



Guidance for Schools Selecting Antibullying Approaches: Translating Evidence-Based Strategies to Contemporary Implementation Realities

Nadia S. Ansary¹, Maurice J. Elias², Michael B. Greene³, and Stuart Green⁴

This article synthesizes the current research on bullying prevention and intervention in order to provide guidance to schools seeking to select and implement antibullying strategies. Evidence-based best practices that are shared across generally effective antibullying approaches are elucidated, and these strategies are grounded in examples garnered from model antibullying programs as implemented in contemporary schools. Future directions for practice, research, and policy are also explicated.

Keywords: bullying prevention; educational policy; educational reform; evidence-based best practices; evaluation; harassment, intimidation, and bullying (HIB); psychology; research methodology

Bullying in schools has been recognized as a pervasive problem and an emerging public health issue requiring intervention. Published evaluations of antibullying programs suggest that these have a modest to moderate effect in reducing bullying perpetration and victimization (Craig, Pepler, Murphy, & McCuaig-Edge, 2010; Merrell, Gueldner, Ross, & Isava, 2008; Pepler, Smith, & Rigby, 2004; J. Smith, Schneider, Smith, & Ananiadou, 2004). Specifically, to date, the most comprehensive meta-analysis of these programs conducted by Ttofi and Farrington (2011) found that on average, these programs reduced bullying perpetration by 20% to 23% and reported reductions in victimization by 17% to 20%. Such modest program outcomes are consistent with the translational science literature, which highlights the difficulty in exporting prevention programs from the research setting to the realities of implementation in contemporary schools. As identified by Astor, Guerra, and Van Acker (2010), some of the underlying reasons for such modest program effectiveness include but are not limited to (a) obstacles in program implementation (e.g., fidelity, adequate fit of the program to the school's needs, "buy-in" from principals and teachers) and (b) challenges in the scientific assessment of program effectiveness (e.g., variations in definitions of what constitutes bullying and in the kinds of instruments used to assess bullying behavior, failure to conduct process evaluations in order to document what program elements were implemented and how).

In light of these factors, how do schools make empirically grounded decisions about selecting antibullying program strategies that are reasonably effective and fit the unique needs and values of the school? More importantly, since there are myriad antibullying approaches to choose from, what *specific* aspects of program content should schools look for in choosing a program? Given that the research evidence establishing the efficacy of antibullying programs continues to evolve, and that new antibullying approaches will emerge, schools need a strategy to address program formulation and selection. Recognizing these challenges, we seek to utilize the most current evidence to provide practical guidance to schools seeking to implement antibullying approaches.

Impetus for This Work

Our work together on this issue began as a report requested of the authors, as well as other experts, by the New Jersey Commission on Bullying in Schools. This report, which delineated recommendations for ways to effectively address bullying in schools, laid the groundwork for New Jersey's Anti-Bullying

¹Rider University, Lawrenceville, NJ

²Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ

³Greene Consulting, Montclair, NJ

⁴New Jersey Coalition for Bullying Awareness and Prevention and Overlook Medical Center, Summit, NJ

Bill of Rights. Passed in 2011, this law has been identified by many as the toughest antibullying legislation in the United States (Perez-Pena, 2011). Other states have created mandates for antibullying programming via law and/or education department statute, thereby creating an imperative for schools that goes well beyond New Jersey's concerns (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 2014a).

The New Jersey report highlights the need to identify core concepts that are present in antibullying programs that have demonstrated some degree of efficacy. As Boxer and Goldstein (2012) assert, we recognize that there are best-practice approaches that have common elements among them that have been shown to produce positive effects. Accordingly, the tenets detailed in that report—intended to assist schools with antibullying program selection—provided the basis for what is presented here. Furthermore, to illustrate how these core concepts can be brought to life, we have selected four model antibullying programs that have been subjected to systematic study and have shown, relative to others, some evidence of demonstrable effectiveness.

Translating Research Into Practice

The equivocal evidence on antibullying program effectiveness suggests that selection and implementation of evidence-based school violence and bullying prevention and intervention programs in schools has been problematic. One potential reason is that programs often are selected and implemented without consideration for the history, context, and unique needs of the school, relative to the context in which the program has proven relatively successful (Astor, Meyer, Benbenishty, Marachi, & Rosemond, 2005). This not only includes the relevance of the program content to the unique characteristics of the school but also concerns the level of staff and administrative support for program implementation as well as the strength and stability of the school environment (Astor et al., 2010). Furthermore, the programs that are empirically evaluated in the literature often use samples consisting of schools that are generally interested in the program, have sufficient funding for implementation, and are closely monitored by researchers (Astor et al., 2010). Surely, these factors do not approximate those in most contemporary educational settings. Nonetheless, schools must evaluate the existing programs that are available and choose which approach best suits their specific needs.

Toward assisting in that endeavor, we have parsed the programmatic elements characteristic of generally successful antibullying programs into two overarching categories of (a) bullying prevention and (b) addressing bullying once it has occurred. The core tenets concerning best practices associated with effective bullying prevention programs are further subdivided into four main areas: (a) *holistic theoretical approach* (e.g., adopting an ecological perspective, whole-school approach, and the creation of a positive school climate); (b) *program content*, which concerns the specific program foci, such as a concentration on social-emotional and character development (SECD), promoting “upstander” behavior (i.e., bystanders who behave in ways to stop the bullying), and developmental appropriateness; (c) *leadership and team management*, including school administrators and teacher/staff training; and (d) *program assessment* (e.g.,

systematic evaluation and reevaluation, coordination of antibullying efforts and sustainability).

The section following these universal prevention strategies—which we have termed “selected/indicated approaches”—addresses bullying once it has occurred. We use this terminology for two reasons: (a) to show that the target audience is those at risk for or who have already engaged in bullying, and though these may be considered distinct groups, the literature has not yet articulated how strategies may be unique for each; and (b) while bullying may have already occurred, the aim is to prevent recurrence of bullying incidents as well as related negative outcomes. Within this section, we highlight three areas, including (a) teacher and staff training to address bullying incidents, (b) school antibullying policies, and (c) the necessity for a team of professionals within each school whose responsibility is to address all aspects of bullying—we will refer to this group of individuals as the Harassment-Intimidation-Bullying Action Team (HIBAT). As noted earlier, to exemplify these core tenets, we highlight four examples of antibullying programs that have programmatically addressed these best-practice elements.

Antibullying Program Exemplars

Program selection. Selection of the four exemplar programs is based on the two most rigorously conducted antibullying program evaluations in the literature to date: a review of 48 antibullying programs conducted by Craig and colleagues (2010) and a meta-analysis conducted on 44 program evaluations published by Ttofi and Farrington (2011). The former assigned each program a scientific merit score based on the effectiveness in reducing bullying as well as the scientific rigor of the program. The latter examined program effectiveness in terms of effect sizes of two separate outcomes: reductions in bullying and decreases in victimization.

The top 10 ranked programs from Craig and colleagues (2010) were compared to the findings of Ttofi and Farrington (2011). Of these, only programs that were represented in both evaluations were retained. Then, these remaining programs were compared on their impact on bullying and victimization outcomes as assessed by Ttofi and Farrington. Programs scoring lower than the “neutral” to “desirable” range on either outcome examined in that study were eliminated. Four programs remained. These programs are described below and are used as exemplars of programs that embody the core tenets and practices used within most effective antibullying prevention and intervention approaches. In saying that they are exemplars, we are not saying they are exemplary. They serve as examples of how key tenets are incorporated into programs coherently and in ways that schools can pragmatically emulate or adapt. Table 1 presents these programs as well as the presence of each of the tenets in the program design.

It is important to emphasize at the outset that our discussion of these four programs does not reflect our unconditional endorsement of them. We are keenly aware of the limitations and mixed evidence associated with each. Furthermore, though we use the terms *effective* and *successful* to characterize these, we recognize that this is done in a relative sense: Compared to existing programs in the literature, the four we discuss here are among

Table 1
Antibullying Program Evaluation Outcomes and Presence of the Core Tenets in
the Four Model Antibullying Programs

Variable	Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (Norway)	The Seville Study (SAVE Model; Spain)	DFE Sheffield Anti Bullying Project (United Kingdom)	KiVa (Finland)
Study				
Craig, Pepler, Murphy, & McCuaig-Edge (2010) scientific merit score ^a	13	13	12	10
Ttofi & Farrington (2011) effect size for bullying reduction ^b	<i>Neutral-desirable</i> range	<i>Neutral-desirable</i> range	<i>Neutral-desirable</i> range	<i>Neutral-desirable</i> range
Ttofi & Farrington (2011) effect size for victimization reduction ^b	<i>Neutral-desirable</i> range	<i>Desirable</i> range	<i>Neutral-desirable</i> range	<i>Neutral-desirable</i> range
Core tenets of universal bullying prevention approaches				
Theoretical foundation	X	X	X	X
Whole-school approach	X	X	X	X
Positive school climate	X	X	X	X
Leadership involvement	X	I	X	X
Teacher and staff training on prevention of bullying	X	X	X	X
Emphasis on SECD	I	X	X	X
Promote “upstanders”	X	X	X	X
Systematic evaluation	X	X	X	X
Developmentally appropriate	I	I	X	X
Coordination of antibullying efforts	X			X
Sustainability	X	I	X	X
Core tenets of selected/indicated bullying prevention approaches				
Effective management of bullying incidents	X	X	X	X
Teacher and staff training on managing bullying	X	X	X	X
School antibullying policy	X	X	X	X
HIBAT	X			X

Note. X indicates the presence of the core tenet in strategies employed by the program. I indicates that the core tenet is implicitly used in the program though publications do not explicitly state so. SECD = social-emotional and character development; HIBAT = Harassment-Intimidation-Bullying Action Team.

^aThe scientific merit score reported by Craig et al. (2010) had a range of 0 to 17 (the top-ranked program score was 17 and the second-ranked program score was 13). This score encompassed the degree of scientific rigor with which the program was evaluated and demonstrated effects. Only programs scoring in the top 10 were selected to be compared on effect sizes of bullying and victimization reduction reported by Ttofi and Farrington (2011).

^bIndividual effect sizes reported by Ttofi and Farrington (2011) are not reported here since they review multiple studies assessing the same program and therefore only ranges are indicated. Ttofi and Farrington map these effect sizes across four levels ranging from *undesirable* to *desirable*.

the most effective antibullying approaches documented in the literature.

Four Program Examples

Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP; Olweus & Limber, 2010). OBPP was created by Dan Olweus in the mid-1980s in Norway (Olweus & Limber, 2010). Briefly, the program employs strategies at the universal and selected/indicated levels in the prevention of bullying by addressing the whole-school, classroom, individual, and community levels (Limber, 2012). To illustrate, a strategy addressing universal prevention is OBPP’s requirement of schools to introduce—on a schoolwide basis—antibullying rules. Additionally, rules related to bullying are also displayed at the classroom level (Olweus & Limber, 2010). With regard to an example of strategies at the selected/indicated level, the OBPP outlines a clear protocol for educators to follow once

bullying occurs. This entails a separate meeting with each of the students involved in the bullying incident, a conference with parents of involved students, and creation of an individual intervention plan (as needed) for youth who engaged in the incident (Olweus & Limber, 2010).

Though the program has demonstrated effectiveness in its widespread implementation in Norway, the evidence of its effectiveness in the United States is limited at best, in large part due to challenges in program implementation. Nevertheless, as Ttofi and Farrington (2011) assert, many programs built on the seminal work of Dan Olweus have been found to be among the most effective antibullying approaches. A detailed description of the OBPP program as well as a review of the mixed evidence regarding program effectiveness can be found in Limber (2012).

The Seville Anti-Bullying in School Project (SAVE model; Ortega, Del-Rey, & Mora-Mercan, 2004). The SAVE project adopts a

whole-school approach with a strong theoretical foundation in an ecological perspective that emphasizes interactions between the microsystems encompassing students, teachers, and families (Ortega & Lera, 2000). Moreover, this program stresses the importance of SECD and attempts to foster this through curricular changes as well as cooperative group work. The program relies heavily on teacher training and requires that teachers develop their own antibullying materials on a yearly basis (Ortega et al., 2004). Though not explicitly stated in the publications by Ortega and colleagues (2004; Ortega & Lera, 2000), two conclusions may be implicitly drawn due to the requirement of this time-consuming task: (a) Leadership support is necessary to provide teachers with the time and resources necessary to prepare their antibullying materials, and (b) since materials are created or refined on a yearly basis, the work is more likely to be developmentally appropriate. Specific program strategies and evidence of effectiveness can be found in Ortega and Lera (2000) and Ortega et al. (2004).

The DFE Sheffield Anti-Bullying Project (Eslea & Smith, 1998). The DFE Sheffield project is generally based on the OBPP but differs from that program in the following ways: (a) It provides the ability for schools to tailor the program to meet their specific needs, (b) emphasizes peer support, and (c) endorses use of the Pikas (2002) method, in which students meet in groups to share concerns and suggest solutions regarding bullying situations (P. Smith & Ananiadou, 2003). The Sheffield project underwent implementation in 23 schools in Sheffield, England, from 1991 to 1993 (P. Smith & Ananiadou, 2003). The theoretical foundation of the program is an emphasis on the whole school, and like the others, this program recognizes the salience of students, staff, families, and the community in addressing bullying. Staff training, a school curriculum that explicitly addresses bullying, and an emphasis on social-emotional learning are all strategies this program employs to reduce bullying. The evidence regarding program effectiveness is generally positive, although some results (particularly in schools with poor implementation fidelity) suggest that certain schools found slight increases in bullying behaviors (Eslea & Smith, 1998). This program has led to the “Bullying: Don’t Suffer in Silence” pack created by Peter Smith available for free at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20050302035856/dfes.gov.uk/bullying/>.

The KiVa Antibullying Program (Salmivalli, Poskiparta, Ahtola, & Haataja, 2013). Three fundamental principles form the backbone of this program (Kärnä et al., 2013): (a) a participant-role approach in which the focus is on the peer network in contrast to an exclusive focus on the dyadic relationship between the student who bullies and the student who is targeted, (b) recognition of the network of social status and power within a school or classroom, and (c) an ecological approach encompassing the various contexts in the child’s life. As Kärnä and colleagues (2013) note, KiVa incorporates both universal prevention approaches (e.g., through curriculum, a focus on increasing empathy and defending behaviors, etc.) as well as selected/indicated levels of prevention (e.g., separate meetings for the target and each child involved in the bullying incident, etc.). The KiVa program has

undergone widespread implementation, with 90% of Finnish schools participating as of 2011 (Salmivalli et al., 2013). Randomized controlled trials as well as the broad rollout revealed significant reductions in bullying (20% and 15%, respectively). Furthermore, the findings of Salmivalli and colleagues (2013) suggest a strong dosage–response relationship, indicating greater effects for schools implementing program strategies more faithfully. Stronger effects have also been documented for younger than for older children involved in the program (see P. Smith, Salmivalli, & Cowie, 2012).

Core Tenets of Universal Bullying Prevention Approaches

As noted earlier, the mixed empirical findings regarding each of these programs suggest that each requires adjustments and adaptations to the specific contexts in which it is being implemented. Astor and colleagues (2005) aptly note, “Research paradigms require that all program components be implemented in the same way at each site, but practice paradigms insist that a ‘one size fits all’ approach does not address the specific needs of each school” (p. 17). Nonetheless, much can be learned from the implementation of the four exemplar programs, combined with the wider research literature.

To guide schools in making a wise selection of an approach or approaches around which to base their antibullying efforts, we elaborate below 10 core tenets—nested within four broad categories—that represent the active ingredients that appear to account for reductions in bullying and victimization. Because receptivity to bullying prevention efforts within a school cannot be disconnected from how that school responds to bullying when it occurs, we subsequently present a related set of guidelines for use when schools need to respond to bullying that has taken place.

Holistic Theoretical Approach

A core feature of relatively efficacious bullying prevention and intervention programs is the centrality of a guiding theoretical framework that recognizes both in- and out-of-school contexts. This necessarily means that effective antibullying approaches must (a) address the various contexts in which students move in and out of on a daily basis (e.g., family, community, etc.), (b) adopt a whole-school approach in which antibullying messages are presented in multiple ways (e.g., curriculum, policies, etc.) and in a coordinated fashion with other existing programs, and (c) foster a positive school climate in which the values, norms, and practices of the school reflect an ethos of caring and respect for one another and for the school community. These three points provide the theoretical foundation upon which program content must build.

Ecological perspective as a theoretical foundation. Integration of school, family, and community has been shown to be a critical element of generally effective antibullying programs (Craig et al., 2010; Rigby, 2008; Rigby, Smith, & Pepler, 2004). While the bioecological model of human development (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006) emphasizes the transactional nature of gene–environment interactions that shape an individual’s development, it also

provides a useful paradigm that can be used to lay the theoretical foundation of effective antibullying programs. Card and Hodges (2008) note that beyond microsystemic-level influences of school, family, and peers, the mesosystem (e.g., school-home-community partnerships that support bullying prevention) and exosystem (e.g., school location and neighborhood) are also ecological structures that matter. Furthermore, macrosystemic-level factors, such as cultural influences (e.g., discrimination against minority groups) as well as antibullying policies and laws, must also be considered. Some examples of how KiVa does this are the following: (a) The peer group is targeted intensively through student lessons as well as Internet games solidifying the antibullying concepts learned, (b) parents are provided guides documenting the definition of bullying and strategies to prevent bullying and intervene when it happens (Kärnä et al., 2013), and (c) school staff supervising recess wear vests that are intended to remind the school community of the antibullying program (Salmivalli et al., 2013).

Emphasis on a whole school approach. A whole-school approach recognizes the salience of these dynamic contexts and is at the foundation of any effective antibullying approach (Jones, Doces, Swearer, & Collier, 2012). From this perspective, students and staff must be provided with basic information on the nature and dynamics of bullying as well as ways to effectively respond when they see or experience bullying (J. Smith et al., 2004). Whole-school approaches do so by (a) infusing this information in schools' curricula, (b) adopting transparent and consistent policies with regard to antibullying practices, and (c) including coordinated universal, selected, and indicated approaches. A few examples from OBPP demonstrate how this program implements a whole-school approach. According to Olweus and Limber (2010), OBPP conducts a schoolwide "kickoff" event in conjunction with a formal introduction to school rules. Other examples from OBPP include staff training and regular discussion meetings, in addition to an evaluation and improvement of the school's leadership structure (Olweus & Limber, 2010). Effective bullying prevention efforts need to focus on positive changes—safer, more supportive, engaging, and flourishing schools—not just problems. And it is to this topic that we now turn.

Positive school climate. A school is said to have a positive school climate when its norms, values, and expectations are such that all individuals feel safe, feel respected, and are active members of the school community (Cohen & Elias, 2011; National School Climate Council, 2007). Furthermore, a positive school climate emphasizes dignity and respect for all and implements curricula and courses that promote the acceptance of diversity. A focus on inclusiveness and diversity addresses the underlying dynamics involved in the targeting of vulnerable populations within the school.

Promotion of a positive school climate is an essential component of the bullying prevention guidelines issued independently by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2014b) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2011). A positive school climate has been associated with myriad positive outcomes (Cohen, 2013; Deal & Peterson, 2009; Thapa, Cohen, Guffey, & Higgins-D'Alessandro, 2013), such as lowered aggression and violence (Goldstein, Young, & Boyd, 2008) and, more

specifically, reductions in bullying (Birkett, Espelage, & Koenig, 2009). The SAVE model provides an example of how a positive school climate can shape the antibullying message. According to Ortega and colleagues (2004), the SAVE model views the school as a community. This is founded on the Spanish term *convivencia*, which espouses a "spirit of solidarity, fraternity, co-operation, harmony, a desire for mutual understanding, the desire to get on well with others, and the resolution of conflict through dialogue or other non-violent means" (Ortega et al., 2004, p. 169).

Program Content

Antibullying approaches layer onto this holistic theoretical framework, program content that addresses the prevention and intervention of bullying in a comprehensive manner. The most effective programs have done so by addressing three salient areas: (a) SECD, (b) the role of bystanders in initiating and perpetuating bullying, and (c) developmental trends associated with prevalence rates of bullying as well as strategies that increase in sophistication as youth mature. These three areas will be elucidated further, and examples are drawn from the four programs to illustrate program content that has been implemented in the real world.

Prominence of SECD. Building children's SECD and the skills needed to successfully defuse interpersonal conflicts is critical. SECD programs have been associated with enhanced prosocial behaviors, social-moral cognition, problem-solving skills, conflict resolution, and reduced aggression (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2010). Too few schools systematically promote these competencies in students, and structured SECD curriculum programs are often the most effective way to systematically deliver skill development to all students with consistency over time (Elias & Arnold, 2006). An emphasis on SECD is an integral element of antibullying programs that have relatively robust documentation of effectiveness (Craig et al., 2010; Jones et al., 2012) and especially so for the four programs highlighted. For example, the SAVE project provides schools with a "tool bag" of ideas for developing an awareness of emotions, values, and mutual respect that are fostered through student participation in cooperative group work (Ortega & Lera, 2000).

Promoting upstander behavior. As noted earlier, we use the term *upstander* to denote bystanders who behave in ways to reduce or end bullying behavior. Focusing on and supporting upstanders has been shown to be an effective means of preventing bullying, and this is largely due to the critical role of peers in initiating and sustaining bullying behaviors (Salmivalli, 2010). In the vast majority of instances of bullying, bystanders are present (Rigby & Johnson, 2006). Emerging evidence suggests that effective antibullying approaches must look beyond the individual bystander and address the larger peer-group norms that passively or actively endorse bullying behaviors (Espelage, Green, & Polanin, 2012; Salmivalli, Kärnä, & Poskiparta, 2011). In a similar vein, a positive school climate necessarily translates to a commitment to an "ethos of caring" that shapes all relationships in the school community. Thus, students and teachers should be

“upstanding” for the positive values of the school and prepared to act on instances of injustice once observed. Furthermore, schools must stipulate explicit expectations for “upstanding” behavior as part of any code the school adopts—to make it normalized and not exceptional, including a norm to report bullying to a responsible adult within the school, clearly distinguishing such telling from “snitching.” KiVa utilizes myriad strategies to empower bystanders to intervene. For instance, in terms of universal prevention strategies, the program uses virtual computer games depicting various scenarios involving bullying for students to effectively navigate and learn from (Salmivalli et al., 2013).

Developmentally appropriate. Generally successful intervention approaches acknowledge that antibullying efforts need to be sustained throughout the school years and shift to accommodate the development that occurs as children move onto higher grade levels (Craig et al., 2010). A continuous approach across the K–12 years is essential for several reasons, among them that (a) there is no empirical evidence to suggest that any program implemented in one grade inoculates a child from bullying perpetration or victimization in later grades and (b) children moving into new districts inevitably bring with them norms relevant to bullying from their previous schools.

A developmentally appropriate intervention must be tailored to the targeted age group with specific attention paid to the social, emotional, cognitive, and motivational capacities at each phase of development (Boxer, Terranova, Savoy, & Goldstein, 2008; Pepler et al., 2004). KiVa provides an elegant example of a prevention strategy that adapts to address bullying in a more sophisticated manner as youth transition from primary to secondary school (Kärnä et al., 2013). For example, in elementary school, children participating in the KiVa program play computer games that test their acquired knowledge about bullying. In secondary school, the game evolves in sophistication by allowing youth to enter a virtual community—“KiVa Street”—in which they can access new information about bullying (e.g., youth may enter a virtual theater to view a movie about bullying or go to a library to read about it). Such program designs continuously capture the interest of youth participating in the program year after year, and the information presented to participants capitalizes on the developmental strides made in the social, cognitive, and moral realms as youth transition from late childhood to adolescence.

In terms of the elementary school years, schools should capitalize on the fact that evidence suggests that (a) younger children are more likely to cooperate with adult authority (Craig et al., 2010; Rigby, 2008), (b) young children tend to be more empathic toward victimized peers (Espelage et al., 2012), and (c) elementary school organization is conducive to addressing bullying, since teachers spend more time with the same students than during secondary school (Rigby, 2008). Moreover, greater reductions in bullying have been documented for younger children—prior to age 8 or 9—involved in antibullying programs compared to their older counterparts (Pepler et al., 2004; Rigby, 2008).

On the other hand, Ttofi and Farrington (2011) assert that superior intervention success can be attained when working with slightly older youth (age 11 or older). This may be due to (a) more mature cognitive abilities, (b) advanced capacity for social-emotional learning (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009), and (c) an enhanced

awareness of peer status position (Salmivalli, 2010). However, barriers to working with this age group include their tendency to reject adult authority (Craig et al., 2010) as well as the organization of secondary schools (e.g., increasing student autonomy and decreasing connection with teachers). These are likely reasons for the increased levels of bullying seen as youth transition from elementary through middle school (Nansel et al., 2001).

P. Smith et al. (2012) disagree with the conclusions of Ttofi and Farrington (2011) and cite evidence that stronger program effects for KiVa as well as OBPP have been demonstrated for younger compared to older children. Similar findings suggesting greater reductions in bullying behavior among younger students have also been found for the Sheffield project (P. Smith & Ananiadou, 2003). In spite of these discrepant views, one conclusion is clear: Bullying prevention is a systemic matter that is not solved by programs in the absence of continuity across all grade levels.

Leadership and Team Management

Effective antibullying programs require school leadership to communicate and actively support modeling the expected behaviors as well as to maintain a nurturing school climate where safety is paramount and all members are engaged in the school community. While leadership by principals (Cohen, 2013; Pepler et al., 2004) and teachers (Craig et al., 2010) is central to initiating and sustaining antibullying efforts, a positive school climate requires all school staff, contract workers, and volunteers to model civility and kindness. Additionally, the school principal and school board should create and empower a leadership team that focuses on all aspects of school safety, including bullying, and school climate (Cohen & Elias, 2011). In their evaluation of the Sheffield project involving 23 schools, P. Smith and Ananiadou (2003) note that schools that had support from the school’s leadership and that also had at least one senior staff member coordinate the school’s antibullying efforts were the most effective.

Antibullying programs rely heavily on the implementation of strategies by teachers, and thus teacher training is crucial (Craig et al., 2010). An example of how an effective program coordinates and conducts such training can be found in the OBPP. According to Limber (2012), the OBPP requires concentrated training for the Bullying Prevention Coordinating Committee (BPCC), which consists of a team of school community members who are then responsible for implementing the program accurately as well as ensuring that all faculty and staff have appropriate training for their roles in the program. To ensure maximal program fidelity, this team also meets on a monthly basis with the OBPP trainer for ongoing training and support.

Program Effectiveness

Empirical evaluation of program effectiveness is a necessary step at all phases of program implementation in order to establish the successes and shortcomings of an antibullying approach. This necessarily entails (a) a needs assessment and continuous evaluation of changes in bullying activities over time and (b) the coordination of antibullying strategies, not only at the prevention and intervention levels but also when considering other school

programs not necessarily related to bullying. Also critical is the sustainability of the antibullying program. Can schools maintain the faculty and staff effort and expend the resources necessary for faithful implementation of the program over time? This section considers these areas and provides illustrative examples from the four exemplar programs.

Systematic assessment and reevaluation. Positive school climate is a continuous work in progress and requires leadership and teacher dedication toward systematic evaluation of the school's alignment with the shared school vision (Cohen & Elias, 2011; National School Climate Council, 2012). Instances of bullying are a direct reflection of a less-than-ideal school climate and should be considered as triggers for school climate reevaluation. Such assessments reveal current strengths and needs, and pave the way for schoolwide action plans designed to foster safer, more supportive, and engaging schools (American Educational Research Association, 2013; Cohen & Elias, 2011; National School Climate Council, 2012). Furthermore, the evaluation must take into account multiple informants (e.g., students, teachers, disciplinary records) and multiple methods (e.g., interviews, surveys, observation) to fully assess the range of effectiveness of the program (Boxer, Musher-Eizenman, Dubow, Heretick, & Danner, 2006). To illustrate, the SAVE project has incorporated quantitative pretest/posttest evaluations from student and teacher respondents as well as additional qualitative data from teachers and parents (Ortega & Lera, 2000).

Coordination of antibullying efforts and sustainability. Integration of various programs in a school—from universal to indicated approaches—has been shown to be most effective (Dwyer & Osher, 2000), while failure to coordinate intervention programs within a school has been shown to elicit iatrogenic effects (Dimitrovich & Greenberg, 2000). Antibullying approaches must not be considered separate from other initiatives undertaken by a school but, rather, should be selected so that they reflect the school's core values and reciprocally reinforce other programs that promote adaptive youth development. As noted earlier, commitment by all stakeholders, particularly, leadership, is necessary to ensure sustainability. In terms of coordination of antibullying efforts, publications pertaining to KiVa present comprehensive, concrete, and empirically supported tools for addressing antibullying efforts at all prevention levels (see Kärnä et al., 2013). With regard to sustainability and intensity, OBPP (Olweus & Limber, 2010), the Sheffield project (P. Smith & Ananiadou, 2003), and KiVa (Salmivalli et al., 2013), all demonstrate a dosage–response relationship such that longer and more intense implementations documented the greatest effect. Eslea and Smith (1998) succinctly summed up this dosage–response association when describing successful schools involved in the Sheffield project: “In general, those who did the most, achieved the most” (p. 206).

Core Tenets of Selected/Indicated Bullying Prevention Approaches

Necessarily, schools evaluating potential antibullying approaches must examine the extent to which prospective approaches programmatically outline steps to be taken when bullying happens.

When prevention efforts fail, schools must have transparent, firm, and consistent policies in place to effectively investigate reported incidents of bullying, begin to rebuild the target's confidence that school is a safe place, ensure that bullying is not seen as normative, and communicate to the rest of the school that bullying is not to be tolerated or “stood by.” What follows are specific recommendations for effectively intervening when bullying occurs, with the following caveat: When intervention strategies are implemented in the absence of a systemic bullying prevention program, or are adopted in the absence of efforts to create a positive school climate, they are likely to have greatly diminished effectiveness.

Teacher and Staff Training to Address Bullying Incidents

Not surprisingly, findings suggest that when teachers and staff are aware of their schools' policies and are trained in how to effectively identify as well as address bullying incidents, victimization rates are substantially lower (Jones et al., 2012). Moreover, the evidence suggests between-classroom differences when considering rates of bullying as well as bystander behaviors (Salmivalli, 2010), suggesting the critical role that teachers may play. In an example from KiVa, Kärnä et al. (2013) outline six concrete steps for teachers to follow in which teachers are expected to conduct separate meetings with the target, alleged bully, and, discreetly, a number of prosocial peers to encourage them to support the target (Kärnä et al., 2013).

Given the critical role that teachers play in any school's antibullying efforts, schools must be committed to investing in helping teachers understand how to respond to incidents of bullying when they occur. Most efficient would be improved preservice training for emerging teachers since preparation for addressing bullying is currently lacking in college-level preparation of the majority of educators (Cross et al., 2011; Nicolaidis, Toda, & Smith, 2002).

School Bullying-Related Policies

A school's policies and response procedures to bullying—including nonphysical forms of bullying, such as verbal harassment, and indirect forms of bullying, such as ostracizing—is a direct expression of the school's climate, culture, and values. These in turn govern investigatory and disciplinary procedures. In this vein, what follows are some specific guidelines for program content addressing bullying when it occurs.

First, generally effective bullying-related policies include explicit guidance on reporting and investigating instances of possible bullying, disciplinary procedures, and when the police should be called (Jones et al., 2012). Clear bullying-related policies have been documented in all four exemplar programs. Second, it is important that children who bully receive clear consequences for their behavior that have been specified in advance. Graduated sanctions that are clear and reasonably escalate with the severity of the bullying behaviors have been shown to be most effective (Greene, 2005). The consequence should be accompanied by encouragement for reflective activity (e.g., dialogue with staff about the behavior). The method of shared

concern (Pikas, 2002), which avoids shaming or blaming the child who bullies while still emphasizing the child's responsibility to change his or her behavior, is an example of such an approach that has been shown to be mostly effective (Rigby, 2005). The Pikas method was used in the Sheffield project, and the authors suggest it yielded positive results (P. Smith & Ananiadou, 2003). In contrast, punitive approaches that serve to humiliate the child who bullied often impose punishments that are unrelated to the bullying behavior and also lack an emphasis on self-reflection. There is no evidence that zero-tolerance approaches are effective (American Psychological Association, 2006).

HIBAT

We advocate for the development of a core group of individuals derived from the school community, which we call a HIBAT (O'Neil, Kellner, Green, & Elias, 2012). Team members generally consist of administrators, pupil services personnel (such as school counselors), instructional staff, and child study staff, to be called in as needed. HIBATs should strive for continuity and to build up their expertise by operating as professional learning communities and socializing new members (even if short-term replacements) with similar expectations.

As noted earlier, the BPCC, which consists of eight to 15 members from the school community, is an example of such a team that is used in the design of the OBPP model (Limber, 2012). As is done in that program, the HIBAT should be responsible for the following: (a) coordinating resources and services to address needs (e.g., clinical or educational, etc.) of the bullied child and the bullying child, (b) ensuring that an incident report has been made in compliance with the district's and state's reporting systems, (c) incorporating a tracking system to document the types and underlying reasons for the bullying, (d) discussing the nature and frequency of occurrences (including the types of bullying, perceived reasons for the bullying, and an examination of how the incident may reflect more systemic school climate problems), and (e) considering the occurrences in light of professional development requirements and any changes that may be needed.

Future Directions for Research and Policy

Indeed, the conditions in contemporary educational settings make it challenging for schools to select and implement effective antibullying approaches. Schools, the children they serve, and policymakers cannot wait for the ultimate studies to be rigorously conducted, reviewed, and published. Until then, we must rely on the evolving quality of the evidence and the certainty that existing programs will be refined and new approaches developed. To better illuminate future paths that schools can take toward effective program selection and implementation, we highlight areas in the field in need of rigorous attention at both the scholarly and policy levels.

One issue confusing to educators and practitioners is the mismatch in operational definitions of bullying used by scholars and policymakers (e.g., state legislators and governors). Legal definitions can be broader in some respects and narrower in others

than the accepted scholarly definition of bullying. The latter tends to follow Olweus's (1999) definition (i.e., an intent to harm, power imbalance, and repetition of the bullying behavior). Furthermore, educators find it can be difficult to appraise intention to harm on the part of the child accused of bullying. Some states have adopted a "reasonable person" standard to assess likely harm caused by the behavior in question, which is a promising alternative to a focus on intent. Given increased public demand, as well as legal and policy trends requiring improved responsibility of schools to stem bullying, greater consensus in the definition of bullying across these domains will be an important step forward. Relatedly, limitations in existing measures of bullying thwart a comprehensive understanding of prevalence rates, correlates of bullying, and evaluations of program effectiveness. Refinement of existing measures of bullying with empirical validation of these measures is essential in moving forward in the field (Hamburger, Basile, & Vivolo, 2011). Particularly needed are feasible measures that schools can and would use. Also missing from policy discussions are findings from continued rigorous evaluations (including experimental and quasiexperimental designs) of antibullying programs with large nationally representative samples.

In terms of policy, although the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2014b) has issued federal guidelines to assist schools with selecting antibullying programs, these require expansion in order to match the realistic conditions in most schools. Challenges due to ineffective or unmotivated leadership, poor school climate, and cross-cultural differences—just to name a few—compromise successful implementation (Cohen, 2013). Distilled down to its most basic level, additional guidance and support for *effective implementation* (e.g., funding to pay for consultants, resources, and training) is vital, and this can be achieved only through policy reform that includes longer funding time-lines to ensure establishing a viable program support infrastructure (Moceri, Elias, Fishman, Pandina, & Reyes-Portillo, 2012). Furthermore, policy must also be revised in order to put in place a more effective mechanism by which schools are monitored for compliance with state and national antibullying standards.

The evident imperfections in policy and our scholarly understanding of bullying prevention and intervention should in no way be viewed as permission for schools to shirk their fundamental responsibility to safeguard its students. Schools must be accountable *now* for preventing bullying in comprehensive, sustained, and schoolwide ways to ensure the safety and dignity of our children. And the first step in the path toward doing so is the informed choice that schools must make in selecting the most effective antibullying program tailored to match their unique needs and values.

REFERENCES

- American Educational Research Association. (2013). *Prevention of bullying in schools, colleges, and universities: Research report and recommendations*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychological Association. (2006). *Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations. A report by the American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force*. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/pubs/info/reports/zero-tolerance-report.pdf>

- Astor, R. A., Guerra, N., & Van Acker, R. (2010). How can we improve school safety research? *Educational Research*, *39*, 69–78. doi:10.3102/0013189X09357619
- Astor, R. A., Meyer, H. A., Benbenishty, R., Marachi, R., & Rosemond, R. (2005). School safety interventions: Best practices and programs. *Children and Schools*, *27*, 17–32.
- Birkett, M., Espelage, D. L., & Koenig, B. (2009). LGB and Questioning students in schools: The moderating effects of homophobic bullying and school climate on negative outcomes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *38*, 989–1000. doi:10.1007/s10964-008-9389-1
- Boxer, P., & Goldstein, S. E. (2012). Treating juvenile offenders: Best practices and emerging critical issues. In E. Grigorenko (Ed.), *Handbook of juvenile forensic psychology and psychiatry* (pp. 323–340). New York, NY: Springer.
- Boxer, P., Musher-Eizenman, D. R., Dubow, E. F., Heretick, D. M. L., & Danner, S. A. (2006). Assessing teachers' perceptions for school-based aggression prevention programs: Applying a cognitive-ecological framework. *Psychology in the Schools*, *43*, 331–344.
- Boxer, P., Terranova, A. M., Savoy, S. C., & Goldstein, S. E. (2008). Developmental issues in the prevention of aggression and violence in school. In T. Miller (Ed.), *School violence and primary prevention* (pp. 277–294). New York, NY: Springer.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In R. M. Lerner & W. Damon (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 1. Theoretical models of human development* (6th ed., pp. 793–828). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Card, N. A., & Hodges, E. V. (2008). Peer victimization among schoolchildren: Correlations, causes, consequences, and considerations in assessment and intervention. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *23*, 451–461. doi:10.1037/a0012769
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2011). *Understanding bullying*. Atlanta, GA: Author. Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/bullying_factsheet.pdf
- Cohen, J. (2013). Effective bullying prevention efforts and school climate reform. In M. Masiello & D. L. Schroeder (Eds.), *A public health approach to bullying prevention* (pp. 23–55). Washington, DC: American Public Health Association Press.
- Cohen, J., & Elias, M. J. (2011). *School climate: Building safe, supportive, and engaging classrooms and schools*. Port Chester, NY: National Professional Resources.
- Craig, W. M., Pepler, D. J., Murphy, A., & McCuaig-Edge, H. (2010). What works in bullying prevention? In E. M. Vernberg & B. K. Biggs (Eds.), *Preventing and treating bullying and victimization* (pp. 215–242). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Cross, D., Epstein, M., Hearn, L., Slee, P., Shaw, T., & Monks, H. (2011). National Safe Schools Framework: Policy and practice to reduce bullying in Australian schools. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, *35*, 398–404.
- Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (2009). *Shaping school culture: Pitfalls, paradoxes, and promises*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Domitrovich, C. E., & Greenberg, M. T. (2000). The study of implementation: Current findings from effective programs that prevent mental disorders in school-aged children. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, *11*, 193–221.
- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. R. (2010). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school based universal interventions. *Child Development*, *82*, 405–432. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x
- Dwyer, K., & Osher, D. (2000). *Safeguarding our children: An action guide*. Washington, DC: U.S. Departments of Education and Justice, American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/actguide/action_guide.pdf
- Elias, M. J., & Arnold, H. (2006). *The educator's guide to emotional intelligence and academic achievement: Social-emotional learning in the classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Eslea, M., & Smith, P. K. (1998). The long-term effectiveness of anti-bullying work in primary schools. *Educational Research*, *40*, 203–218.
- Espelage, D., Green, H., & Polanin, J. (2012). Willingness to intervene in bullying episodes among middle school students: Individual and peer-group influences. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *32*, 776–801. doi:10.1177/0272431611423017
- Farrington, D. P., & Tofi, M. M. (2009). *School-based programs to reduce bullying and victimization* Campbell Systematic Reviews 2009:6. doi:10.4073/csr.2009.6
- Goldstein, S. E., Young, A., & Boyd, C. (2008). Relational aggression at school: Associations with school safety and social climate. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *37*, 641–654.
- Greene, M. B. (2005). Reducing violence and aggression in schools. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, *6*, 236–253.
- 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.
- Jones, L., Doces, M., Swearer, S., & Collier, A. (2012). *Implementing bullying prevention programs in schools: A how-to guide* (Berkman Center Research Publication No. 2013-1). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2197498>
- Kärnä, A., Voeten, M., Little, T. D., Alanen, E., Poskiparta, E., & Salmivalli, C. (2013). Effectiveness of the KiVa Antibullying Program: Grades 1–3 and 7–9. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *105*, 535–551. doi:10.1037/a0030417
- Limber, S. P. (2012). The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program: An overview of its implementation and research basis. In S. R. Jimerson, A. B. Nickerson, M. J. Mayer, & M. J. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety: International research and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 369–395). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Merrell, K. W., Guedner, 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. doi:10.1037/1045-3830.23.1.26
- Moceri, D. C., Elias, M. J., Fishman, D. B., Pandina, R., & Reyes-Portillo, J. A. (2012). The urgency of doing: Assessing the system of sustainable implementation model via the Schools Implementing Towards Sustainability (SITS) Scale. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *40*, 501–519. doi:10.1002/jcop.21477
- Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheldt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *285*, 2094–2100.
- National School Climate Council. (2007). *The school climate challenge: Narrowing the gap between school climate research and school climate policy, practice guidelines and teacher education policy*. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolclimate.org/publications/policy-briefs.php>
- National School Climate Council. (2012). *The school climate improvement process: Essential elements* (School Climate Brief No. 4). Retrieved from <http://www.schoolclimate.org/climate/schoolclimatebriefs.php>
- Nicolaidis, S., Toda, Y., & Smith, P. K. (2002). Knowledge and attitudes about school bullying in trainee teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *72*, 105–118.
- Olweus, D. (1999). Sweden. In P. K. Smith, Y. Morita, J. Junger-Tas, D. Olweus, R. Catalano, and P. Slee (Eds.), *The nature of school bullying: A cross-national perspective* (pp. 7–27). London: Routledge.

- Olweus, D., & Limber, S. P. (2010). Bullying in school: Evaluation and dissemination of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 80, 124–134.
- O'Neil, R., Kellner, M. H., Green, S., & Elias, M. J. (2012). Effective intervention for bullying. *Principal Leadership*, 12(5), 56–60.
- Ortega, R., Del-Rey, R., & Mora-Mercan, J. A. (2004). SAVE model: An anti-bullying intervention in Spain. In P. K. Smith, D. Pepler, & K. Rigby (Eds.), *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?* (pp. 167–186). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ortega, R., & Lera, M. J. (2000). The Seville Anti-Bullying in School Project. *Aggressive Behavior*, 26, 113–123.
- Pepler, D., Smith, P. K., & Rigby, K. (2004). Looking back and looking forward: Implications for making interventions work effectively. In P. K. Smith, D. Pepler, & K. Rigby (Eds.), *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?* (pp. 307–324). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Perez-Pena, R. (2011, January 6). Christie signs tougher law on bullying in schools. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/07/nyregion/07bully.html>
- Pikas, A. (2002). New developments of the shared concern method. *School Psychology International*, 23, 307–326.
- Rigby, K. (2005). The method of shared concern as an intervention technique to address bullying in schools: An overview and appraisal. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counseling*, 15, 27–34.
- Rigby, K. (2008). *Children and bullying: How parents and educators can reduce bullying at school*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Rigby, K., & Johnson, B. (2006). Expressed readiness of Australian schoolchildren to act as bystanders in support of children who are being bullied. *Educational Psychology*, 26, 425–440.
- Rigby, K., Smith, P. K., & Pepler, D. (2004). Working to prevent school bullying: key issues. In P. K. Smith, D. Pepler, & K. Rigby (Eds.), *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?* (pp. 1–12). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Salmivalli, C. (2010). Bullying and the peer group: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15, 112–120.
- Salmivalli, C., Kärnä, A., & Poskiparta, E. (2011). Counteracting bullying in Finland: The KiVa program and its effects on different forms of being bullied. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 35, 405–411. doi:10.1177/0165025411407457
- Salmivalli, C., Poskiparta, E., Ahtola, A., & Haataja, A. (2013). The implementation and effectiveness of the KiVa Antibullying Program in Finland. *European Psychologist*, 18, 79–88. doi:10.1027/1016-9040/a000140
- Smith, J. D., Schneider, B. H., Smith, P. K., & Ananiadou, K. (2004). The effectiveness of wholeschool antibullying programs: A synthesis of evaluation research. *School Psychology Review*, 33, 547–560.
- Smith, P. K., & Ananiadou, K. (2003). The nature of school bullying and the effectiveness of school-based interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, 5, 189–209.
- Smith, P. K., Salmivalli, C., & Cowie, H. (2012). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: a commentary. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 8, 433–441. doi:10.1007/s11292-012-9142-3
- Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. *Review of Educational Research*. doi:10.3102/0034654313483907
- 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 Health and Human Services (2014a). Key components in state anti-bullying laws. Retrieved from <http://www.stopbullying.gov/laws/key-components/>
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2014b). *Prevention at school*. Retrieved from www.stopbullying.gov/prevention/at-school/index.html

AUTHORS

NADIA S. ANSARY, PhD, is an associate professor at Rider University, 2083 Lawrenceville Road, Lawrenceville, NJ 08648; nansary@rider.edu. Her research examines bullying in schools, bullying of Muslim youth in particular, as well as discrimination and psychosocial outcomes of Muslim Americans.

MAURICE J. ELIAS, PhD, is a professor of psychology and director of the Social-Emotional Learning Lab at Rutgers University, 53 Avenue E, Piscataway, NJ 08854; RutgersMJE@aol.com. His research focuses on social-emotional and character development, school culture and climate, and the development of sustainable and feasible school-based interventions.

MICHAEL B. GREENE, PhD, is a developmental psychologist and senior fellow at Rutgers University School of Criminal Justice, 17 Aldon Terrace, Bloomfield, NJ 07003; mbgchef@gmail.com. His research focuses on the prevention of youth and school violence with a particular emphasis on positive youth development, social justice, and youth community organizing.

STUART GREEN, DMH, LCSW, is director of the NJ Coalition for Bullying Awareness and Prevention and associate director of Overlook Family Medicine #103, 33 Overlook Road, Summit, NJ 07901; stuart.green@atlantichealth.org. His work interests are patient-centered care, medical education, and childhood bullying.

Manuscript received February 15, 2013
 Final revision received September 29, 2014
 Accepted December 10, 2014