Issue Description:
Members of law enforcement, educators and psychologists are giving bullying a second look, recognizing its detrimental impact on the lives of bullies and their victims. Multiple studies have emphasized the link between bullying and antisocial and/or criminal behavior: approximately 60 percent of boys identified as bullies were convicted of a crime by the age of 24 and an astonishing 40 percent of bullies had three or more convictions by age 24.

Featured Program:
Some jurisdictions in the United States have successfully implemented the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program in schools, including the Chula Vista (CA) Police Department (CVPD). Olweus is a Norwegian program, developed in the mid-1980’s, that resulted in a 50 percent reduction in bullying behavior. The program emphasizes community involvement and the establishment of clear rules and policies against bullying. CVPD implemented the program in 2003 in collaboration with local schools, and saw a measurable reduction in bullying behaviors.

Goals/Objectives:
The CVPD began operating a bullying prevention program in order to reduce bullying in schools, and reduce the overall effects of bullying in the community, including school violence, truancy, and adult crimes.

Results:
According to continuing surveys, the program contributed to the following results:
- 17% less name-calling
- 19% less exclusion from groups
- 18% less hitting and kicking
- 13% fewer false rumors
- 21% fewer threats
- 12% less racial name-calling

Bullying has been reduced 23% in bathrooms, 27% in gym class and 11% in the lunchrooms. Significantly, 12% more students were willing to intervene if they witnessed bullying and 82% of parents agreed that the school was treating bullying more seriously.

Program Details:
The program was undertaken with annual surveys of students in three schools, starting in 2003. Each participating school organized an on-site Bullying Prevention Committee consisting of SROs, teachers, administrators, parents, campus staff, and Family Resource Coordinators. The research was funded by a state grant and implemented by an in-house Public Safety Analyst.
The Impact of Bullying: A Precursor to Crime

Bullying, once considered a normal part of childhood, has garnered national media attention in the wake of a series of highly publicized school shootings. In 1999, twelve students and one teacher were killed at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado. The year before Columbine, five persons were killed at Westside Middle School in Jonesboro, Arkansas. Post-event analysis produced evidence that the shooters, four boys ranging between 11- and 18-years old, were victims of bullying in their schools. The Secret Service and the U.S. Department of Education have reported that almost three-quarters of student shooters in these and other attacks apparently felt bullied or threatened at school. Members of law enforcement, educators, and psychologists have begun giving bullying a second look, coming to recognize its detrimental impact on the lives of both the bullies and their victims.

Studies have estimated that as many as one in three teenagers are involved in bullying, either as a bully or as a victim, and bullying is more prevalent at elementary and junior high schools than high schools.1 Throughout the country, education, health, and safety professionals have worked together to address the issue of bullying. Children are learning to identify both direct and indirect bullying, and they are learning how to cope with bullies. Direct bullying includes ongoing coercive and intimidating behavior, threats, or acts causing physical harm, while indirect bullying consists of ongoing acts such as verbal bullying (malicious teasing), and relational bullying (spreading rumors or excluding someone from a group). Some types of bullying, such as sexual bullying, can be both direct and indirect.

The impact of bullying has been affirmed in recent research:

- According to the National Center for Education Statistics survey “Student Reports of Bullying,” students who were bullied were more likely to report that they had “carried a weapon to school for protection (4 percent), as compared to students who were not bullied (1 percent).
- Bullied students were also more likely to report being involved in a physical fight (15 percent), compared to nonbullied students (4 percent).”2
- A 1998 National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) survey found that some bullies were seven times more likely than non-bullies to have carried a weapon to school in the last month.
- The National Education Association reports that 160,000 victims of bullying miss one or more school days each month because they are too afraid to go to school.3

Clear correlations emphasize the link between bullying and antisocial or criminal behavior, indicating that early intervention to prevent bullying may reduce an individual’s proclivity to commit crime. The nonprofit organization Fight Crime: Invest in Kids has reported that approximately 60 percent of boys identified as bullies were convicted of a crime by the age of 24, as compared to 23 percent of boys not involved in bullying. An astonishing 40 percent of bullies had three or more convictions by age 24, as compared to ten percent for nonbullies.4 According to a study done by Vanderbilt University business professor Mark Cohen, each high-risk juvenile deterred from a criminal lifestyle could save the country between $1.7 and $2.3 million.

Various schools have begun teaching Conflict Resolution courses as a way of coping with bullying. While some stand behind this approach, there are different opinions regarding its effectiveness; some believe conflict resolution may have a limited impact on bullying. Dr. Susan Limber, who co-authored the “Blueprints” Olweus Bullying Prevention Program and is the Associate Director of the Institute on Family and Neighborhood Life and Associate Professor of Psychology at Clemson University, is skeptical. “Bullying is a form of victimization. It’s no more of a ‘conflict’ than child abuse or domestic violence.” Instead, she argues, a more holistic or systemic approach is needed. That approach, she suggests, is undertaken in the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program.

An Effective Response: The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program

According to most bullying research, bullying is underreported and not well understood. Because of the dearth of information about bullying, adults often do not recognize or respond to bullying behaviors until it is too late. The director of the Maine Project Against Bullying (MPAB), Chuck Saufler, notes, “If there are no data about a particular region, people will refuse to believe there is a problem.” The prevalence of this attitude leads most bullying experts to invite schools to conduct regular surveys of their students. This survey is an essential part of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program, a program borrowed from Norwegian schools that saw a 50 percent reduction in bullying behavior after implementing the program in the mid-1980s. In addition to the local survey, Olweus encourages creating a school-wide climate against bullying. This means creating school-wide policies, train-

1 www.wabashplaindealer.com/article/2005/06/28/local_news/local1.prt
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ing staff on implementation of the program, providing adequate adult supervision, and holding assemblies to discuss bullying as a school-wide issue. In his 2004 article “Preventing Violence in Schools,” Dr. Stuart Tremlow, professor of psychiatry at the Baylor College of Medicine in Houston, argues that there are three effective approaches to countering bullying:

- Identifying at-risk students and intervening.
- Teaching students skills and knowledge that promote social and emotional competence and provide a foundation for reflective learning and non-violent problem solving.
- Developing systemic interventions that create safer, more caring and responsive school environments and, optimally, communities as well.

At the classroom level, teachers are expected to document bullying behavior, enforce rules against bullying, and discuss the issue with students during class time. “Develop a non-coercive classroom-management or discipline plan,” Dr. Tremlow suggests, “instead of consequence-based punishments.” Consequence-based punishment focuses attention on the bullying behavior only when it arises, rather than encouraging an ethic of respectful interpersonal interaction at all times. Non-coercive classroom management, on the other hand, demands a more holistic approach, focusing attention on the students’ overall behavior in the classroom and creating an environment with a consistent message with the goal of preempting any bullying behavior. Education professionals, as part of this program’s emphasis on community engagement, also intervene with children who bully and their targets, providing appropriate, gradual discipline and communicating with the parents to ensure the bullying behavior stops. In this way, teachers help raise awareness among parents and community members in order to create a comprehensive culture against bullying. According to Susan Limber, “the entire school as a community must be involved to change the climate of the school and the norms of behavior.”

The Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence (CSPV), a group associated with the University of Colorado and funded in part by United States Department of Justice’s Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, researched and evaluated the effectiveness of violence prevention programs. The CSPV identified 11 prevention and intervention programs that “meet a strict scientific standard of program effectiveness” to offer as Blueprints for Violence Prevention. One of the 11 programs identified as a Blueprint is the Bullying Prevention Program, modeled on Olweus. According to Blueprints for Violence Prevention, “In addition to costs associated with compensating an on-site coordinator for the project, the costs (which vary with the size of the site) for program expenses consist of approximately $200 per school to purchase the questionnaire and computer program to assess bullying at the school, plus approximately $65 per teacher to cover costs of classroom materials.”

The Role of Law Enforcement: The Chula Vista Example

Addressing bullying promises measurable returns in terms of crime prevention, violence reduction, and investment of scarce police resources. A long-term study of 856 eight-year-olds in New York State found that one in four of the most aggressive kids had an arrest record by the age of 30; just one in 20 non-aggressive children did.

The United States Department of Justice’s Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services (COPS) has specific recommendations for how law enforcement personnel should handle bullying and similar antisocial behavior:

1. **Enlist the school principal’s commitment and involvement.** The school principal’s commitment to and involvement in addressing school bullying are key. In fact, in comparing schools with high and low bullying rates, some research suggests that a principal’s investment in preventing and controlling bullying contributes to lower rates. A police officer’s knowledge of and interest in the problem may serve to convince a principal to invest the time and energy to collaboratively tackle it.

2. **Use a multifaceted, comprehensive approach.** A multifaceted, comprehensive approach is more effective than one that focuses on only one or two aspects of school bullying. A multifaceted, comprehensive approach includes: establishing a school wide policy that addresses indirect bullying (e.g., rumor spreading, isolation, social exclusion), which is more hidden, as well as direct bullying (e.g., physical aggression); providing guidelines for teachers, other staff and students (including witnesses) on specific actions to take if bullying occurs; educating and involving parents so they understand the problem, recognize its signs and intervene appropriately; adopting specific strategies to deal with individual bullies and victims, including meeting with their parents; encouraging students to report known bullying; developing a comprehensive reporting system to track bullying and the interventions used with specific bullies and victims; encouraging students to be helpful to classmates who may be bullied; developing tailored strategies to counter bullying in specific school hot spots, using environmental redesign, increased supervision (e.g., by teachers, other staff members, parents, volunteers) or technological monitoring equipment; and conducting post-intervention surveys to assess the strategies’ impact on school bullying.

---
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The Chula Vista Police Department in Chula Vista, California, has implemented a successful bullying prevention program following these guidelines. Using the Olweus Anti-Bullying model, the program was begun in three local elementary schools, funded by a School Community Policing Partnership grant. This grant was awarded in 2002 by the Attorney General’s Office and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and provides $325,000 over three years for school districts, law enforcement and community agencies to collaborate in reducing juvenile violence.

The program was set in motion with annual surveys of students in three schools that began 2003. The surveys were used to determine the frequency, location, and types of bullying. Then CVPD Public Safety Analyst Melanie Culuko, who led the effort to implement the program, created a four-hour training for School Resource Officers to educate them on the different types of bullying, long- and short-term effects, as well as the best practices in intervening with this behavior. The CVPD SRO unit has 17 officers, 2 Agents, and 2 Sergeants. Each school that participated in the program organized a Bullying Prevention Committee at the school site, and each committee consists of teachers, administrators, parents, campus staff, SROs and Family Resource Coordinators. In-house research analyst Culuko conducts and supervises the project, administering incident databases maintained at school sites, coordinating implementation, providing detailed analysis of the surveys, researching bullying prevention strategies, and training SROs. Culuko reports, “Every SRO has attended the training. Our officers reported that many of the issues they deal with at schools revolve around bullying behaviors.” The committee then develops a consistent message about bullying—delivered to parents, educators, and students—to prevent the students from getting mixed messages.

“The SROs have actually been a big driving force behind the expansion of the project,” Culuko observes. “When they respond to a call at a school that involves bullying they inform the administration that there are proactive steps that can be taken to reduce bullying in their school. In addition, schools often request an SRO to come out and speak to students about bullying. As a result, one of our SROs is putting together a PowerPoint presentation for officers to use in the classroom. The SROs also participated in the school-wide kickoff events at each of the schools.”

The Chula Vista Bullying Prevention Project is so successful that it has been adopted by nine total schools and recognized with a 2005 Helen Putnam Award from the League of California Cities. According to the continuing surveys, the following results have been achieved:

- 17% less name-calling
- 19% less exclusion from groups
- 18% less hitting and kicking
- 13% fewer false rumors
- 21% fewer threats
- 12% less racial name-calling

Bullying has been reduced 23% in bathrooms, 27% in gym class, and 11% in the lunchrooms. Significantly, 12% more students were willing to intervene if they witnessed bullying and 82% of parents agreed that the school was treating bullying more seriously.

Summary

In addition to grants such as that earned by the CVPD, Federal and State funding programs may be able to provide assistance in implementing an anti-bullying program at local schools. Safe and Drug Free Schools coordinators, currently funded in almost every school in America, is one possible administrator for the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. The Maine Project Against Bullying, mentioned above, is funded by a three-year Perkins grant from the Maine Department of Education. County Mental Health Associations, mental health professionals, and school counselors are also important resources in building a strong local effort to reduce bullying. Associated nonprofit organizations are great resources for information and education, from the local PTA chapter to the U.S. Health Resources and Service Administration’s Stop Bullying Now! Program. Some schools have also relied heavily on volunteers from the community. For instance, in Lansing, Michigan, Parents on Patrol (PoPs) volunteer to drive a police cruiser through the neighborhood around the school to try to increase the safety of children going to and from classes. They are there only as observers, to write down descriptions of those involved in bullying and violence. Parents are not permitted to approach or intervene, but are trained to report bullying behavior to the police.

Effective police response to bullying behavior helps to prevent crime and develops a stronger relationship between the local PD and the surrounding community. The model program described above offers one creative approach to addressing the problem of bullying and reducing juvenile crime—and statistics show that such early intervention may even lead to a decrease in adult criminal activity. Following the approaches suggested here, proactive policing, such as developing a bullying prevention program, might considerably enhance your department’s short- and long-term crime prevention efforts.
Bullying Research


OJJDP’s report entitled “Bullying Among Children and Youth” (Limber, Nation 1998) with a section about consequences. The high prevalence of bullying in schools is also discussed. An overview of the highly successful Olweus anti-bullying model is also included. The program focuses on intervention at the school-wide and individual levels.


OJJDP’s report “Addressing the Problem of Bullying” (Ericson 2001) offers some valuable background information on the presence of bullying in school-aged children. The article also focuses on the effects of bullying on victims, including poor behavior and performance issues in school. A brief summary of what can be done to reduce the problem is provided. Contact information for several academic sources on bullying are listed at the end of the article.

3.) “Bullying in Schools”—Office of Community Oriented Policing, 2002

http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/e12011405.pdf

The Center for Problem Oriented Policing provides an overview of the incidence and consequences of bullying from a police perspective in its article “Bullying in Schools” (Simpson 2002). They offer some valuable research on the extent of bullying in schools followed by some insight into the mind of a bully. The article also includes a section on how to assess local bullying problems effectively. There is also a helpful section devoted to several different police approaches to bullying and their success.

4.) “Indicator 12: Bullying at School”—Department of Education, Indicators of School Crime and Safety, 2005


This brief description of the rates and demographics of bullying is part of the Education Department’s “Indicators of School Crime and Safety 2005.” They have taken data from student surveys and prepared a report on the findings. The report discusses several factors in bullying rates, including school environment, ethnicity and age. There are also 2 charts that illustrate bullying by gender and grade level.


http://www.fightcrime.org/reports/BullyingReport.pdf

Fight Crime: Invest in Kids produced this policy oriented article entitled “Bullying Prevention is Crime Prevention.” The report begins with a statistical analysis of the incidence of bullying using a variety of statistics. The report also includes a detailed description of the effects of bullying on both the bully and the victim. Several successful bullying prevention programs are described, and a “what not to do” section is included.

6.) “Student Reports of Bullying”—National Center for Education Statistics, 2001


The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) produced an in-depth analysis of the 2001 School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey in its report “Student Reports of Bullying.” The report examines the frequency and characteristics of bullying in relation to a number of factors. NCES also analyzes the different emotions and behaviors that victims of bullying experience. Bullying as a source of crime, truancy and violence is explored, including the relationship between bullying and bringing weapons to school. A copy of the survey that was issued to students is also provided in the document.


http://www.urbancollaborative.org/pdfs/Bullying.pdf

The National Center on Secondary Education and Transition wrote an Issue Brief in December 2003 about the issue of bullying in schools, particularly of students with disabilities. The brief presents a strong argument for the need to act on a “steadily increasing” crisis. Bullying the disabled has created a divisive community in American schools in which some students are deprived of a proper learning environment. The article offers some policy solutions that could reduce the problem.

8.) “Bullies, Victims at Risk for Other Problem Behaviors”—National Institute of Health, 2003


This National Institute of Child Health and Human Development article provides an in-depth analysis of the psychological effects of bullying. The article, titled “Bullies, Victims At Risk for Violence and Other Problem Behaviors,” attempts to draw a relationship between bullying and future criminality. The effects on both the bully and the victim are explored, giving the perspective from both sides. The NICHD concludes using several statistics that there is in fact a strong relationship between violent tendencies and a history of bullying.

9.) “New Ways to Stop Bullying”—Monitor on Psychology, 2002

http://www.apa.org/monitor/oct02/bullying.html

“New Ways to Stop Bullying,” examines the characteristics of bullies from a psychological standpoint and analyzes different groups and sub-groups of bullies. There is also a description of
the tendencies and behaviors of school shooters. A section on creating effective prevention programs is also included.

10.) “Bullying: An Old Problem Gets New Attention”—Texas Classroom Teacher’s Association, 2005
http://www.tcta.org/edmatters/trouble/bullying.htm

The Texas Classroom Teacher’s Association prepared this article to illustrate the depth of the bullying crisis in America’s schools. They summarize the prevalence of the bullying problem and show the difference between mutual teasing and bullying. The article illustrates some failures in the way schools deal with bullying, and offers some suggestions to fix those problems. The TCTA also discusses multiple ways in which teachers and adults can deal with bullying when they see it.

Juvenile Justice/Law Enforcement Training and Technical Assistance Program

Project Background

The Juvenile Justice Law Enforcement Training and Technical Assistance Project, conducted by the IACP in collaboration with the Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, is a multi-year initiative focused on increasing the capacity of law enforcement and justice professionals to enhance their approach to dealing with juvenile justice issues. This project facilitates multi-agency responses to juvenile crime and strengthens law enforcement’s ability to holistically address youth issues. To that end, we deliver a portfolio of products and services that:

- promote the creation of multi-agency partnerships,
- increase the focus on juvenile justice issues,
- encourage the development of innovative and effective prevention and/or intervention programs, and
- educate law enforcement on pertinent juvenile justice issues.

Promising Practice Briefs

These periodic briefs deliver information to law enforcement and justice officials and address some of the gaps in contemporary juvenile justice policy and practices. Each brief highlights a promising program that addresses an important juvenile justice issue. Proposed topics for 2006 include:

- Truancy
- Repeat Offenders
- Gangs
- Sexual Offenders

Training

We currently offer five training workshops to law enforcement and juvenile justice professionals. Police, court and probation officers, school administrators and teachers, social service agency and other justice professionals attend. Course offered are:

Partnerships for Safe Schools

Focuses on improving school safety: course topics include principles of school safety, model school safety programs, and critical incident management.

Managing Juvenile Operations

Provides law enforcement, investigations, and community policing agency professionals with the tools and resources for improving their response to juvenile issues.

SHOCAP
(Serious Habitual Offender Comprehensive Action Program)

Emphasizes the development/enhancement of a proactive program focused on youth who repeatedly commit serious crimes.

Reclaiming the Lives of Our Youth Through Tribal Collaboration

This training, developed for delivery in Indian Country, assists native nations in developing and implementing effective plans for addressing priority juvenile justice problems.

Juvenile Interview and Interrogation

This course has been designed to lay a foundation for the development of the skills required to interview and interrogate juveniles.

Technical Assistance

Offered to agencies that meet approval criteria, technical assistance is provided to:

- facilitate the implementation of enhanced or new programs,
- evaluate the effectiveness of juvenile justice initiatives,
- provide assistance on improving or developing juvenile justice operations, policies, and/or programs.

For More Information

JuvenileJustice@theiacp.org
International Association of Chiefs of Police
515 N. Washington Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
1/800 THE-IACP (843-4227)
www.theiacp.org

This project is supported by Cooperative Agreement #1999-MU-MU-0021, awarded by the Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
“It started out with people calling me names, and then it got worse. They threw things at me, they vandalized my house, and they sang nasty songs about me in school hallways and classrooms. It got so bad that I felt like I was in danger physically.”

The young woman who spoke those words, Erika Harold, survived bullying and became Miss America 2003. But her experience in ninth grade left an indelible mark, and Erika has became a powerful spokesperson on the need for bullying prevention programs in schools across America.

Erika is a survivor, but that’s not the case for all victims or bullies. Research has shown that the two suicidal teens who killed 12 schoolmates and a teacher at Columbine High School had been bullied. Among my fellow members of Fight Crime: Invest in Kids is Beth Nimmo, whose daughter Rachel Scott was killed at Columbine.

In the aftermath of Columbine, America may no longer view bullying as simply one of the rites of passage kids must endure. Bullying spawns loneliness, depression, lack of self-esteem and suicidal tendencies among victims. However, law enforcement leaders are principally concerned with bullying because schoolyard bullies too often grow up to become violent criminals.

A Swedish study has found that nearly 60 percent of boys who researchers classified as bullies in grades six through nine were convicted of at least one crime by the age of 24 compared with less than a quarter of non-bullies. Forty percent of bullies were chronic lawbreakers—three or more convictions—by their 24th birthday. Only 10 percent of non-bullies grew up to be chronic offenders. Still, our country has done little to invest in programs that we know prevent bullying and reduce later crime.

The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program works with parents, teachers, principals, and students to establish school rules and provide adequate adult supervision on playgrounds and in hallways. When this program was replicated in 39 South Carolina schools, bullying dropped by 20 percent in those schools. Meanwhile, reports of bullying throughout the rest of the state continued to climb.

When violence occurs, law enforcement must respond appropriately. Yet, it’s far wiser to invest in prevention efforts before anyone gets hurt. That’s why Fight Crime: Invest in Kids’ 2,500 police chiefs, sheriffs, prosecutors, other police leaders and survivors of violence call on local, state and national policy makers to invest in proven anti-bullying measures for every school in America.

It will help potential victims and bullies live better lives, and make all Americans safer from crime and violence.