or home, parents model a range of behaviors. Modeling certain negative behaviors, such as violence, are associated with children's increased risk of involvement. Modeling positive behaviors, such as helping with homework, may reduce children's risk of involvement. In connection to schools' anti-bullying efforts, parents can participate in trainings and meetings with school staff. Counseling, particularly family therapy, is another way parents may respond to children's involvement in bullying as bullies, victims, or bully-victims.

(Please note that the following summary of positive actions parents can take is drawn from research literature, as scoped in the Introduction. Prescriptive, or "guidebook", literature for parents may offer more or other suggestions).

4.1 Associations Between Parenting and Children's Involvement in Bullying

4.1.1 The ways that parents model behavior for their children have notable effects; some types of modeling, as well as relationships within families, are associated with kids' bullying later in life. The associations between parent-child relations and bullying vary moderately by race/ethnicity.

- Children learn behaviors through observation and role modeling; observing violence in the family may lead children to accept bullying and aggression, according to a review of literature on bullying among youth and adults in various contexts, including schools, home environments, and sibling relationships (Monks, Smith, Naylor, Barter, Ireland, & Coyne, 2009).
- A nationally representative study of 11,033 students in the 6th-10th grades found that among Hispanics, African Americans, and Whites, students who reported that they could not communicate easily with their parents were more likely to be involved in bullying, across multiple roles. Among African Americans and Whites, students' reports of parental involvement in school (i.e., parents' help with homework or communication with teachers) were associated with lower involvement in bullying. "Family structure" (i.e., the number of parents living in a home) were associated with involvement for White youth only (Spriggs, Iannotti, Nansel, & Haynie, 2007).

4.2 What Parents Can Do

4.2.1 Not only can certain parenting practices mitigate the risk of children's involvement in bullying, but parents' participation in school's broad anti-bullying efforts can contribute to their success. Parents may

get involved in such efforts by receiving trainings or attending meetings to learn about anti-bullying initiatives. Apart from participating in school-based efforts, parents may also productively engage counseling for children involved with bullying.

- Parent and community involvement are important parts of school's anti-bullying and/or other SEL prevention programs, and should complement efforts that operate through curricula and that address the school climate, according to an educator's guide and review of about 250 SEL programs (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning [CASEL], 2003).

- Furthermore, a recent meta-analysis of studies on 44 anti-bullying programs recommends that new initiatives should aim to educate and work with parents, in addition to creating change within classrooms and school climates. In particular, the meta-analysis found that trainings and meetings for parents were associated with decreases in bullying (Ttoffi & Farrington, 2011).

- Beyond participating in community-oriented prevention and intervention efforts driven by schools, parents may also engage family counseling for children who may be bullies, victims, or bully-victims, according to a partial review of literature on bullying and family therapy. Both "narrative family therapy," which allows families to envision their desired future and generate their own solutions, and "strategic/structural family therapy," which aims to decrease negative communication patterns and improve conflict resolution techniques, have demonstrated efficacy (Powell & Ladd, 2010).

4.2.2 Yet parents can also pose challenges for school-based anti-bullying efforts. Research has found that some parents – along with other adults, including educators – do not consider bullying to be a significant concern.

- A review of several evaluations of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP, an internationally implemented, "evidence-based" program), in the U.S. found that one of the greatest challenges to success was parents' and other adults' beliefs that bullying is not a major concern, either because they believed it to be rare or because they considered bullying a "rite of passage" (Olweus & Limber, 2010, p. 130).

5. Importance of Comprehensive and Cross-Cutting Solutions

While on the surface it may seem obvious to adults that youth should simply "stop bullying," the reality is that youth bullying involves complex behaviors influenced by multiple factors (i.e., individual characteristics, family life, peer relationships, social norms, school environment, and broader societal norms). Therefore, stopping these behaviors requires comprehensive and coordinated solutions across the areas of intervention described above. New ways of understanding and addressing the multiple factors that

influence bullying can provide such coordination. Moreover, coordinated solutions should address both the online and offline contexts, with an eye to positive interactions youth experience online.

5.1 The Social-ecological Framework and Other Approaches

5.1.1 The "social-ecological" framework considers multiple contextual and environmental factors related to bullying, and seeks to relate them in the effort to guide research and action related to bullying.

- The social-ecological framework seeks to account for the multiple systems directly affecting youth, including "families, schools, peer groups, teacher-student relationships, parent-child relationships, parent-school relationships, neighborhoods, and cultural expectations" (Swearer et al., 2010, p. 42).

- Recent meta-analyses of bullying prevention programs show that many programs tend to focus on shifting school climate so that bullying is not tolerated. The programs aim to provide students with knowledge about bullying, the consequences of bullying for all involved, and the importance of being an effective defender or bystander. Yet such programs may not consider other relevant factors that influence school climate, such as neighborhood, cultural norms and beliefs, and religion. Consequently, the results of these meta-analyses suggest that existing programs have a limited impact on reducing bullying in school. To improve, programs should include additional "ecologically-based" components: "1) parent training/meetings, 2) improved playground supervision, 3) classroom management, 4) teacher training, 5) classroom rules, 6) whole-school bullying policy, and 7) cooperative group work" (Hong and Espelage, 2012, p. 8).

- Other prevention and intervention programs, which address both offline and online bullying, address multiple levels of factors that influence bullying with a tiered model (borrowed from public health). The first tier is universal preventative education; the second involves more focused prevention and intervention strategies for particular students; the third tier involves interventions for perpetrators that can include counseling services, law enforcement, the medical community, and other stakeholders (Donlin, 2012; Nigam & Collier, 2010).

5.2 Youths' Positive Experiences Online

5.2.1 Research shows little reason for online bullying to disproportionately cloud our understanding of teens' social interactions online. Teens' activities online can produce positive experiences, including exposure to diverse perspectives, which is helpful for positive social and intellectual growth. When cultivating a school, home, or community environment, educators, parents, and other adults can learn of ways to leverage or encourage the development of youths' positive social interactions online.

- In a survey of 799 teens ages 12-17, 78% of teens who use social media report having at least one positive experience on social network sites, and 65% say that have had an interaction that made them feel positive about themselves (Lenhart et al., 2011).

- Findings from multiple surveys administered to over 500 youth ages 16-21 show that, contrary to popular concern, the Internet exposes youth to views about social and political issues different from their own. Theorists and researchers have long held that exposure to diverse perspectives is not only important for participation in a democracy, but also for "perspective-taking," the ability to understand the rationale or mindset of someone with whom you disagree. As previously noted, "perspective-taking" plays a role in how bystanders' respond to bullying situations. (Kahne, Middaugh, Lee, & Feezell, 2011).

- Teachers and school administrators can endeavor to learn from and with students about new online social environments, tools, and services, which student-led workshops, for example, can help facilitate. Such types of collaborative learning could also be supported by school policies toward technology use that are not overly restrictive. By better understanding students' use of the Internet, educators can better model "digital citizenship," or positive behavior and participation in social spaces online, according to a recent review of research recommendations for best practices for schools (see Couvillon & Ilieva, 2011; Bhat, 2008; Hinduja & Patchin, 2009; Mason, 2008; Trolley & Hanel, 2010).

REFERENCE LIST

Aboud, F., & Miller, L. (2007). Promoting peer intervention in name-calling. *South African Journal of Psychology, 37*, 803–819.

Aceves, M.J., Hinshaw, S.P., Mendoza-Denton, R., & Page-Gould, E. (2010). Seek help from teachers or fight back? student perceptions of teachers' actions during conflicts and responses to peer victimization. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence, 39*(6), 658-669. DOI: 10.1007/s10964-009-9441-9

Allen, K.P. (in press). 'We don't have bullying, but we have drama.' An exploratory, grounded theory study of social climate and social environment in a suburban US high school. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education.

Atlas, R.S., & Pepler, D.J. (1998). Observations of bullying in the classroom. *The Journal of Educational Research, 92*, 86-97.

Bandyopadhyay, S., Cornell, D., Fan, X., & Gregory, A. (in press). Bullying Climate and School Engagement in Ninth Grade Students. *Journal of School Health*.

Bhat, C.S. (2008). Cyber bullying: Overview and strategies for school counselors, guidance officers, and all school personnel. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counseling, 18*, 53–66.

Bollmer, J.M., Milich, R., Harris, M.J., & Maras, M.A. (2005). A friend in need: The role of friendship quality as a protective factor in peer victimization and bullying. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*, 701–712.

Branson, C.E & Cornell, D.G. (2009). A Comparison of Self and Peer Reports in the Assessment of Middle School Bullying. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 25*, 5-27.

Biegler, S., & boyd, d. (2010). Risky behaviors and online safety: A 2010 literature review (draft). Available at: http://www.zephoria.org/files/2010SafetyLitReview.pdf

Blumenfeld, W.J., & Cooper, R.M. (2010). LGBT and allied youth responses to cyberbullying: Policy implications. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 3*(1), 114-133.

Breivik, K., & Olweus, D. (2006). Adolescent's adjustment in four post-divorce family structures: Single mother, stepfather, joint physical custody and single father families. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 44*, 99–124.

Card, N.A., Stucky, B.D., Sawalani, G.M., & Little, T.D. (2008). Direct and indirect aggression during childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic review of gender differences, intercorrelations, and relations to maladjustment. *Child Development, 79*(5), 1185-1229.

The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning in Cooperation with the Mid-Atlantic
    Regional Educational Laboratory, The Laboratory for Student Success (2003). Safe and Sound:
    An Educational Leader's Guide to Evidence-Based Social and Emotional Learning (SEL)
    Programs. Retrieved from http://casel.org/wp-content/uploads/1A_Safe__Sound-rev-2.pdf

Cook, C.R., Williams, K.R., Guerra, N.G., Kim, T.E., & Sadek, S. (2010). Predictors of bullying in
    childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic investigation. *School Psychology Quarterly, 25*(2),
    65-83.

Craig, W. M. & Pepler, D. J. (1995). Peer processes in bullying and victimization: An observational
    study. *Exceptionality Education in Canada, 5*(3/4), 81-95.

Craig, W.M. & Pepler, D. J. (1997). Observations of bullying and victimization in the schoolyard.
    Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 13(2), 41-59.

Craig, W., Harel-Fisch, Y., Fogel-Grinvald, H., Dastaler, S., Hetland, J., Simons-Morten, B., et al. (2009).
A cross-national profile of bullying and victimization among adolescents in 40   countries. *International
Journal of Public Health, 54,* S216–S224.

Cornell, D., & Brockenbrough, K. (2004). Identification of bullies and victims: A comparison of methods.
    Journal of School Violence, 3, 63–87.

Couvillon, A., & Ilieva, V. (2011). Recommended practices: A review of school wide preventative
    programs and strategies on cyberbullying. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for
    Children and Youth, 55*(2), 96-101.

Crick, N.R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological
    adjustment. *Child Development, 66*(3), 710–722.

D'Augelli, A.R., Pilkington, N. W., & Hershberger, S. L. (2002). Incidence and mental health impact of
    sexual orientation victimization of lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths in high school. *School
    Psychology Quarterly, 17*(2), 148-167.

Davis, S., & Nixon, C., (2010). Preliminary results from the Youth Voice Research Project:
    Victimization & Strategies. Retrieved from
    http://www.youthvoiceproject.com/YVPMarch2010.pdf

Davis, T., & Nixon, C. (2012). Empowering bystanders. In J.W. Patchin & S. Hinduja (Eds.),
    Cyberbullying Prevention and Response: Expert Perspectives (pp. 93-109). New York, NY:
    Routledge.

Demaray, M. K., & Malecki, C. K. (2003). Perceptions of the frequency and importance of social support
    by students classified as victims, bullies and bully/victims in an urban middle school. *School
    Psychology Review, 32,* 471–489.

Dinkes, R., Kemp, J., Baum, K., & Snyder, T. D. (2009). Indicators of school crime and safety: 2008. (NCES 2009-022/NCJ-226343). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education and Justice. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2009022

Dishion, T.J., McCord, J., Poulin, F. (1999). When Interventions Harm: Peer Groups and Problem Behavior. *American Psychologist, 54*(9), 755-764.

Dooley, J.J., Pyzalski, J., & Cross, D. (2009). Cyberbullying versus face-to-face bullying: A theoretical and conceptual review. *Journal of Psychology, 217*(4), 182-188.

Donlin, M. (2012). You mean we gotta teach that, too? In J.W. Patchin & S. Hinduja (Eds.), *Cyberbullying Prevention and Response: Expert Perspectives* (pp. 110-127). New York, NY: Routledge.

Durlak, J.A., Weissberg, R. P., & 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*, 294-309.

Durlak, J.A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A.B., Talyor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development, 82*(1), 405-432.

Eliot, M., Cornell, D., Gregory, A., Fan, X. (2010). Supportive school climate and student willingness to seek help for bullying and threats of violence. *Journal of School Psychology, 48,* 533–553. DOI: 10.1016/j.jsp.2010.07.001

Englander, E., Mills, E., & McCoy, M. (2009). Cyberbullying and information exposure: User-generated content in postsecondary education. *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology, 46*(2), 213-230.

Englander, E.K. (2012). Spinning our wheels: Improving our ability to respond to bullying and cyberbullying. *Child, Adolescent and Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 21*(1), 43–55.

Espelage, D.L., Holt, M. K., & Henkel, R. R. (2003). Examination of peer-group contextual effects on aggression during early adolescence. *Child Development, 74*(1), 205-220.

Espelage, D.L., Green Jr., H., & Wasserman, S. (2007). Statistical analysis of friendship patterns and bullying behaviors among youth. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 2007*(118), 61-75.

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 (pp. 588–606). (4th edition). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Espelage, D. L., Green, H. D., & Polanin, J. (2011). Willingness to intervene in bullying episodes among middle school students: Individual and peer-group influences. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 1-26.

Espelage, D. L., Basile, K. C., & Hamburger, M. E. (2012). Bullying Perpetration and Subsequent Sexual Violence Perpetration Among Middle School Students. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 50(1), 60 – 65.

Espelage, D. L., & Poteat, V. P. (2012). Counseling psychologists in schools. In N. Fouad, J. Carter, & L. Subich (Eds.), *Handbook of Counseling Psychology (Volume 2)*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Fabelo, T., Thompson, M.D., Plotkin, M., Carmichael, D., Marchbanks III, M.P., & Booth, E. A. (2011). *Breaking schools rules: A statewide study of how school discipline relates to students' success and juvenile justice involvement*. Council of State Governments Justice Center, New York.

Farrington, D. P., & Ttofi, M. M. (2009). School-based programs to reduce bullying and victimization. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 6, i-148.

Farrington, D. P., & Ttofi, M. M. (2011). Bullying as a predictor of offending, violence and later life outcomes. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 21(2), 90 -98.

Fedewa, A., & Ahn, S. (2011). The effects of bullying and peer victimization on sexual-minority and heterosexual youths: A quantitative meta-analysis of the literature. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 7(4) 398-418.

Felix, E. D., Sharkey, J. D., Green, J. G., Furlong, M. J., & Tanigawa, D. (2011). Getting precise and pragmatic about the assessment of bullying: The development of the California bullying victimization scale. *Aggressive Behavior*, 37(3), 234-247. Retrieved from: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ab.20389/pdf

Finkelhor, D., Turner, H.A., & Hamby, S. (2012). Let's prevent peer victimization, not just bullying. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 36(4), 271-274.

Frey, K. S., 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(2), 466–481.

Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network. (2010). *The 2009 National School Climate Survey: The Experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Youth in Our Nation's Schools*. New York, NY: Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Diaz, E. M., & Bartkiewicz, M. J. Retrieved from http://www.glsen.org/cgi-bin/iowa/all/news/record/2624.html

Graeff, Erhardt (2012). Tweens, Cyberbullying, and Moral Reasoning: Separating the Upstanders

from the Bystanders. GoodWork® Project Report Series, 76. Retrieved from:

   http://www.goodworkproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/76-Tweens-Cyberbullying-
   And-Moral-Reasoning.pdf

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. DOI: 10.1037/a0018562.

Griffin, R. S., & Gross, A. M. (2004). Childhood bullying: Current empirical findings and future
   directions for research. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 9, 379–400.

Hamburger, M. E., Basile, K. C., & Vivolo, A.M. (2011). Measuring Bullying Victimization,
   Perpetration, and Bystander Experiences: A Compendium of Assessment Tools. Atlanta, GA:
   Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.

Hanish, L. D., Martin, C. L., Fabes, R. A., Leonard, S., & Herzog, M. (2005). Exposure to externalizing
   peers in early childhood: Homophily and peer contagion processes. *Journal of Abnormal Child
   Psychology, 33*(3), 267-281. DOI: 10.1007/s10802-005-3564-6

Hanish, L. D., Sallquist, J., DiDonato, M., Fabes, R. A., & Martin, C. L. (2012). Aggression By Whom-
   Aggression Toward Whom: Behavioral Predictors of Same- and Other-Gender Aggression in
   Early Childhood. *Developmental Psychology*. Advance online publication. DOI:
   10.1037/a0027510

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2009). Bullying beyond the schoolyard: Preventing and responding to
   cyberbullying. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Holt, M. K., & Espelage, D. L. (2003). A cluster analytic investigation of victimization among high school
   students: Are profiles differentially associated with psychological and school belonging? *Journal
   of Applied School Psychology, 19*(2), 81-98.

Hong, J. S., & Espelage, D. L. (2012). A review of research on bullying and peer victimization in school:
   An ecological system analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 17*(4), 311-322.

Hourbe, B., Targuinio, C., Thuillier, I., & Hergott, E. (2006). Bullying among students and its
   consequences on health. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 21, 183–208.

Hoy, W. K., Smith, P. A., & Sweetland, S. R. (2002). The development of the organizational
    climate index for high schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. *The High School
   Journal, 86*, 38-49.

Ikeda, J, M., Grimes, J., Tilly III, WD, Allison, R., Kurns, S., & Stumme, J. (2002). Implementing an
   intervention-based approach to service delivery: A case example. In Shinn, R, M., Walker, M, H.,

and Stoner, G. (Eds.) *Interventions for academic and behavior problems II: Preventive and remedial approaches*, (pp. 53-70). Bethesda: NASP Publications

Ito, M., Baumer, S., Bittanti, M., boyd, d., Cody, R., Herr-Stephenson, B., Horst, H.A., Lange, P. G., Mahendran, D., Martinez, K.Z., Pascoe, C.J., Perkel, D., Robinson, L., Sims, C., & L. Tripp (2010). Hanging out, messing around, geeking out: Kids living and learning with new media. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Jones-Ringold, D. (2002). Boomerang effects in response to public health interventions: Some unintended consequences in the alcoholic beverage market. *Journal of Consumer Policy, 25*, 27-63.

Jones, L.M. (March, 2012). Youth internet victimization: Ten year trends and new developments. Invited workshop presented at the 28th National Symposium on Child Abuse. Huntsville, AL.

Juvonen, J., Graham, S., & Schuster, M. A. (2003). Bullying among young adolescents: The strong, the weak, and the troubled. *Pediatrics, 112*(6), 1231–1237.

Juvonen, J., & Gross, E.F. (2008). Extending the school grounds?—bullying experiences in cyberspace. *Journal of School Health, 78*, 496-505.

Kahne, J., Middaugh, E., Lee, N-J., & Feezell, J. (2011). Youth online activity and exposure to diverse perspectives. New Media & Society, 1-21. Available at: http://nms.sagepub.com/content/early/2011/09/27/1461444811420271

Kerns, S. E. U., & Prinz, R. J. (2002). Critical issues in the prevention of violence-related behavior in youth. *Clinical Child And Family Psychology Review, 5*(2), 133-160.

Kimmel, M. S., & Mahler, M. (2003). Adolescent masculinity, homophobia, and violence: Random school shootings, 1982-2001. *American Behavioral Scientist, 46*(10), 1439-1458.

Klomek, A.B., Sourander, A., & Gould, M. (2011). 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.

Kowalski, R. M., & Limber, S. (2007). Electronic bullying among middle school students. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41*, S22–S30.

Kowalski, R.M. & Fedina, C. (2011). Cyber bullying in ADHD and Asperger Syndrome populations. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders, 5*, 1201–1208. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2011.01.007

Kratochwill, T.R., Volpiansky, P., Clements, M., & Ball, C. (2007). Professional development in implementing and sustaining multitier prevention models: Implications for response to intervention. *School Psychology Review, 36*(4), 618–631.

Ladd, B. K., & Ladd, G W. (2001) Variations in peer victimization: Relations to children's maladjustment. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 25-48). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Lamden, A. M., King, M. J., & Goldman, R. K. (2002). Divorce: Crisis intervention and prevention with children of divorce and remarriage. In J. Sandoval (Ed.), *Handbook of crisis counseling, intervention, and prevention in the schools* (pp. 83–104). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Law, D. M., Shapka, J. D., Domene, J. F., & Gagné, M. H. (2012). Are cyberbullies really bullies? An investigation of reactive and proactive online aggression. *Computers in Human Behavior, 28*(2), 664-672. Available at: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0747563211002573

Law, D., Shapka, J., Hymel, S., Olson, B., & Waterhouse, T. (2012). The changing face of bullying: An empirical comparison between traditional and internet bullying and victimization. *Computers in Human Behavior, 28*(1), 226-232.

Lenhart, A., Madden, M., Smith, A., Purcell, K., Zickuhr, K., & Rainie, L. (2011). Teens, kindness, and cruelty on social network sites. Pew Internet and American Life Project.

Little, T.L., Brauner, J., Jones, S.M., Nock, M., & Hawley, P.H. (2003). Rethinking aggression: A typological examination of the functions of aggression. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 49*(3), 343-369.

Low, S., Frey, K. S., & Brockman, C. J. (2010). Gossip on the playground: Changes associated with universal intervention, retaliation beliefs, and supportive friends. *School Psychology Review, 39*(4), 536–551. Available at: http://www.nasponline.org/publications/spr/39-4/spr394low.pdf

Marwick, A. E., & boyd, d. (2011). The drama! Teen conflict, gossip, and bullying in networked publics. A Decade in Internet Time: Symposium on the Dynamics of the Internet and Society, September 2011. draft. Available at: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1926349

Mason, K. (2008). Cyberbullying: A preliminary assessment for school personnel. *Psychology in the School, 45*, 323–348.

Merrell, K. W., Gueldner, B. A., Ross, S. W., & Isava, D. M. (2008). How effective are school bullying intervention programs? A meta-analysis of intervention research. *School Psychology Quarterly, 23*, 26–42.

Mishna, F., Saini, M., & Solomon, S. (2009). Ongoing and online: Children and youth's perceptions of cyber bullying. *Children and Youth Services Review, 31*, 1222-1228.

Mishna, F., Cook, C., Saini, M., Wu, M., & MacFadden, R. (2010). Interventions to Prevent and Reduce Cyber Abuse of Youth: A Systematic Review. *Research on Social Work Practice, 21*(1), 5-14.

Mishna, F., Khoury-Kassabri, M., Gadalla, T., & Daciuk, J. (2011). Risk factors for involvement in cyberbullying: Victims, bullies and bully–victims. Children and Youth Services Review, 1-8.

Monks, C. P., Smith, P. K., Naylor, P., Barter, C., Ireland, J. L., & Coyne, I. (2009). Bullying in different contexts: Commonalities, differences and the role of theory. *Aggressive and Violent Behavior, 14,* 146–156.

Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M. D., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviours among U.S. youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 16,* 2094–2100.

Nansel, T. R., Craig, W., Overpeck, M. D., Saluja, G., & Ruan, J. (2004). Cross-national Consistency in the Relationship Between Bullying Behaviors and Psychosocial Adjustment. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 158*(8), 730-736.

Nation, M., Crusto, C., Wandersman, A., Kumpfer, K. L., Seybolt, D., Morrisey-Kane, E., & Davino, K. (2003). What works in prevention: Principles of effective prevention programs. *American Psychologist, 58*(6/7), 449-456.

Nigam, H. & Collier, A. (2010, June 4). Youth Safety On A Living Internet: Report Of The Online Safety And Technology Working Group. Retrieved from: http://www.ntia.doc.gov/legacy/reports/2010/OSTWG_Final_Report_070610.pdf

Novick, R. M., & Isaacs, J. (2010). Telling is compelling: The impact of student reports of bullying on teacher intervention. *Educational Psychology*, 30(3), 283-296.

O'Connell, P., Sedigdeilami, F., Pepler, D., Craig, W., Connolly, J., Atlas, R., Smith, C. and Charach, A. (1997). Prevalence of bullying and victimization among Canadian elementary and middle school children. Poster session presented at the meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Washington, D.C.

Olweus, D. (1993). Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do. Oxford & Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

Olweus, D. (1994). Bullying at school: Basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 35(7), 1171-1190.

Olweus, D., & Limber, S.P. (2010). Bullying in school: Evaluation and dissemination of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 80(1), 124–134.

Orpinas, P., & Horne, A. M. (2006). *Bullying prevention: Creating a positive school climate and developing social competence*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Ostrov, J.M. (2010). Prospective Associations Between Peer Victimization and Aggression. *Child Development, 81*(6), 1670-1677.

Patchin, J., & Hinduja, S. (2010a). Traditional and nontraditional bullying among youth: A test of general strain theory. *Youth & Society, 43*(2), 727–751.

Patchin, J., & Hinduja, S. (2010b). Cyberbullying and Self-Esteem. *Journal of School Health, 80*(12), 614-621.

Patchin, J.W. & Hinduja, S. (2010c). Bullying, Cyberbullying, and Suicide. *Archives of Suicide Research, 14*(3), 206-221.

Patchin, J., & Hinduja, S. (2012). Cyberbullying: An update and synthesis of the research. In J. Patchin & S. Hinduja (Eds.), *Cyberbullying prevention and response: Expert perspectives* (pp. 13-35). New York, NY: Routledge.

Pellegrini, A. D., & Bartini, M. (2000). A longitudinal study of bullying, victimization, and peer affiliation during the transition from primary school to middle school. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*, 699–725.

Pellegrini, A. D. (2002). Bullying and victimization in middle school: A dominance relations perspective. *Educational Psychologist, 37*(3), 151-163.

Pepler, D. J., Craig, W. M., Connolly, J. A., Yuile, A., McMaster, L., & Jiang, D. (2006). A developmental perspective on bullying. *Aggressive Behavior, 32*, 376 –384.

Pepler, D., Craig, W., & O'Connell, P. (2010). Peer Processes in Bullying: Informing Prevention and Intervention Strategies. In S. Jimerson, S. Swearer, & D. Espelage (Eds.), *The handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 469-479). New York: Routledge.

Perkins, H. W., Craig, D. W., & Perkins, J.M. (2011). Using social norms to reduce bullying: A research intervention among adolescents in five middle schools. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 14*(5), 703–722.

Petrosino, A., Guckenburg, S., DeVoe, J., & Hanson, T. (2010). What characteristics of bullying, bullying victims, and schools are associated with increased reporting of bullying to school officials? (Issues &Answers Report, REL 2010–No. 092). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast and Islands. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs

Polanin, J., Espelage, D.L., & Pigott, T.D. (2012). A meta-analysis of school-based bullying prevention programs' effects on bystander intervention behavior and empathy attitude. *School Psychology Review, 41*(1).

Poteat, V. P., & Espelage, D. L. (2005). Exploring the relation between bullying and homophobic verbal content: The Homophobic Content Agent Target (HCAT) Scale. *Violence and Victims, 20*(5), 513-528.

Poteat, V. P., & Espelage, D. L. (2007). Predicting psychosocial consequences of homophobic victimization in middle school students. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 27*(2), 175-191.

Poteat, V. P., & Rivers, I. (2010). The use of homophobic language across bullying roles during adolescence. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 31*(2), 166–172.

Powell, M., & Ladd, L. (2010). Bullying: A review of the literature and implications for family therapists. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 38*(3), 189–206

Reijntjes, A., Kamphuis, J. H., Prinzie P., & Telch, M. J. (2010). Peer victimization and internalizing problems in children: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 34*(4), 244-252.

Resnick, M.D., Bearman, P.S., Blum, R.Wm., Bauman, K.E., Harris, K.M., Jones, J., Tabor, J., Beuhring, T., Sieving, R.E., Shew, M., Ireland, M., Bearinger, L.H., & Udry, J.R. (1997). Protecting Adolescents From HarmFindings From the National Longitudinal Study on Adolescent Health. *JAMA, 278*(10), 823-832. DOI: 10.1001/jama.1997.03550100049038

Rivers, I., & Noret, N. (2008). Well-being among same-sex and opposite-sex-attracted youth at school. *School Psychology Review, 37*(2), 174-187.

Rodkin, P.C., Farmer, T.W., Pearl, R., & Van Acker, R. (2000). Heterogeneity of popular boys: Antisocial and prosocial configurations. *Developmental Psychology, 36*, 14–24.

Rodkin, P. C., Farmer, T. W., Pearl, R., & Van Acker, R. (2006). They're cool: Social status and peer group supports for aggressive boys and girls. *Social Development, 15*(2), 175-204.

Rodkin, P. C., & Berger, C. (2008). Who bullies whom? Social status asymmetries by victim gender. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 32*, 473–485.

Rose, C., Monda-Amaya, L., & Espelage, D. (2011). Bullying perpetration and victimization in special education: A review of the literature. *Remedial and Special Education, 32*(2), 114–130.

Russell, S. T., Sinclair, K. O., Poteat, P. V., & Koenig, B. W. (2012). Adolescent Health and Harassment Based on Discriminatory Bias. *American Journal of Public Health, 102*(3), 493-495.

Salmivalli, C. (2004). Consequences of school bullying and violence. In E. Munthe, E. Solli, E. Ytre-Arne, & E. Roland (Eds.), Taking fear out of schools (pp. 29–35). Stavanger, Norway: University of Stavanger.

Salmivalli, C., Karna, A., & Pskiparta, E. (2010). From peer putdowns to peer support: A theoretical model and how it translated into a national anti-bullying program. In S. Jimerson, S. Swearer, & D. Espelage (Eds.), *The handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 441-454). New York: Routledge.

Salmivalli, C., Voeten, M., & Poskiparta, E. (2011). Bystanders matter: Associations between reinforcing, defending, and the frequency of bullying behavior in classrooms. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 40*(5), 668-676.

Schmidt, M. E., & Bagwell, C. L. (2007). The protective role of friendships in overtly and relationally victimized boys and girls. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 53,* 439–460.

Shariff, S., & Churchill, A. H. (2010). Appreciating complexity: detangling the web of stakeholder influence and responsibility. In S. Shariff & A. H. Churchill (Eds.), *Truths and myths of cyber bullying: International perspectives on stakeholder responsibility and children's safety,* (pp. 1-26). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Skiba, R., Reynolds, C. R., Graham, S., Sheras, P., Conoley, J. C., Garcia-Vasquez, E. (2006). *Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations.* American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force.

Smith, P. K., Madsen, K. C., & Moody, J. C. (1999). What causes the age decline in reports of being bullied at school? Toward a developmental analysis of risks of being bullied. *Educational Research, 41,* 267–285.

Smith, P.K., Talamelli, L., Cowie, H., Naylor, P., & Chauhan, P. (2004). Profiles of Non-Victims, Escaped Victims, Continuing Victims and New Victims of School Bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 74,* 565–581.

Smith, P.K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., & Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying: its nature and impact in secondary school students. *Journal of School Psychology and Psychiatry, 49*(4), 376-385.

Smith, P.K., Smith, C., Osborn, R., & Samara, M. (2008). A content analysis of school anti-bullying policies: progress and limitations. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 24*(1), 1–12

Snell, P.A., & Englander, E.K. (2010). Cyberbullying victimization and behaviors among girls: applying research findings in the field. *Journal of Social Sciences, 6*(4), 510-514.

Spriggs, A.L., Iannotti, R.J., Nansel, T.R., & Haynie, D.L. (2007). Adolescent bullying involvement and perceived family, peer and school relations: Commonalities and differences across race/ethnicity. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41*, 283–293.

Steeves, V. & Webster, C. (2007). Closing the barn door: The effect of parental supervision on Canadian children's online privacy. *Bulletin of Science Technology Society, 28*(4), 4-19.

Stevens, V., Van Oost, P., & De Bourdeaudhuij, I. (2000). The effects of an anti-bullying intervention programme on peers' attitudes and behaviour. *Journal of Adolescence, 23*, 21–34.

Swearer, S., Turner, R., Givens, J., & Pollack, W. (2008). You're so gay! Do different forms of bullying matter for adolescent males?. *School Psychology Review, 37*(2), 160-173.

Swearer, S., Espelage, D. L., Vaillancourt, T., & Hymel, S. (2010). What can be done about school bullying?: Linking research to educational practice. *Educational Researcher, 39*(1), 38-47.

Thornberg, R. (2011) 'She's Weird!' – The Social Construction of Bullying in School: A Review of Qualitative Research. *Children & Society, 25*, 258-267.

Tokunaga, R. S. (2010). Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of literature on cyberbullying victimization. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26*(3), 277–287.

Trach, J., Hymel, S., Waterhouse, T., & Neale, K. (2010). Bystander Reponses to School Bullying: A Cross-Sectional Investigation of Grade and Sex Differences. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 25*(1), 114-130. DOI: 10.1177/0829573509357553

Trolley, B. & Hanel, C. (2010). *Cyber kids, cyber bullying, cyber balance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Ttofi, M.M & Farrington, D.P. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: a systematic and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 7*, 27-56. DOI: 10.1007/s11292-010-9109-1

U.S. Department of Education (2011). Analysis of State Bullying Laws and Policies. Folsom, CA: Stuart-Cassel, V., Bell, A., & Springer, J.F. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/bullying/state-bullying-laws/state-bullying-laws.pdf

Vaillancourt, T., McDougall, P., Hymel, S., Krygsman, A., Miller, J., Stiver, K., & Davis, C. (2008). Bullying: Are researchers and children/youth talking about the same thing? *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 32*(6), 486–495.

Vandebosch, H., & VanCleemput, K. (2009). Cyberbullying among youngsters: Profiles of bullies and victims. *New Media & Society, 11*(8), 1349-1371.

Vreeman, R. C., & Carroll, A. E. (2007). A systematic review of school-based interventions to prevent bullying. *Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine, 161*, 78–88.

Walrave, M., & Heirman, W. (2010). Towards understanding the potential triggering features of technology. In S. Shariff & A. H. Churchill, *Truths and myths of cyber-bullying: International perspectives on stakeholder responsibility and children's safety* (pp. 27-50). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Wang, J., Iannotti, R.J., & Nansel, T.R. (2009). School Bulling Among Adolescents in the United States: Physical, Verbal, Relational, and Cyber. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *45*, 368-375.

Williams, K. R., & Guerra, N. G. (2007). Prevalence and predictors of internet bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *41*, S14–S21.

Xie, H., Cairns, R. B., & Cairns, B. D. (2004). The development of social aggression and physical aggression: A narrative analysis of interpersonal conflicts. *Aggressive Behavior, 28*(5), 341-355.

Ybarra, M. L., Mitchell, K. J., Wolak, J., & Finkelhor, D. (2006). Examining Characteristics and Associated Distress Related to Internet Harassment: Findings From the Second Youth Internet Safety Survey. *Pediatrics, 118*(4), e1169- e1177.

Ybarra, M. L., boyd, d., Korchmaros, J. D., & Oppenheim, J. (2012). Defining and Measuring Cyberbullying Within the Larger Context of Bullying Victimization, *Journal of Adolescent Health, forthcoming*.

Ybarra, M., Mitchell, K., & Espelage, D. Comparisons of bully and unwanted sexual experiences online and offline among a national sample of youth. *Pediatrics/Book, 2, 2012*. Retrieved from http://cdn.intechopen.com/pdfs/30834/InTech-Comparisons_of_bully_and_unwanted_sexual_experiences_online_and_offline_among_a_national_sample_of_youth.pdf

You, S., Furlong, M. J., Felix, E., Sharkey, J. D., Tanigawa, D., & Green, J. G. (2008). Relations among school connectedness, hope, life satisfaction, and bully victimization. *Psychology in the Schools, 45*(5), 446-460.