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Executive Summary

Bullying is a pervasive problem in our society, and students who are victimized suffer both short and long-term harm. The Learning for Life Anti-Bullying and Cyber-Intimidation Training Program adopts a unified, community-based approach, wherein schools can harness the power of multiple contexts to make a positive difference.

Within schools, peers, teachers, and school climates impact student actions and outcomes. Provided with Learning for Life awareness building and training, peers can learn pro-victim attitudes, develop positive social skills, and feel empowered to speak up when witnessing bullying.

Teachers can also positively benefit from Learning for Life awareness training. Becoming cognizant of bullying types, prevalence, and prevention strategies supports teachers in understanding the importance of intervention, fostering positive student-teacher interactions, enacting a classroom anti-bullying culture, and reinforcing the importance of classroom anti-bullying messages.

Through Learning for Life training, students and teachers can learn about the importance of building a supportive culture. As part of nurturing a positive climate, schools can create whole school anti-bullying policies for prevention, swiftly react when bullying occurs, and self-reflect on current bullying and victimization behaviors in their schools.

Learning for Life also helps to build parental support and awareness, as parents have an important impact on child outcomes. Studies suggest that a positive and supportive home environment with compassionate and involved parents helps to prevent and reduce the negative effects of bullying and victimization.

The interconnections between school and home serve to strengthen and support the anti-bullying message in Learning for Life. Parents, students, and teachers can work together to observe and respond to bullying and victimization through improved supervision methods and co-development of anti-bullying policies. This multi-modal approach to bullying acknowledges that all parties are stronger together. The Learning for Life Anti-Bullying and Cyber-Intimidation Training Program aims to harness the power of communities in taking a proactive stance against bullying.

Quality implementation is critical to using the Learning for Life program. Specifically, students need to be engaged and attentive, teachers need to be trained with adequate support, teachers need to implement the program fully, and communities need to adopt an anti-bullying culture. Use of these practices can lead to enhanced effectiveness of the Learning for Life program.

The Learning for Life Anti-Bullying and Cyber-Intimidation Training Program takes a multi-modal approach to combating bullying. Through the inclusion of videos and activities for students, teachers, and parents, the program aims to reduce bullying through a community-oriented approach. The program advocates that communities are stronger as a united front against bullying than any one group can be alone.
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Introduction

*A child sits with her head in her hands, wondering what she did to deserve such hatred. Other peers watch as the child is pelted with objects during class. The child is too scared to say anything, and depressed that no one seems to care.* (Vignette based on bullying accounts shared with the author)

Bullying is universal. Studies indicate the majority of students in Grades 5-12 frequently witness various incidents of bullying and harassment, with a host of associated consequences for student victims, bullies, and witnesses (see Table 1). Both the prevalence and impacts are widespread and far-reaching, necessitating the importance of taking steps to prevent and respond to bullying.

For the purpose of this paper, bullying is defined as a relationship wherein an individual is repeatedly mentally or physically harmed by another, and there is a power imbalance between bully and victim (Olweus, 1992). Bullying can be manifested in many forms, including physical (e.g., hitting), verbal (e.g., direct teasing), relational (e.g., rumor spreading) and cyber (e.g., bullying through cell phones or computers) (e.g., Wang, Ianotti, & Nansel, 2009). It remains a pervasive problem with a need for solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Prevalence of bullying in schools and associated consequences for students and schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97% of 5th-12th grade students have witnessed or experienced bullying at some point (Langdon &amp; Preble, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96% of middle school students have seen peers sexually harassed (Lichty &amp; Campbell, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents experience an average of seven different types of sexual harassment in middle school (Lichty &amp; Campbell, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in Grades 5-8 note that cyber-bullying can happen all day and anywhere, calling it never-ending (Mishna, Saini, &amp; Solomon, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past behavior begets present behavior. Being a bully or victim once predicts being a bully or victim again (Hemphill et al., 2012; Jose, Klackovic, Scheib, &amp; Notter, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consequences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessing bullying, being a bully, or being a victim are associated with various psychological problems including depression and substance abuse (Rivers, Poteat, Noret, &amp; Ashurst, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a bully, a victim, or a bully-victim are associated with greater likelihood of suicidal ideation (Hepburn, Azrael, Molnar, &amp; Miller, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a victim or a bully-victim in early life are associated with increased risk of psychiatric issues in adulthood (Copeland, Wolke, Angold, &amp; Costello, 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher levels of student-reported and teacher-reported bullying in schools are significant and independent predictors of increased high school dropout rates (Cornell, Gregory, Huang, &amp; Fan, 2013).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1. The child is impacted by a variety of different people in various settings (i.e., microsystem) as well as by the interrelations among those settings (i.e., mesosystem)

One way to combat bullying is through use of an anti-bullying program. A meta-analysis of 41 studies of anti-bullying programs shows that such programs can be effective at reducing bullying and victimization behaviors (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009). This paper explores components of the Learning for Life Anti-Bullying and Cyber-Intimidation Training Program that are associated with successful reductions in school bullying and victimization, using the framework of Bronfenbrenner’s (1977) social ecological theory of human development.

According to Bronfenbrenner’s model, every individual is supported and influenced by different systems. At the innermost level, the microsystem, a student is influenced by his or her immediate settings (e.g., school, home). At the next level, the mesosystem, a student is influenced by the interrelations between those settings (e.g., impact of interactions between school and home) (Figure 1). Both levels provide an important lens for understanding how different individuals and contexts impact the student. Not only are peers, teachers, and parents important, but the communications and interactions between these groups are essential as well.

The Learning for Life Anti-Bullying and Cyber-Intimidation Training Program brings communities together to combat bullying. Training videos and discussion guides for different individuals at school and home serve to build common awareness and garner community support. Students, staff, and parents learn that they are stronger united against bullying than any one group can be alone.

In this paper, I will first explore home and school microsystem impacts on student outcomes. Next, I will examine the impact of mesosystem interrelations, specifically communications across school and home environments on bullying and victimization. At the end, I will offer some guidelines on maximizing the effectiveness of the Learning for Life Anti-Bullying and Cyber-Intimidation Training Program through high-quality implementation.

Throughout the paper, endnotes provide additional information on study design, sample size, analyses, and effect sizes.
Learning for Life brings peers, teachers, and school staff together to prevent bullying

The Learning for Life Anti-Bullying and Cyber-Intimidation Training Program includes targeted video and discussion activities for peers, teachers, and school staff. These components provide awareness building and reflection opportunities for individuals in the school-to-child microsystem. By working within this microsystem, program developers hope to positively change the school climate and student outcomes.

The following section examines the research base for how individuals within schools and the overall school climate impact bullying and victimization behaviors.

The Importance of Peers

Victims of bullying often have friendship difficulties and issues with social isolation. For example, feeling rejected or isolated from adolescent peers is associated with an increased risk of victimization for males and females (Brighi, Guarani, Melotti, Galli, & Genta, 2012). In addition, victims and victim-bullies have more difficulties in making friends than bullies or other peers (e.g., Marini, Dane, Bosacki, & YLC-CURA, 2006). Why does this happen? Pellegrini (2002) hypothesizes that an increase in bullying behavior during adolescence occurs because of a lack of cohesion in middle school peer groups. Students go from having a single class peer group to interacting with a wide variety of students and classes. As a result, students have less familiarity with each other, and might be less likely to resolve conflicts (Pellegrini, 2002). However, having friends or feeling less isolated does not always translate to reduced victimization.

Sometimes peers ignore bullying or make it worse. In the case of peer bystanders, bullies only need to be minimally reinforced by other peers to increase the risk that socially rejected or anxious students will be victimized (Kärnä, Voeten, Poskiparta, & Samivalli, 2010). Additionally, peer adolescent bystanders might ignore bullying if they perceive friends as unsympathetic to victims, and this ignorance is associated with more bullying (Rigby, 2005). To halt the negative cycle, peers need to be informed of their potential impact.

Peer awareness of the bullying problem and their unique influence is essential. A meta-analysis of 89 studies finds that when anti-bullying programs include components that involve working with peers and building awareness, there is an associated decrease in victimization (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). Additionally, three separate meta-analyses find that when anti-bullying programs build student awareness of bullying through videos, there is a decrease in student victimization (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009; Ttofi & Farrington, 2009, 2011). Thus, Learning for Life’s strategy of educating peers on their important role can prove effective.

What makes peers so powerful and what components of Learning for Life’s peer awareness training can be helpful? Several research studies suggest that peer friendships serve as a protective factor. Having more friends or more high-quality friendships is associated with a lower likelihood of victimization (Bollmer, Milich, Harris, & Maras, 2005; Richard, Schneider, & Mallet, 2012; Wang et al., 2009). However, having more friends might also be
related to a greater likelihood of bullying behavior (Wang et al., 2009), but this relationship could be dependent on the type of friends that a bully has around them. For example, Bollmer et al. (2005) find that high-quality friendships can serve as an anti-bullying protective factor for students who are prone to aggression and acting out. Strong and supportive relationships amongst friends are protective, suggesting that encouraging students to nurture and develop friendships could be useful in prevention efforts.

Awareness building in the Learning for Life program can support peers in taking a pro-victim stance. Studies find that pro-victim attitudes in peers are associated with less bullying, as well as more incidents of students reporting harassment to teachers, and increased peer bystander intervention (Pozzoli, Gini, & Vieno, 2012; Rigby, 2005; Rigby & Johnson, 2004, 2006). However, adolescents will likely need support in developing pro-victim beliefs because of discrepant self-other perceptions. Specifically, adolescents can be subject to pluralistic ignorance, in that they believe watching bullying and not defending a victim is morally wrong, but they do not intervene because they believe their peers support bullying behavior when peers do not intervene (Sandstrom & Bartini, 2010). As a result, students might not realize that their peers are also morally against bullying. Thus, the Learning for Life bullying-related classroom discussions could be helpful in creating a common understanding.

When violence prevention programs teach social skills to students, there are decreases in violent behavior (Hahn et al., 2007; Wilson, Lipsey, & Derzon, 2003). Females could particularly benefit, as feeling confident in social situations is related to girls being 32 times more likely to intervene in bullying compared to less confident girls (Cappadocia, Pepler, Cummings, & Craig, 2012). Empathy might also be an important social skill, as higher levels of empathy are associated with lower levels of bullying behavior and greater bystander intervention (Barchia & Bussey, 2011; Cappadocia et al., 2012; Nickerson, Mele, & Princiotta, 2008; Topcu & Erdu-Baker, 2012). Through Learning for Life social skills training, students can gain confidence and develop anti-bully attitudes.

Awareness training in the Learning for Life program can also encourage peers to intervene. Some studies suggest that peers intervene only 14% to 41% of the time in elementary through high school (Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Oh & Hazler, 2009). What prompts intervention? Students intervene (a) when they think the victim will feel better, (b) if they think the bullying will stop as a result, or (c) if they are close to the victim (Oh & Hazler, 2009; Pöyhönen, Juvonen, & Samivalli, 2012). When students do intervene, there is an enhanced likelihood that other students will intervene as well (Wernick, Kulick, & Inglehart, 2013), and studies support that targeting peer intervention in an anti-bullying program is an effective strategy for reducing bullying and victimization (Frissen & Holmqvist, 2010; Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott, 2012).

Bullying victims often suffer the negative consequences of social isolation, and peer ignorance or endorsement of bullies can make matters worse. By educating peers on the nature of the
problem and their potential impact, Learning for Life can utilize the positive power of peers for protection. Specifically, anti-bullying training in Learning for Life’s program can support students in developing a pro-victim stance, building social skills, and teaching peers to intervene. Through use of these methods, peers can make a difference.

**BUILDING PEER AWARENESS AND EMPATHY IN LEARNING FOR LIFE**

*The Learning for Life Anti-Bullying and Cyber-Intimidation Training Program includes several components designed to build peer awareness, social skills, and encourage pro-victim behavior. The program includes student training videos that educate Grade 3-12 students on the nature and prevalence of harassment, bullying, and cyber-bullying. The videos also offer several strategies for dealing with bullying, including positive bystander behavior.*

*In-classroom discussion guides are designed to foster and build student social skills, victim perspective-taking, and empathy. For example, students spend time discussing how the impacts of bullying are long-lasting, and they are asked to fully consider how words cannot be taken back once said.*

The Importance of Teachers

Twenty-five percent of teachers in one study believed that cyber-bullying is a normal part of life with no lasting psychological effects (Stauffer, Heath, Coyne, & Ferin, 2012). This is troubling considering that the greatest predictor of when teachers intervene is the perceived severity of the bullying incident (Ellis & Shute, 2007). Teachers are also not aware of everything going on around them. In an observational study, teachers were only aware of 50% of observed bullying incidents (Atlas & Pepler, 1998). To help build understanding and awareness, teachers need support from anti-bullying training.

Learning for Life teacher training and awareness building can be beneficial. A meta-analysis of 89 studies of anti-bullying programs reveals that when teachers receive anti-bullying training, there are decreases in bullying behavior (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). Middle school students also rate teacher awareness and intervention training as their top preference for an anti-bullying intervention (Crothers, Kolbert, & Barker, 2006).

Why can Learning for Life’s teacher training help? There are several reasons. First, training can emphasize the importance and significance of teacher intervention. When teachers learn the power of intervening in bullying, they help not only the children directly affected, but also positively influence the classroom environment. One study found that teachers successfully intervened in 49% of bullying incidents (Fekkes, Pijpers, & Verloove-Vanhorick, 2005). When teachers intervene, they serve as a positive role model for their students. Studies show that when students see their teachers intervene to stop bullying, they are more likely to intervene themselves (Aboud, 2007; Hektner & Swenson, 2012; Wernick et al., 2013). Seeing teachers serve as positive role models might be one reason why students endorse teacher intervention to stop bullying as an effective anti-bullying strategy (Frisen & Holmqvist, 2010).

Second, training can help to strengthen student-teacher interactions. Positive teacher-student interaction is a critical factor in sending the anti-bullying message. Students are more
likely to tell teachers about bullying if they have an established, positive relationship with them (Maunder & Tattersall, 2010; Oliver & Candappa, 2007). In addition, more positive teacher-student interactions and greater teacher compassion are related to lower levels of bullying behavior and victimization (Richard et al., 2012; Roth, Kanat-Maymon, & Bibi, 2011). At the school level, greater perceptions of teacher support are related to more positive perceptions of school belonging amongst students (Murdock & Bolch, 2005). Thus maintaining positive student-teacher relationships is key.

Third, teacher training can support creating a classroom anti-bullying culture. Establishing a positive classroom climate that supports victims and disapproves of bullying is essential. Implicit classroom beliefs, attitudes, and norms send the message that bullying is not accepted. When peers in a classroom respect one another and have higher anti-bullying beliefs, there are significantly lower levels of bullying (Langdon & Preble, 2008; Salmivalli, Voeten, & Poskiparta, 2011). Additionally, pro-victim classroom attitudes are associated with a greater likelihood of peers defending victims (Pozzoli et al, 2012; Rigby & Johnson, 2006), and when more students defend victims in a class, there is an associated reduction in bullying (Salmivalli et al., 2011). As a result, overall attitudes can have a profound effect on outcomes.

Finally, Learning for Life training can reinforce the importance of classroom anti-bullying policies. Two separate meta-analyses of anti-bullying programs found that having classroom management strategies for responding to bullying, and classroom rules against bullying, are associated with decreases in bullying behavior (Ttofi & Farrington, 2009, 2011).

Many times teachers are unaware of the extent of the bullying problem in their school, which is one of the reasons why teacher awareness training is so critical. Learning for Life training can help teachers to understand the importance of intervening in bullying, establish positive teacher-student interactions, create a positive classroom culture that supports victims, and take steps to enact policies and procedures to prevent and respond to bullying. All of these components send a message that bullying will not be tolerated.
The Importance of School Climate

Anti-bullying work does not end in the classroom. It encompasses efforts to create a whole school climate and culture dedicated to prevention.

Negative school climates are associated with bullying. One international study spanning 40 countries showed that negative school climates relate to a greater prevalence of bullies and victims (Harel-Fisch, et al., 2011). Furthermore, students who are bullied frequently have lower levels of school connectedness and lower motivation to learn, compared to students who are bullied less often (Skues, Cunningham, & Pokharel, 2005). Thus, a negative school climate can create a never-ending cycle of victimization and poor school outcomes.

Part of the reason why negative school climates are harmful might be that students do not feel safe. Insecurity about school climate is associated with greater odds of being a victim or a bully compared to a bystander (Glew, Fan, Katon, Rivara, & Kernic, 2005). One example of an unsafe environment involves greater gang presence in schools, which is associated with an increased risk of physical and social victimization (Popp, 2012). By contrast, stronger perceptions of school safety are associated with lower levels of physical and verbal bullying (Richard, Schneider, & Mallet, 2012). A focus on increasing safety and maintaining a positive climate is the best course of action.

A unified perception of a positive school climate provides powerful protection against bullying. One meta-analysis of 53 studies of violence prevention programs showed that when programs focus on making positive whole-school changes, there is a 12% decrease in violent behavior (Hahn et al., 2007). The following findings illustrate how a positive school climate can make a difference.

- When high school students feel that they are in a supportive school environment, they are more likely to seek help for victimization (Eliot, Cornell, Gregory, & Fan, 2010).
- When adolescents believe the school is working together to prevent student aggression, there is a greater likelihood that students will defend victims (Barchia & Bussey, 2011).
- When adolescents believe they are in a positive school climate, there are lower reports of victimization (Brighi et al., 2012; Gendron, Williams, & Guerra, 2011; McGrath & Noble, 2010).

The creation of a positive, supportive, and collaborative school climate can serve as a protective factor against bullying and victimization.

As part of the positive school culture, students need to be aware of school policies against bullying. The presence of whole school anti-bullying rules is associated with decreases in bullying and victimization (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011; Woods & Wolke, 2003). School psychologists endorse this strategy as one of the most effective means of preventing bullying (Sherer & Nickerson, 2010). Student interpretation of policies is also important. When students perceive school rules as fair, consistently enforced and just, there is a lower risk of physical and social bullying victimization (Popp, 2012).
Even the best policies will not prevent all types of bullying, so when bullying does occur, there should be swift responses from the school. Teachers believe that having stronger school-level consequences results in decreased bullying behavior (Stauffer, Heath, Coyne, & Ferin, 2012). Two meta-analyses support this belief, finding that having school punishments for bullying behavior is associated with decreases in bullying and victimization (Ttofi & Farrington, 2009, 2011).^44,^45^55

Before deciding how to change the school climate, school staff need to make sure they are informed and aware of the full extent of bullying in their school. In light of research that shows only 53% of victimized students reported bullying to their teachers and only 43% of bullies were approached by teachers (Fekkes et al., 2005), it becomes important to reflect on behaviors in individual schools. Open conversations about bullying and anonymous student surveys help students and staff to understand the prevalence, typical responses to bullying behavior, impacts on students, and effectiveness of current efforts in individual schools (Couvillon & Ilieva, 2011; Pellegrini, 2002; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2013).

A whole school approach that recognizes the importance of a unified and positive front is essential. Schools should understand why negative school climates hamper any type of anti-bullying program success. Positive school climates enable students to defend others, seek help, and be protected from bullying and victimization. Positive climates also encourage steps to prevent (i.e., through whole school anti-bullying policies) and respond to (i.e., through punishment) bullying. Finally, positive school climates promote better understanding of unique school environments, including the prevalence and extent of bullying. In this way, the school can serve as a safe haven for students.

BUILDING A POSITIVE SCHOOL CLIMATE IN LEARNING FOR LIFE

Through the inclusion of different bullying awareness videos for students and teachers, the Learning for Life Anti-Bullying Training program aims to educate and inform different people within the school environment. Use of the videos sends an explicit message that bullying will not be tolerated and ensures that all parties are on the same page.

The program also encourages whole school review of current anti-bullying policies and harassment laws, and school review of the extent of the problem through anonymous student questionnaires. Teachers are encouraged to always intervene in bullying incidents and to dedicate time each week to discussing bullying prevention.

At the school level, the program advocates for changing the whole school climate and notes that one individual cannot effect change for an entire school. Rather, bullying prevention and response requires the efforts of the entire school community. As a result, students and staff can come together through review of and discussions surrounding the student and teacher versions of the online training videos.
Learning for Life builds parental awareness and encourages support

The Learning for Life Anti-Bullying, and Cyber-Intimidation Training Program includes a parent training video and associated discussion activities. These components serve to support schools in garnering parental support and building bullying awareness. By involving the home-to-student microsystem, program developers aim to utilize the power of parental support in effecting positive change.

The following section details research on how parental awareness and support impact bullying-related outcomes.

The Importance of Parents

Parents are not always aware of bullying. In one study, 39% of elementary school students who were bullied did not tell their parents (Holt, Kantor, & Finkelhor, 2009). In another study, half of parents learned that their child was a victim of bullying during the study interview (Sawyer, Mishna, Pepler, & Wiener, 2011). As another example, a group of high school-age bullies and bully-victims reported that parents knew less about their activities compared to victims and uninvolved peers (Marini, Dane, Bosacki, & YLC-CURA, 2006). Such research indicates that awareness training is an important tool. Meta-analyses support that educating parents about bullying and training parents on anti-bullying initiatives is associated with reductions in bullying and victimization (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009; Ttofi & Farrington, 2009, 2011).\(^56,57,58\)

When parents are aware of bullying, they can help to stop it. In one study, parents were successful in intervening to stop bullying in 46% of incidents (Fekkes et al., 2005). Furthermore, elementary and middle school-aged students believe parents can be helpful in dealing with bullying if students are taken seriously and parents respect their children’s wishes for the best way to deal with the situation (Oliver & Candappa, 2007). Parental involvement and respect appears to be key for responding to bullying situations.

Family involvement and support is critical, as less supportive home environments are associated with a wide range of negative bullying-related outcomes. All of the following family factors are associated with increased risk of victimization and/or bullying behaviors:

- family abuse and violence (Bowes et al., 2009; Espelage, Bosworth, & Simon, 2000),\(^59,60\)
- feelings of parental rejection or distance (Brighi et al., 2012; Marini et al., 2006),\(^61,62\)
- conflict at home (Hemphill et al., 2012),\(^63\)
- child spends time unsupervised (Espelage et al., 2000),\(^64\)
- parent feels their child hassles or angers them (Shetgiri, Lin, & Flores, 2013),\(^65\) and
- poor maternal mental health (Shetgiri et al., 2013).\(^66\)
By contrast, families can also serve as protective factors against bullying. Studies show that greater parental support is related to a lower likelihood of being a bully or a victim, child resiliency, and fewer long-term psychological issues for victims (Bowes, Maughan, Caspi, Moffitt, & Arseneault, 2010; Wang et al., 2009). Examples of beneficial parental support include talking with children and sharing thoughts, and meeting their children’s friends (Shetgiri, Lin, & Flores, 2013). Additionally, greater parental closeness is associated with a higher likelihood of peer bystander intervention (Nickerson, Mele, & Princiotta, 2008). Thus, parental closeness, support, and direct involvement in their children’s lives can make a positive difference.

Parents may be less aware of bullying and victimization than they realize, but Learning for Life parent training, support of children, and intervention can help. Supportive home environments are critical, as negative home environments are associated with a constellation of maladaptive bullying and victimization-related outcomes. Home environments that maximize parental closeness, support, and direct involvement in children’s lives can lead to a lower likelihood of bullying and victimization, as well as positive psychological outcomes.

**EDUCATING AND EMPOWERING PARENTS IN LEARNING FOR LIFE**

The Learning for Life Anti-Bullying and Cyber-Intimidation Training Program acknowledges the power of parents, and seeks to build their awareness, and encourage support for children through parent training videos. The videos for parents, like the videos for students and teachers, provide education on the different types of harassment and bullying, discuss potential impacts on students, and offer possible solutions.

Parents are encouraged to take a supportive and active role in their children’s lives. Through discussion points accompanying the video, parents learn about school policies and procedures, prevention methods, long-term psychological impacts of bullying on students, and how to monitor children’s online interactions.
Learning for Life fosters cross-setting collaborations

Learning for Life Anti-Bullying and Cyber-Intimidation Training Program developers understand the collective power that comes with a unified anti-bullying front. By including components designed to foster support and interaction across settings, developers aim to build supportive relationships and create common understanding across individuals. These cross-setting collaborations are a unique part of the mesosystem (Bronfenbrenner, 1977), wherein connections between school and home provide an important context for child development, and can impact the child in significant ways.

The following section offers research-based examples of how cross-setting collaborations make a difference.

The Importance of Working Together

Effective communication between parents, students, teachers, and school staff builds trust and positive perceptions across groups. When parents are involved and interactive with their child’s school, they have more positive perceptions of the school (Zablotsky, Bradshaw, Anderson, & Law, 2012). Parental involvement is also important because, as one study shows, teachers often find out about bullying from parents, and the information is more reliable if parent-teacher relationships are strong (Maunder & Tattersall, 2010). By building solid relationships across settings, families and schools take a community approach to tackling the bullying problem.

A whole-school and community approach to prevention makes a difference. Having support from a variety of individuals and cross-setting collaborations is associated with reductions in bullying and a lower likelihood that students will carry weapons to school (Coyle, 2008; Donnon, 2010). Supportive adult figures also have an impact, as the presence of positive adult role models relates to lower levels of bullying and victimization (Espelage et al., 2000; Popp, 2012).

A collaborative approach to bullying prevention helps to stop bullying before it starts. One study suggests that bullying occurs more frequently in less supervised settings, with 76% of students being bullied on the playground compared to 41% being bullied in the classroom (Fekkes et al., 2005). Therefore, training teachers and other adults, such as parents, to identify and respond to bullying on the playground can be one method for reducing bullying behavior (Craig, Henderson & Murphy, 2000). This strategy is also supported by recent meta-analyses of the literature (Ttofi & Farrington, 2009, 2011).

Every individual should have the right to be spared oppression and repeated, intentional humiliation, in school as in society at large. No student should be afraid of going to school for fear of being harassed or degraded, and no parent should need to worry about such things happening to his or her child! (Olweus, 1992, p. 105)
In preventing bullying, community members should come together to create anti-bullying policies and procedures. It is particularly important to involve students in the process so that they feel included and valued (Brown, Jackson, & Casidy, 2006; Cunningham, Vaillancourt, Cunningham, Chen, & Ratcliffe, 2011). Including the entire community is important, as having more individuals involved in the process helps to ensure that multiple areas and contexts are covered (Pellegrini, 2002; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2013).

Ultimately, greater exposure to an anti-bullying program model that targets multiple levels is the best course of action for schools and families. One meta-analysis of 249 studies on school violence prevention programs finds that when schools adopt a multimodal approach to prevention, through targeting different contexts (e.g., parents and students), there are positive effects when individuals are exposed to the program on a frequent basis (Wilson & Lipsey, 2007). Thus, a unified front with repeated reinforcements will strengthen anti-bullying initiatives.

The communications and interrelations between school and home are imperative to the success of the Learning for Life program. When parents are involved, they have more positive perceptions and teachers have more reliable information on their students. Additionally, greater support from multiple individuals and supportive role models guards against the negative impact of bullying. The community can work together to prevent and respond to bullying through monitoring of students and development of policies. Ultimately, Learning for Life’s targeting of multiple individuals and settings can be effective, so long as the messages are reinforced on a consistent basis.
Seeing results: The importance of quality implementation

Once the Learning for Life Anti-Bullying and Cyber-Intimidation Training Program is implemented, it is important to recognize that the ultimate success will be determined by how it is used within and outside of school.

When schools do not monitor program use or implementation, good programs can have contradictory effects. A meta-analysis of the literature on violence prevention programs finds that schools with more implementation difficulties had lower program effectiveness in reducing violent behaviors (Wilson, Lipsey, & Derzon, 2003). Additionally, studies of anti-bullying programs have found conflicting or negative outcomes when implementation was not monitored:

- Bullying was reduced in the short-term but not the long-term (Andreou, Didaskalou, & Vlachou, 2008).
- Teachers reported higher efficacy in creating a positive classroom environment and working with bullies, but students reported increases in problem behaviors (Bell, Racynski, & Horne, 2010).
- Students had more positive attitudes to victims in a two-year bullying prevention program, but varying the program duration (i.e., 3 months, 1 year, 2 years) did not change reports of bullying or school climate (Beran, Tutty, & Steinrath, 2004).
- Bullying incidences increased over time in response to a peer intervention anti-bullying program (Cowie & Olafsson, 2000).

Thus, how a program is implemented is a critical factor to consider. There are certain steps that schools can take to maximize Learning for Life program effectiveness through quality implementation. Based on the available research on the importance of quality program implementation to maximize anti-bullying program effectiveness, I present the following guidelines:

GUIDELINE #1

Students need to be engaged in and attentive to the program.

One study by Boulton and Boulton (2011) found that 82% of middle school students reported being inattentive to the anti-bullying messages of their teacher. Of these children, 82% believed the messages were irrelevant. A lack of student engagement and perceived relevance is a clear barrier to program implementation. If students are not paying attention, they are not going to retain the information. Further, a meta-analysis of violence prevention
programs suggests that greater engagement in a program is associated with greater decreases in violent behavior (Wilson, Lipsey, & Derzon, 2003). By making relevance and importance clear to students, and presenting the information in an engaging format, Learning for Life program impacts can be stronger.

GUIDELINE #2
Teachers need training, adequate resources, and administration support.

Quality program implementation begins with effective training. When interviewing staff members who had experienced unsuccessful bullying prevention programs, Coyle (2008) found that use of core program components and support for program use was associated with positive program effects. This suggests that teachers need to use what is included with the Learning for Life program and have a supportive school structure that encourages program use.

Studies also show that initial exposure time is important. Meta-analyses of the literature reveal that when teachers spend at least 10-15 hours in program training and students are exposed to program components for at least 20 hours, there are decreases in victimization (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009; Ttofi & Farrington, 2009, 2011). Not only is training important, but the length of training and initial exposure time are equally important factors for teachers and students.

GUIDELINE #3
Teachers need to implement the program fully.

An entire program is more effective as a unit than broken down into individual components. Correspondingly, when teachers fully implement a program and use the majority of components, there are positive effects. Consider the following examples from previous studies:

- When schools implemented 75% or more of a bullying prevention program’s core components, there were positive reductions in bullying (Black, Washington, Trent, Harner, & Pollock, 2010).
- When 92% of teachers in one study used all bullying prevention program components in their instruction, there were significant positive effects on overall school climate and stronger program effects on reducing bullying (Brown, Low, Smith, & Haggerty, 2011).
- When teachers implemented a bullying prevention program more closely, they saw their students as more socially skilled (Hirschsten, Edstrom, Frey, Snell, & Mackenzie, 2007) or saw greater decreases in school-wide discipline issues (Pack, White, Raczynski, & Wang, 2011).
- Positive anti-bullying program effects were stronger when teachers implemented the entire program to a greater extent (Joronen, Konu, Rankin, & Astedt-Kurki, 2011; Olweus, 1992).
The effectiveness of a program is strengthened when teachers use more of that program in the classroom. Therefore, schools should implement the Learning for Life program as fully as possible to maximize positive outcomes.

GUIDELINE #4

The program and anti-bullying message need to become an integral part of the school culture.

Recent meta-analyses of the literature show that teachers and students need to be exposed to the program over an extended period of time to ensure that the anti-bullying message becomes an integral part of school culture. Specifically, when teachers have at least 4 days of training practice and students are exposed to the program for 270 or more days, there are reductions in bullying and victimization (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009; Ttofi & Farrington, 2009, 2011).\(^2\),\(^3\),\(^4\)

Adequate exposure to the Learning for Life message is key to seeing results. Schools cannot expect to effect positive change if they implement the program for a condensed or isolated amount of time. There needs to be a focus on making anti-bullying programming an essential and ongoing part of the school climate and culture. Accordingly, schools must implement and revisit Learning for Life components several times every year.

When schools and communities ensure that their target audiences are engaged, teachers and groups are adequately trained, program components are fully implemented, and the anti-bullying message becomes an important part of school culture, they strengthen the potential for program effectiveness.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE LEARNING FOR LIFE ANTI-BULLYING AND CYBER-INTIMIDATION TRAINING PROGRAM

Learning for Life provides 35-40 minute training videos for parents, teachers, and students. The program also includes specialized discussion guides and activities for parents, teachers, and students. To maximize the potential of the Learning for Life program, I recommend the following:

• Teachers should watch the training video several times each year, so that they are adequately exposed to the training and are well versed in the materials.

• Students should watch the videos several times each school year, and the anti-bullying messages present in the program should be integrated into the school day and overall school climate.

• Parents should watch the videos at least once, and preferably frequently throughout each school year.

• Schools should use as many of the Learning for Life program components as possible. Teachers, students, and parents should all watch the videos and take part in the associated discussion points and activities.

• Schools should take steps to create an enduring and supportive anti-bullying community.
Summary

Bullying is a ubiquitous problem in our society with pervasive short and long-term consequences, requiring a unified, community-based approach. The Learning for Life Anti-Bullying and Cyber-Intimidation Training Program utilizes the power of individuals in immediate settings, such as in school and home, with the purpose of building a protective, anti-bullying community. The program’s foundational base includes a wealth of research on the individual and collective power of schools and homes on student bullying-related outcomes.

Within the school-to-student microsystem, studies show that peers, teachers and school climates all have a profound impact. Peers, in particular, may be especially influential as studies show victims of bullying often have difficulty making friends (Marini et al., 2006) and peers can make bullying worse by ignoring or reinforcing bullies (Kärnä et al., 2010; Rigby, 2005). Educating peers on the bullying problem can ultimately help to reduce victimization through emphasizing the importance of peer friendships, encouraging pro-victim behaviors, developing student socio-emotional skills, and emboldening peers to intervene.

Teachers might be unaware of the extent of bullying in their school, necessitating the importance of teacher training and awareness building. Learning for Life awareness training can be beneficial for several reasons:

1. Training can emphasize the importance of intervention. When teachers intervene to stop bullying, they positively impact the victims and overall classroom environment (Aboud, 2007; Hektner & Swenson, 2012; Wernick et al., 2013).
2. Training can help to foster more positive student-teacher interactions. Positive student-teacher relationships aid in encouraging student disclosure of harassment and increasing feelings of student belonging (Maunder & Tattersall, 2010; Murdock & Bolch, 2005; Oliver & Candappa, 2007).
3. Training can support creating an anti-bully culture in the classroom. Creating a classroom culture that supports victims and disapproves of bullies is related to lower levels of bullying and more defending (Langdon & Preble, 2008; Pozzoli et al., 2012; Rigby & Johnson, 2006; Salmivalli et al., 2011).
4. Training can reinforce the importance of classroom anti-bullying policies. Enacting anti-bullying classroom management techniques and policies can reduce bullying (Ttofi & Farrington, 2009, 2011).

As part of the within-school toolkit for bullying reduction, the creation of a positive school climate and culture is essential. Negative school climates lead to lower levels of school connectedness, higher victimization risks, lower motivation to learn, and potentially unsafe environments (Harel-Fisch et al., 2011; Skues et al., 2005). Positive school climates, in contrast, are associated with greater support seeking, more defending behavior, and lower victimization (Barchia & Bussey, 2011; Brighi et al., 2012; Eliot et al., 2010; Gendron et al., 2011; McGrath & Noble, 2010). In creating a supportive climate, schools should enact whole school anti-bullying policies for prevention, respond quickly if bullying does occur, and take steps to assess the current school bullying culture.
Within the home-to-student microsystem, parents have a profound impact on their children but are often left unaware of the bullying problem (e.g., Holt et al., 2009). However, when parents develop awareness, their intervention can help to stop bullying (Fekkes et al., 2005). A positive and supportive home environment protects students, in contrast to a less caring home environment, which is associated with a constellation of negative outcomes (e.g., Bowes et al., 2009; Hemphill et al., 2012; Shetgiri et al., 2013). Positive and compassionate home environments where parents are directly involved in their child’s lives are particularly beneficial (e.g., Bowes et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2009).

As discussed in Bronfenbrenner’s (1977) social ecological model, the interconnections between immediate settings in the mesosystem can have a profound impact on children. Thus the interconnections and communications between home and school can strengthen and support Learning for Life program messages. Specifically a community approach to prevention and response can make a difference. Parents and teachers can work together to stop bullying before it occurs through enhanced supervision and co-development of policies designed to protect the welfare of students in schools (Craig et al., 2000; Pellegrini, 2002; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2013). As a result, a multi-modal approach harnesses the power of multiple groups to enact positive change.

In implementing the Learning for Life Anti-Bullying and Cyber-Intimidation Training Program, it is important to understand the essential impact of quality implementation. Poorly implemented or monitored programs can have contrasting effects. To give Learning for Life the chance to reach its full potential, I present the following research-based implementation guidelines:

1. Students need to be engaged in and attentive to the program.
2. Teachers need to have training, adequate resources, and administration support.
3. Teachers need to implement the program fully.
4. The program and anti-bullying message need to become an integral part of the school culture.

In using these implementation guidelines, schools give Learning for Life the greatest chance for success.

The Learning for Life Anti-Bullying and Cyber-Intimidation Training Program emphasizes the importance of a multi-modal approach to combating bullying, in recognition of the program’s potential to achieve what Aristotle described as a “whole greater than the sum of its parts.”
Notes

1 This study investigated which factors predict traditional and cyber-bullying in a sample of 2,326 Italian adolescents. Overall, isolation and rejection from peers related to higher incidences of victimization for males and females (Effect Sizes = 0.24 to 0.52) (Brighi et al., 2012).

2 This study included 7,290 high school adolescents in Canada and examined risk factors for being a bully, victim, or victim-bully. Overall, victims and victim-bullies had more difficulties in peer friendships compared to bullies and other peers (Partial Eta Squared = .02) (Marini, Dane, Bosacki, & YLC-CURA, 2006).

3 In a study with 8,248 students in Grades 3–5 from Finland, researchers investigated whether peer interventions can moderate the relationship between victimization risk factors (i.e., peer rejection, social anxiety) and being victimized. Using HLM analyses, the researchers found that bullies only needed to be reinforced by peers to a small extent in order to increase the risk for socially rejected or anxious students to be victimized ($b = .019$, $z = 12.28$, $p < .001$) (Kärnä, Voeten, Poskiparta, & Samivalli, 2010).

4 In their meta-analysis of 89 high-quality studies of anti-bullying programs, Ttofi and Farrington (2011) found that there was more victimization in control compared to treatment groups when treatment students had bullying awareness building exercises or training (Odds Ratio = 1.13).

5 In a meta-analysis of 41 bullying intervention studies, Farrington and Ttofi (2009) used weighted regression analyses and found that when treatment groups watched anti-bullying videos there were associated decreases in victimization compared to control groups ($B = 0.14$).

6 In this meta-analysis of 59 high-quality studies on anti-bullying programs, researchers found that when treatment students watched videos to build student awareness of bullying they had lower rates of victimization compared to control students who did not watch bullying awareness videos (Odds Ratio = 1.47) (Ttofi & Farrington, 2009)

7 Ttofi and Farrington (2011) found that when treatment students watched videos to build student bullying awareness, they had lower rates of victimization compared to control students (Odds Ratio = 1.38).

8 In a study with 99 10- to 13-year-old children, students with higher quality friendships were less likely to be victims of bullying ($\beta = -0.29$) (Bollmer et al., 2005).

9 Using HLM analyses with a sample of 18,222 French students and 701 teachers, Richard, Schneider, and Mallet (2012) found that the following were associated with lower levels of bullying: greater acceptance by peers (Relative Effect Size = -0.08 for physical bullying, -0.17 for verbal bullying) and stronger friendships (Relative Effect Size = -0.02 for physical bullying, -0.03 for verbal bullying).

10 In a study with 7,508 adolescents (Grades 6–10) from the Healthy Behavior in School-Aged Children study, researchers conducted logistic regressions to examine what protective factors predict different types of bullying. Having more friends was also associated with a lower likelihood of being a victim (Odds Ratios = 0.78 (physical bullying), 0.69 (verbal bullying), 0.72 (relational aggression)) (Wang et al., 2009).

11 Wang et al. (2009) used logistic regressions to determine that having more friends was related to a greater likelihood of being a bully (Odds Ratio = 1.64 [physical bully], 1.31 [verbal bully], 1.49 [relational aggression]).
In a study with 99 10- to 13-year old children, there was an externalizing-by-friendship quality interaction ($\beta = -0.18$). For those high externalizing students, if they had a higher-quality friend, they were less likely to be a bully. For low externalizing students, friendship quality did not change bullying practices. Additionally, children with higher-quality friendships were less likely to bully than those with lower-quality friendships ($\beta = -0.33$) (Bollmer, et al., 2005).

Pozzoli et al., (2012) conducted a study with 797 elementary school and 1,028 Italian middle school students who completed a survey about bystander behavior in response to bullying. HLM analyses revealed that when peers have pro-victim attitudes, they are more likely to intervene when bullying occurs $C = .30$, $t(1791) = 5.49$, $p < .001$.

In a bullying study with 400 early adolescents from South Australia, Rigby (2005) used regression analyses to find that being pro-victim is associated with less bullying behaviors ($B = -0.30$).

Rigby and Johnson (2004) conducted a study on high school peer bystander intervention in witnessing sexual harassment. Overall, regression analyses revealed that pro-victim attitudes were a significant predictor of whether or not high school students would intervene ($B = 0.22$) or tell a teacher ($B = 0.28$) when witnessing sexual harassment.

Rigby and Johnson (2006) conducted a study on peer bystander intervention with 400 Australian adolescents. Regression analyses revealed that having a pro-victim attitude was related to a greater likelihood of helping victims ($B = 0.20$).

Sandstrom and Bartini (2010) conducted a study with 91 U.S. eighth graders to examine how peer perceptions of class norms predicted bystander behavior. Eighth grade students who had more discrepant self-other beliefs also were more likely to be bystanders in bullying situations ($\beta = 0.28$).

Hahn, et al. (2007) conducted a meta-analysis of 53 studies to examine successful components of violence prevention programs. When violence prevention programs taught social skills to students, there was a 19% decrease in violent behavior.

Wilson et al. (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of 221 studies of school violence prevention programs and found that social competence interventions were associated with decreases in violent behavior (Effect Sizes = 0.15–0.34).

Barchia and Bussey (2011) collected data from a sample of 1,167 students in Grades 7–10 in Australia. The study examined factors predictive of bystander behavior. Using regression analyses, higher levels of empathy predicted self-efficacy for defending in girls only ($\beta = 0.15$).

Cappadocia et al. (2012) conducted a study of bystander intervention using a sample of 108 eight- to sixteen-year old students from Canada. Logistic regression analyses revealed that boys with high levels of empathy were 17 times more likely to intervene than boys with low empathy.

Nickerson et al. (2008) conducted a bystander intervention study with a sample of 105 middle school students (Grades 6-8). Overall, peers with higher levels of empathy were more likely to intervene (versus remaining an outsider) during middle school bullying episodes (Odds Ratio = 1.89).
Topcu and Erdu-Baker (2012) conducted a survey-based study with 795 Turkish students (ages 13–18) on bullying behavior. Researchers found that empathy mediated the relationship between gender and traditional bullying behaviors ($z = 2.02$, $p < .01$).

Oh and Hazler (2009) conducted a retrospective study with 298 college students, asking them to provide information about their experiences with bullying, intervening, and being a victim in middle and high school. Students noted they were more likely to intervene in bullying if they were close to the victim ($\beta = 0.14$).

Pöyhönen et al. (2012) conducted a survey with 6,397 third-through-fifth graders in Finland about the likelihood of bystander intervention. The researchers found that elementary school-age peers tended to intervene when they believed the victim would feel better and they valued making the victim feel better ($\beta = 0.03$). By contrast, they remained passive when they valued reducing bullying behavior, but did not believe bullying would decrease if they intervened ($\beta = -0.05$).

Wernick et al. (2013) conducted a study on bystander interventions in anti-gay bullying with 1,171 high school students from the Riot Youth Project in Michigan. Overall, peers intervening in anti-gay bullying was associated with a greater likelihood of other students intervening ($\beta = 0.19$).

Frisen and Holmqvist (2010) asked 877 students at ages 13 and 16 to identify effective bullying prevention strategies. At age 13, 14% said that having students intervene to stop bullying was an effective response, and this percentage increased to 16% of students at age 16.

Polanin et al. (2012) conducted a meta-analysis of 11 K–12 studies of bystander interventions, and found that peer bystander interventions are effective at increasing defending behavior (Hedges $g = .20$).

Ellis and Shute (2007) conducted a study that examined teacher responses to bullying. Overall, the greater the perceived severity of a bullying scenario, the more likely teachers were to respond to it ($Bs = 5.16-8.37$).

Ttofi and Farrington (2011) found that when treatment teachers received training on a bullying program, students in control teacher classrooms had higher levels of bullying behavior compared to treatment students (Odds Ratio = 1.46).

Aboud (2007) examined student bystander behavior. The researcher found that when younger students (Grades 2 and 3) had a positive adult role model they were more likely to intervene in bullying episodes compared to older students (Grades 5 and 6), $F (1, 87) = 4.00$, $p < .05$.

Wernick et al. (2013) found that seeing teachers intervene in anti-gay bullying was associated with a greater likelihood of other students intervening ($\beta = 0.07$).

This study included 877 Swedish children who were interviewed at age 13 and at age 16. Researchers asked the adolescents about effective bullying prevention strategies. At age 13, 13% said that having staff respond to bullying was an effective response and this percentage increased to 22% at age 16 (Frisen & Holmqvist, 2010).

Richard et al. (2012) looked at the impact of teacher-student interactions on bullying behaviors in a sample of 18,222 French students and 701 teachers. Using HLM, researchers found that more positive student-teacher interactions related to lower levels of victimization (Effect Sizes = -0.15 for physical, -0.15 for verbal).
Roth et al. (2011) explored how middle school students’ perceptions of teachers’ emotions and actions influence classroom bullying in a sample of 725 Israeli students in 27 classrooms. Using HLM, researchers found that students’ perceptions of teachers as compassionate and sympathetic to their perspective significantly predicted decreases in bullying behavior ($\beta = -0.12$).

This was a study of 101 Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual (LGB) students in high school who completed a survey about their perceptions of school climate and social support. Amongst LGB youth, greater perceptions of teacher support related to more positive perceptions of school belonging ($\beta = 0.32$) (Murdock & Bolch, 2005).

This study explored how respect relates to bullying behavior in a sample of 3,147 fifth through twelfth grade students in 26 schools. Overall, a regression analysis revealed that peer respect for one another explained a significant and substantial amount of the variance in bullying behaviors within schools (14.4%). Higher levels of peer respect related to lower levels of bullying in the school $r(22) = 0.43$ (Langdon & Preble, 2008).

Salmivalli et al. (2011) conducted a study on the relation between classroom beliefs and bullying in a sample of 6,764 third through fifth grade students in 385 classrooms. HLM analyses revealed that greater beliefs in anti-bullying in classrooms were significantly associated with lower levels of bullying behavior ($B = -0.21$).

Pozzoli, et al., (2012) conducted a study with 797 elementary school and 1,028 Italian middle school students who completed a survey about bystander behavior in response to bullying. HLM analyses revealed that perceived peer pressure to defend victims was associated with greater defending behavior ($C = .17, t(1791) = 5.51, p < .001$).

Rigby and Johnson (2006) conducted a study on peer bystander intervention with 400 Australian adolescents. Regression analyses revealed that perceiving friends as expecting intervention in bullying was associated with greater defending behavior ($B = 0.18$).

Salmivalli et al. (2011) conducted a study on the relation between classroom beliefs and bullying in a sample of 6,764 third through fifth grade students in 385 classrooms. HLM analyses revealed that having more peers defending victims in a class was associated with a reduced frequency of bullying ($B = -0.35$).

Ttofi and Farrington (2009) conducted a meta-analysis of the literature examining 59 high-quality studies of anti-bullying programs to determine what components are associated with positive outcomes. Having classroom management strategies for observing and responding to bullying, compared to no anti-bullying management strategies, was associated with decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.46).

Ttofi and Farrington (2011) conducted a meta-analysis of the literature examining 89 high-quality studies of anti-bullying programs to determine what components are associated with positive outcomes. Having classroom management strategies for observing and responding to bullying, compared to no class anti-bullying strategies, was associated with decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.44). Additionally, having class rules against bullying, compared to no class rules against bullying, was associated with decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.44).

Skues et al. (2005) conducted a study about the relationship of bullying to psychological and academic outcomes in a sample of 975 Australian students in years 7 to 12 of schooling. Overall, MANOVA analyses revealed that more frequent bullying (compared to being bullied sometimes) was related to lower peer $F(2, 963) = 150.76, p < .001$, teacher $F(2, 963) = 24.59, p < .001$, and school connectedness $F(2, 963) = 24.54, p < .001$, and lower motivation to learn $F(2, 963) = 15.10, p < .001$. 
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Glew et al. (2005) conducted a study with 3,530 third through fifth-grade students, and asked students about bullying and victimization experiences at their school. Researchers used logistic regression for the primary analyses. Overall, not feeling safe at school among elementary school students related to greater odds of being a victim versus a bystander (Odds Ratio = 2.1) and greater odds of being a bully versus a bystander (Odds Ratio = 2.5).

Popp (2012) conducted a study with 8,031 U.S. adolescent students, and found that gang presence in a school (versus lack of gang presence) was associated with an increased risk of physical bullying victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.49) and social bullying victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.28).

Richard et al. (2012) conducted HLM analyses with a sample of 18,222 French students and 701 teachers and found that greater perceptions of a safe school environment were associated with lower levels of bullying (Relative Effect Sizes = -0.16 for physical, -0.08 for verbal).

In a sample of ninth-grade students from 291 high schools, researchers used HLM analyses on survey data and found that a supportive school climate was positively and significantly related to willingness to seek help (Standardized Estimate = 0.59, p < .001) (Eliot et al., 2010).

Barchia and Bussey (2011) conducted a longitudinal study with 1,167 Australian adolescents in Grades 7–10. The researchers found that when students had higher perceptions of school efficacy in preventing aggression, they were more likely to defend victims (β = 0.08).

Brighi et al. (2012) investigated which factors predict traditional and cyber-bullying in a sample of 2,326 Italian adolescents. Overall, perceptions of a positive school climate related to lower incidences of victimization for males and females (Effect Sizes = 0.17 to 0.26).

Gendron et al. (2011) examined the impacts of school climate on bullying behavior in a sample of students in Grades 5, 8, and 11 across 78 schools. There was a significant interaction between school climate and self-esteem, such that among high self-esteem students, positive school climate perceptions related to less bullying (Effect Size = -0.47).

Ttofi and Farrington (2011) conducted a meta-analysis of 89 high-quality studies of anti-bullying programs and found that having a whole school anti-bullying policy, compared to no whole school anti-bullying policy, related to decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.44).

In a study of 8,031 U.S. adolescent students, when students perceived school rules as fair and consistently enforced there were lower levels of physical bullying victimization (Odds Ratio = 0.72) and social bullying victimization (Odds Ratio = 0.76) (Popp, 2012).

Ttofi and Farrington (2009) examined 59 high-quality studies of anti-bullying programs to determine what components are associated with positive outcomes. Having punishments for bullying behavior, in contrast to no punishments, related to decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.66) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.50).

Ttofi and Farrington (2011) explored 89 high-quality studies of anti-bullying programs to determine what components are associated with positive outcomes. Having punishments for bullying behavior, compared to no punishments, was associated with decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.59) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.44).
This was a meta-analysis of 41 bullying intervention studies. Having parent training or meetings on anti-bullying, compared to no parent training or anti-bullying meetings, was associated with decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.57) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.41) (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009).

This meta-analysis examined 59 high-quality studies of anti-bullying programs to determine what components are associated with positive outcomes. Training parents on anti-bullying initiatives was associated with decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.59) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.47) compared to no parent training. Furthermore, providing some type of anti-bullying information for parents was associated with decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.48) compared to not providing anti-bullying information for parents (Ttofi & Farrington, 2009).

This was a meta-analysis of 89 bullying intervention studies. Training parents on anti-bullying initiatives was associated with decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.57) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.41) when compared to no parent training. Furthermore, providing some type of anti-bullying information for parents was associated with decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.44) when compared to not providing parents with anti-bullying information (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011).

In a twin study with 2,232 children, risk factors at age 5 were associated with bullying and victimization at age 7. Overall, more family abuse was associated with increased victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.9) and increased likelihood of being a bully-victim (Odds Ratio = 2.1). Additionally, greater exposure to violence at home related to a greater prevalence of bullying behavior (Odds Ratio = 1.4) (Bowes, Arsenault et al., 2009).

This was a study of 558 U.S. students who completed a survey about bullying during the past 30 days. Being slapped or hit at home was associated with greater bullying behaviors (β = 0.09) (Espelage et al., 2000).

This study investigated which factors predict traditional and cyber-bullying in a sample of 2,326 Italian adolescents. Overall, greater feelings of parental rejection related to more cyber victimization for females (β = 0.14) and poor perceptions of parental relationships related to more cyber victimization for males (β = -0.15) (Brighi et al., 2012).

This study included 7,290 high school adolescents in Canada and examined risk factors for being a bully, victim, or bully-victim. ANCOVA analyses revealed that high school aged-bullies, victims, and bully-victims were more distant from their mothers compared to uninvolved students (Partial Eta Squared = 0.02) (Marini et al. (2006).)

This was a study of 696 students from Australia, who were a subset of the International Youth Development study. The longitudinal study examined how traditional bullying behaviors relate to bullying two years later. The researchers found that when children experience conflict at home in Grade 7, they have greater odds of bullying behavior in Grade 9 (Odds Ratio = 1.4) (Hemphill, et al., 2012).

Espelage et al. (2000) found that spending time unsupervised at home was associated with greater bullying behaviors (β = 0.16).

Shetgiri et al. (2013) collected data from a sample of 48,639 parents of 10- to 17-year-old children in 2003 and another 44,152 parents in 2007 as part of the National Survey of Children’s Health. Logistic regressions revealed the following factors were associated with greater odds of children being bullied in 2003 and 2007: parents feeling like their child hassles them a lot (Odds Ratios = 2.27-2.43) and parents are often angry with their child (Odds Ratios = 1.83-3.15).
Shetgiri et al. (2013) found that poor maternal mental health was associated with a greater risk of children being bullied (Odds Ratios = 1.45-1.56).

In a study of 1,116 twins from the longitudinal Environmental E-risk twin study, researchers found that warmth from moms ($\beta = 0.17$) and a supportive home climate ($\beta = 0.23$) predicted resiliency in the face of bullying. Additionally, for bullied children, being in a more warm ($\beta = -0.75$ to $-2.34$) and supportive home environment ($\beta = -0.23$ to $-0.44$) were associated with fewer long-term psychological issues (Bowes, Maughan et al., 2010).

In a study with 7,508 adolescents (Grades 6-10) from the Healthy Behavior in School-Aged Children study, researchers conducted logistic regressions to examine what protective factors predict different types of bullying. Overall, greater parental support related to lower likelihoods of being a bully or being a victim of physical bullying (Odds Ratios = 0.57-0.91), verbal bullying (Odds Ratios = 0.57-0.69), relational bullying (Odds Ratios = 0.61-0.62), and cyber-bullying (Odds Ratios = 0.54-0.55) (Wang et al., 2009).

Shetgiri et al. (2013) found that parents talking with their children and sharing thoughts (Odds Ratios = 0.50-0.59) and parents meeting their child’s friends (Odds Ratios = 0.58-0.77) were associated with lower odds of being bullied.

Nickerson et al. (2008) conducted a study of bystander intervention behavior in a sample of 105 sixth through eighth grade U.S. students. Using logistic regression, researchers found that greater maternal (Odds Ratio = 2.10) or paternal (Odds Ratio = 1.70) attachment predicted higher levels of bystander behavior.

Zablotsky et al. (2012) conducted a study with 1,148 parent-child dyads of children with Autism. They found that parents of children who had been bullied had more negative perceptions of the school ($\beta = -0.27$). However, parental involvement and interactions with their children’s school was related to more positive perceptions about the school ($r = 0.13$).

Donnon (2010) conducted a study with 2,991 middle and high school students in Canada, examining how various coping and positive strength factors (e.g., support of parents, school, peers) related to bullying behaviors. Donnon (2010) found that when middle and high school students have support from a variety of areas and contexts (e.g., parents, peers, community, school climate), they are three to eight times less likely to carry a weapon. Additionally, having lower amounts of support across contexts was associated with increased likelihood of bullying.

Espelage et al. (2000) found that having positive adult role models who do not condone aggression and violence was associated with less bullying behaviors amongst middle school students ($\beta = -0.27$).

Popp (2012) examined how different factors relate to bullying victimization in a sample of 8,031 U.S. adolescent students. Having supportive peer or adult figures related to lower levels of social bullying victimization (Odds Ratio = 0.85).

Ttofi and Farrington (2009) conducted a meta-analysis of 59 studies of anti-bullying programs and found that greater supervision of students on playgrounds is associated with a decreased risk of bullying behavior (Odds Ratio = 1.60).

This meta-analysis of 89 studies of anti-bullying programs found that greater supervision of students on playgrounds was associated with a decreased risk of bullying behavior (Odds Ratio = 1.53) (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011).
This meta-analysis of 249 studies on school violence prevention programs found that programs with a multimodal approach are effective at reducing violence, provided individuals are exposed to the program on a frequent basis (i.e., several times a week) (Effect Size = 1.25). (Wilson & Lipsey, 2007).

Wilson et al. (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of 221 studies on school violence prevention programs, finding that lower quality program implementation related to lower program effectiveness in reducing violent behaviors (Effect Size = 0.35).

Andreou et al. (2008) conducted an effectiveness study of a bullying prevention program with Grade 4-6 students in Greece. Researchers found the treatment group had less bullying ($\epsilon^2 = 0.04$), more negative thoughts toward bullying ($\epsilon^2 = 0.19$), more positive feelings for victims ($\epsilon^2 = 0.14$), higher self-efficacy to intervene ($\epsilon^2 = 0.18$), and were more likely to intervene immediately after the intervention ($\epsilon^2 = 0.15$). However, there were no differences between groups six months later and schools did not monitor program implementation.

Bell et al. (2010) examined the efficacy of the Bully Buster Program and included 52 teachers and 488 students. Researchers found that teachers reported higher levels of efficacy in creating a positive classroom ($d = 0.51$) and feeling more capable of working with bullies and victims ($d = 0.40$). However, students reported problem behaviors increased following the intervention ($d = 0.21$). Researchers did not monitor program implementation.

Beran et al. (2004) examined the impact of the Dare to Care bullying intervention in a sample of 197 students. The study found that students who participated in a bullying prevention program had more positive attitudes toward victims if they participated in a 2-year program but not anything shorter in duration ($F = 2.74, p = .01$). There were no program impacts for the 3-month, 1-year, or 2-year program on reports of bullying (seen or experienced), support strategies, or school climate. Schools were free to implement the program in various ways and program implementation was not measured.

Cowie and Olafsson (2000) conducted a study of a peer support/intervention program and found that bullying incidences increased over time ($U = 24961, p = .03$). However, teachers did not support the new initiative and students in charge of implementing the program did not follow suggested implementation guidelines, suggesting poor implementation.

In a meta-analysis of 221 studies on school violence prevention programs, low quality program implementation was related to less effective reductions in violent student behaviors (Effect Size = 0.35) (Wilson et al., 2003).

Farrington and Ttofi (2009) conducted a meta-analysis of 41 studies of bullying intervention programs. They found that when teachers spent 10 or more hours in program training there are associated decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.52) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.37) compared to spending 9 hours or less. Furthermore, when students spent more than 20 hours exposed to the program there were associated decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.62) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.42) compared to spending 19 hours or less.

This meta-analysis examined 59 high-quality studies of anti-bullying programs to determine what components were associated with positive outcomes. When teachers spent 15 or more hours in program training there were decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.54) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.47) compared to 14 or fewer hours. Furthermore, when students spent more than 20 hours exposed to the program there were decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.65) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.46) (Ttofi & Farrington, 2009) compared to 19 or fewer hours.
This meta-analysis examined 89 high-quality studies of anti-bullying programs to determine what components were associated with positive outcomes. When teachers spent 15 or more hours in program training there were associated decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.52) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.37) compared to 14 or fewer hours. Furthermore, when students spent more than 20 hours exposed to the program there were associated decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.62) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.42) compared to 19 or fewer hours (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011).

In a study of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program in thirteen elementary and middle schools, researchers found that when schools implemented 75% or more of the program’s core components, there was a 5% reduction in bullying. By contrast, those with lower implementation saw a 14% increase in bullying (Black et al., 2010).

This randomized control trial of the Steps to Respect program (n = 34 schools) found the following when 92% of teachers reported implementing the programs core components fully: greater use of anti-bullying guidelines (Effect Size = 0.38); better school climate for staff (Effect Size = 0.26) and students (Effect Size = 0.21); a smaller decrease in reports of students being willing to intervene in bullying (Effect Size = 0.28) compared to the control; and a greater decline in bullying issues at the school (Effect Size = -0.35) compared to the control condition. They also found a smaller increase in bullying at the treatment compared to the control schools (Adjusted Odds Ratio = 0.61). Students at treatment schools reported a smaller decrease in teacher interventions in bullying (Adjusted Odds Ratio = 1.27), more students (Effect Size = 0.12) and staff intervening (Effect Size = 0.13), more students acting as positive bystanders (Effect Size = 0.14), and a more consistent climate for students (Effect Size = 0.19) compared to control schools (Brown et al., 2011).

This study explored how teacher implementation of the Steps to Respect program impacted student outcomes. Researchers found that when teachers implemented the program more closely, they perceived their students as more socially skilled (d = 0.30) (Hirschsten et al. 2007).

In a study of the Safe School Ambassadors program in middle school, greater school implementation of the program related to a decrease in school-wide behavior issues (p < .0001) (Pack et al., 2011).

One study of a drama-based anti-bullying program found that stronger positive effects of the program in classes that implemented the program to a greater extent (Joronen et al., 2011).

This meta-analysis examined 41 studies of anti-bullying programs to determine what components are associated with positive outcomes. When children spent 270 or more days in an anti-bullying program (compared to fewer days), there were associated decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.49) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.35). Furthermore, when teachers spent 4 or more days in training (compared to fewer days), there were associated decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.50) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.41) (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009).

This meta-analysis examined 59 high-quality studies of anti-bullying programs to determine what components are associated with positive outcomes. When children spent 270 or more days in an anti-bullying program (compared to fewer days), there were associated decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.51) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.42). Furthermore, when teachers spent 4 or more days in training (compared to fewer days), there were associated decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.55) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.44) (Ttofi & Farrington, 2009).
bullying program (compared to fewer days), there were associated decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.49) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.35). Furthermore, when teachers spent 4 or more days in training (compared to fewer days), there were associated decreases in bullying (Odds Ratio = 1.50) and victimization (Odds Ratio = 1.41) (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011).
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