

Bullying in Schools: A Critical Problem in Need of a New Approach

Thomas Lickona

Worldwide, one of 3 students reports being bullied. Bullied students do less well academically, often suffer social isolation, and are at greater risk of anxiety, depression, and other mental health problems that commonly persist into adulthood and are worse than the effects of parental abuse. Students who frequently perpetrate bullying are at greater risk of engaging in criminal conduct as teens and adults and having other poor life outcomes. Despite anti-bullying legislation in all 50 states and many bullying prevention programs, most of the problem remains. Because bullying typically feeds off a wider peer culture of disrespect and cruelty, a comprehensive character education approach is needed in order to build a positive peer culture and foster student virtues such as kindness and respect that function as psychological inhibitors of bullying. School and classroom strategies for building culture and character are described and research cited that support this promote-the-positive approach to the problem of school bullying.

As an elementary school student, Carl Walker-Hoover had enjoyed sports, Scouts, and school. But in sixth grade, he began to act out in class. He told his mother that some boys at school kept picking on him, saying, "You must be gay, you act like a girl." She complained to the school, but Carl was afraid to name the kids who were doing it. The harassment continued. One evening in his home, while his mother was cooking dinner downstairs, Carl hanged himself from a rafter. He left a letter to his mother saying he couldn't take it anymore. He was 11 (Wilson, 2009).

It took us a long time to wake up to how serious a problem bullying is and the toll it takes on our young. In the 1990s, the country was stunned by a surge in school shootings—50 in that one decade, culminating in the 1999 Columbine High School killings of twelve students and a teacher. A Secret Service study of school shootings found that 71 percent of the student shooters had been bullied—ostracized, harassed, ridiculed, threatened, or otherwise persecuted by their peers (Vossekuil, Fein, Reddy, Borum, & Madzeleski, 2002). The school shootings of the 90s were followed in the next decade by a wave of student suicides that appeared to be triggered at least in part by bullying, interacting with other factors such as troubled families, peer conflicts, and depression. In the single month of September 2009, there were nine such student deaths.

Countries around the world struggle with the problem of school bullying. The World Health Organization (2012) states that, across 38 countries or regions, one in three schoolchildren reports being bullied. A survey of British teens (Whitney & Smith, 1993) found that more than one in five said they were

“targeted regularly” by bullies. One-third of Canadian teens say they are bullied at school; 10 percent say they experience attacks daily (COLF, 2013). When I work with schools in other countries, there are almost always stories about bullying in the news. “Bullying in Schools a Worry in Indonesia—A Key Cause of Child Suicides” ran a typical headline. The article reported that a 15-year-old Indonesian girl had recently killed herself after being made fun of by classmates because she had failed several classes.

Verbal bullying, teachers say, is increasingly common, even in the early elementary grades. At the middle and high school levels, the emotional cruelties inflicted by peers—insults, taunts, rumor-spreading, exclusion, and cyberbullying—can become vicious. An eighth-grade girl who had been taunted about her weight for years, came to school one day to find that flyers had been circulated showing her head superimposed on a pig’s body with the caption, “Winner of Food-Eating Competition, Soon to Go to the National Competition” (Wellman, 2002). Says a high school girl about the bullying she did in junior high: “I made somebody bulimic. I’d say, ‘You are fat, you are disgusting. How much do you weigh—four tons?’”

Frequency of Bullying

How common is bullying behavior and being the victim of bullying? *Bullying in U.S. Schools* (Luxenberg, Limber, & Olweus, 2014), based on 200,000 anonymous *Olweus Bullying Prevention Questionnaires* collected from grades three through twelve in a representative sample of 785 U.S. schools, reported the following findings:

- **Perpetrators:** The percentage of boys and girls who admit on the questionnaire that they engage in bullying two to three times a month or more (the frequency standard used in the Olweus questionnaire) remains about the same across grades. In third grade, 7 percent of boys bully at that rate; in twelfth grade, 9 percent of boys do. In third grade, 5 percent of girls admit that they bully others two to three times a month or more; in twelfth grade, 4 percent of girls do. (Note that the “percentage of students who bully” would be *higher* if one were to base that figure on the number of students who bully *less often* than the Olweus standard of “two to three times a month.” In that sense, the Olweus standard provides a low estimate of school-bullying.)
- **Victims:** Bullying victimization (the number of students who are bullied), at least on this survey, appears to be highest in elementary school. In third and fourth grades, 22 percent of children say they are bullied “two to three times a month or more.” In seventh grade, 15 percent of students say they are bullied two to three times monthly or more. By twelfth grade, the number of students being bullied two to three times a month or more drops to 8 percent.

3 PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION – AN INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

- One-fifth of students who are victims of bullying say it lasted one to two weeks. Half of victims say it lasted “six or more months.” Nearly four in ten students say the bullying lasted *a year or longer*. And fully one-quarter of bullied students say they have been bullied *for several years or longer*.

The Damage to Victims

How does bullying harm its victims?

Academic problems. Students who are bullied develop negative attitudes toward school and do less well academically (Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simons-Morton, & Scheidt, 2001). Being excluded in kindergarten is linked to with lower academic achievement in later grades (Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1996). Among pre-adolescents, those who have few friends and/or get little parental support are most vulnerable to bullying’s negative effects on school achievement (Napolitano, Espelage, Vaillancourt, & Hymel, 2010). Victims of bullying are more likely to have poor school attendance and eventually drop out of school (Sharp, 1995).

Social-emotional problems. There have been scores of studies documenting the social-emotional effects of bullying. Victims are at increased risk for anxiety, depression, confusion, lowered self-esteem, self-inflicted violence, and suicide (Napolitano, Espelage, Vaillancourt, & Hymel, 2010). Students who are bullied are often afraid they will be bullied again and may stay home from school to avoid it. When they are at school, they may be ostracized by peers who blame them for the bullying they suffer. Reduced positive contact with peers reduces children’s opportunities for friendship, an important nutrient of emotional health and social development. Bullied children may also blame themselves for the bullying and see themselves as social failures (Graham & Juvonen, 1998).

The writer George Saunders, in a 2013 commencement speech at Syracuse University on the importance of kindness, put a human face on the emotional suffering caused by peer rejection. Ellen, the new kid in his seventh-grade class, was small, shy, wore funny glasses, and had the nervous habit of chewing on a strand of her hair. She was mostly ignored by other students but sometimes teased (“Your hair taste good?”). “I could see that this hurt her,” Saunders said. “I still remember the way she’d look after such an insult: eyes cast down, a little gut-kicked, trying, as much as possible, to disappear. After a while, she’d drift away, hair strand still in her mouth. Sometimes I’d see her hanging around alone in her front yard, as if afraid to leave it” (Saunders, 2013).

A major new study (Lereya, Copeland, Costello, & Wolke, 2015) reveals that the psychological damage that bullying causes—whether by exclusion, persecution, or both—is worse than previously known. This study, jointly carried out by Duke University’s School of Medicine and England’s University of Warwick, analyzed data from two longitudinal studies of thousands of youth in the United Kingdom and the U.S. It compared three groups: (1) young adults who had been bullied at school but not abused at home by parents; (2) young adults

who had been abused at home but not bullied at school; and (3) young adults who had been both bullied at school and abused at home.

The unexpected finding: The long-term harmful mental health effects of being bullied by peers were worse—much worse—than being abused by parents. In the UK, young adults (age 18) who had been bullied by peers in school were 60 percent more likely to suffer from anxiety, depression, and self-harming behaviors in adulthood than those who had been abused by their parents. In the United States, young adults (between 19 and 25) who had been bullied by school peers were four times more likely to suffer these kinds of adult mental health problems than persons who had been abused by their parents.

Youth who had been abused by parents were also more likely to be bullied by peers in school. Surprisingly, however, the mental health damage done by suffering peer bullying *and* parental abuse was no greater than the damage done just from being bullied. Dieter Wolke (quoted in Albernaz, 2015), part of the British research team, offered this interpretation of the study's findings: "A child who does not fit in is defeated in a major developmental task. As children grow older, they can move away from their parents, including abusive parents. However, they can never move away from peers."

The Damage to Bullies

Bullying deforms the character of the bully. It is typically part of a "problem syndrome" with negative personal and societal consequences. Bullies are more likely to have problems in school, use alcohol and marijuana, become involved in early dating and dating violence, engage in criminal conduct as teens, and have a criminal conviction as adults (Connolly, Pepler, & Taradash, 2000; Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simons-Morton, & Scheidt, 2001; Olweus, 1991). Olweus (1991) found that 60 percent of boys who showed serious bullying behavior as 10- to 14-year-olds had at least one criminal conviction by 24 years of age; 40 percent of these bullies had three or more convictions. Ttofi & Farrington (2011) found that bullying at age 14 predicted violent convictions between ages 15 and 20, low job status at age 18, drug use by age 27, and an "unsuccessful life" at 48.

The Damage to Bystanders

Half of students say they witness an act of school bullying at least once a month; more than 80 percent of bullying incidents are observed by bystanders (Craig & Pepler, 1995). In the past, bystanders have intervened only about 10 percent of the time, but bystander intervention increases when schools teach students how to take positive action (Frey, Hirschstein, Edstrom, & Snell, 2009).

When peer bystanders do intervene, half of the time the bullying stops—usually within ten seconds (Hawkins, Pepler, & Craig, 2001). When bystanders *don't* do anything to help, witnessing bullying has the potential to have various negative effects on bystanders: harmful impact on their character if they cheer on the bully or take pleasure in seeing the bully make someone suffer, copying the bully's aggressive behaviors, becoming desensitized to the suffering of others,

forming a habit of being passive in the face of injustice, and becoming anxious that they, too, might become the target of bullying.

Bullying Prevention Programs: How Effective?

Bullying prevention programs have proliferated. How effective have they been in reducing the number of students who bully and the number of those who are victims?

In the *International Journal of Violence and Schools*, Cohen, Espelage, Twemlow, Berkowitz, and Comer (2015) note that there have been a number of peer-reviewed meta-analyses that have examined the effectiveness of school-based bully prevention programs (e.g., Ferguson, San Miguel, Kilburn, & Sanchez, 2007; Merrell, Gueldner, Ross, & Isava, 2008; Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott, 2012; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). These research reviews have found program effectiveness to vary from no effects to low effects across different countries and contexts. The largest of the meta-analyses, Ttofi and Farrington (2011), examined forty-four studies carried out between 1983 and 2009 in 16 countries. It reported that: (1) programs on average achieved a 20–23 percent decrease in bullying and a 17–20 percent decrease in victimization (being bullied), and (2) the *Olweus Bullying Prevention Program* “worked best” and was the one most often copied by other programs.

Named after the Swedish psychologist Dan Olweus (1993) who created it, the *Olweus* program has been used by elementary, middle, and high schools in more than a dozen countries and 45 states in the U.S. The *Olweus* program has the following components: a school Bullying Prevention Committee; training for all school staff; parent awareness and involvement; clear, consistently enforced school rules about bullying; weekly class meetings on how to respond to bullying as a victim or bystander; supervision of all school areas during lunch and recess; individual meetings with bullying victims, perpetrators, and their parents; and pre- and post-implementation assessment. The *Olweus* organization conducted its own evaluation (Limber, 2012) of three years of K-12 implementation with approximately 18,000 students in over 400 hundred Pennsylvania schools. It reported—across all school grades—a 22 percent reduction in student reports of being *verbally* bullied and a 23 percent reduction in student reports of being *physically* bullied. The number of elementary school students who admitted they had bullied others two to three times a month or more declined by 27 percent in elementary schools, 35 percent in middle schools, and 31 percent in high schools. Critics (Cohen, Espelage, Twemlow, Berkowitz, and Comer, 2015), however, have pointed out that such data do not carry the same weight as findings from studies that include control groups and that are reported in peer-reviewed professional journals.

Steps to Respect (Brown, Low, Smith, & Haggerty, 2011) is another popular bullying prevention program with some evidence of effectiveness. Whereas *Olweus* is intended for K-12 use, *Steps to Respect* is designed for elementary

schools. According to its developers (Committee for Children, www.cfchildren.org), *Steps to Respect* has been used in 26 countries, every state in the U.S., and every province in Canada. It has a dual focus, on bullying and friendship. Students with at least one friend are significantly less likely to be bullied and are less likely to develop emotional problems as a result of being bullied (Hodges, Bolvin, Vitaro, & Bukowski, 1999). To help all students acquire the skills of making and keeping friends, the *Steps to Respect* curriculum coaches them in how to join a group, discover shared interests, manage hurt feelings, solve disagreements fairly, forgive misunderstandings, and resist pressure from friends to exclude others or otherwise be unkind.

The largest experimental study of *Steps to Respect* was carried out in 33 demographically diverse elementary schools in northern California (Brown, Low, Smith, & Haggerty, 2011). Seventeen of the 33 schools were randomly chosen to implement *Steps to Respect*, with the rest serving as the control group. *Steps to Respect* schools experienced a 33 percent reduction in the number of students who bullied. In a separate study, *Steps to Respect* significantly increased the likelihood that students would try to stop bullying whenever they saw it (Frey, Hirschstein, Edstrom, & Snell, 2009).

Redefining the Problem

Despite a national movement that has produced anti-bullying legislation in all 50 states and a spate of bullying prevention programs, the 2014 report *Bullying in U.S. Schools* concluded, "The prevalence of bullying is still one of the most pressing issues facing our nation's youth" (Luxenberg, Limber, & Olweus, 2014). According to that report's findings, one in five high school students has been bullied sometime during the past year, 22 percent of third- and fourth-graders are bullied 2-3 times or more each month, and half of all bullied students say the bullying has gone on for six months or more.

Even the bullying prevention programs with some evidence of impact, such as *Olweus* and *Steps to Respect*, when implemented in U.S. schools, have reduced the number of students who bully by *no more than a third* and the number of students who are victims by *less than a quarter*. Most of the bullying problem remains. Why?

To solve a problem, we have to define it correctly. To be sure, part of the problem schools face is bullying as researchers have traditionally defined it: repeated hostile acts, intended to harm, and carried out by someone more powerful than the victim. But a moment's reflection tells us that schools face a much bigger problem than dominant aggressors preying on weaker victims. The bigger problem is cruelty and disrespect of *all* kinds, including that between social equals and near-equals. Bullying feeds off, and contributes to, a wider peer culture that permits and promotes disrespectful and unkind behavior.

New light on the prevalence of a negative peer culture in schools comes from a study in *The American Sociological Review* (Faris & Felmlee, 2011). Researchers

asked 4,000 students, grades 8-10, whether they had ever engaged in peer aggression, defined as physical violence, verbal harassment, rumors and gossip, or ostracism. Fully one-third of students admitted engaging in one or another kind of aggression (social aggression being twice as common as physical aggression)—and the more popular students displayed more frequent social aggression.

Building Character and Culture

If we're going to make further progress in the battle against bullying, we need to see bullying as a *symptom*—of an unhealthy school culture and underdeveloped character in students. All young people are capable of both cruelty and kindness. When cruelty comes to the fore, it's a sign we need to do more to develop their capacity for kindness and respect *and* more to create a surrounding moral culture that brings out the best side of their character, not the worst.

This line of analysis is similar to the recommendations put forth in the article, "Rethinking Effective Bullying and Violence Prevention Efforts" (Cohen, Espelage, Twemlow, Berkowitz, & Comer, 2015). It called for a new focus on "promoting healthy school climates and positive youth development" rather than "simply targeting the eradication of bullying and related undesirable behaviors" (p. 7).

In the work that our college's Center for the 4th and 5th Rs (www.cortland.edu/character) has done with schools over the past two decades, we call this character-and-culture approach to preventing bullying the "kindness cure." It makes use of an old psychological principle: *If you want to weaken a negative behavior or attitude, strengthen its psychological opposite.* Combat the negative by promoting the positive. The kindness cure for peer cruelty has two parts:

- **Build good character:** Challenge and support all members of a school and its families in developing kindness and related virtues such as courtesy, caring, and self-control as habits that are practiced in daily life.
- **Build a good culture:** Develop a positive moral environment in the school and home—a culture of kindness and respect—that expects and brings out our best self, thereby helping all of us (adults as well as students) to act on our capacity for goodness. A positive moral culture also helps us grow to new levels of maturity in our character.

Let me describe just two examples of the combined power of character and culture to curb cruelty and bring out our best.

"Let's Be Courteous, Let's Be Caring"

Before bullying became a national concern, Winkelman Elementary School, on Chicago's north shore, had the kind of negative peer culture that is the breeding ground for bullying. Winkelman served a very diverse social and economic community; more than 40 languages were represented among the school's families. Some children came from families on public assistance; others arrived

at school in limos. Fights and mean-spirited put-downs were common. Students would also “smart-off” (“I don’t have to listen to you!”) to teachers and other adults in the building.

Winkelman’s principal and faculty decided that to deal more effectively with these problems, they needed a pro-active, character-centered schoolwide effort. At the start of the new school year, they launched a project they called “Let’s Be Courteous, Let’s Be Caring” that emphasized the virtues of courtesy and caring at every opportunity. I visited Winkelman as part of my research for *Educating for Character* (Lickona, 1991) on how American and Canadian schools were beginning to use character education to try to turn around schools with low levels of student achievement, high levels of behavior problems, or both. Winkelman’s overall student achievement was above the norm; it was student behavior they were concerned about.

When I walked into Winkelman’s lobby, the first thing I saw was a giant display defining courtesy and caring in terms of concrete, observable school behaviors: “Courtesy” was defined as: (1) Saying please, thank you, you’re welcome, and excuse me; (2) Being a good listener; (3) Waiting your turn; (4) Acting politely everywhere; and (5) Discussing problems. “Caring” was defined as: (1) Sharing; (2) Respecting others’ feelings; (3) Following rules; (4) Working cooperatively, and (5) Being a good friend. This was a clear effort to promote a school culture based on these norms.

Winkelman’s teachers took deliberate steps to create a parallel culture in classrooms. At the start of the school year, all teachers asked their students, “What rules do we need that will help us show courtesy and show caring?” Children were thereby learning to see rules as the expression of something deeper—shared values. When a student broke a classroom or school rule, a teacher would take the child aside and ask quietly, “Did that behavior show courtesy?” “Did it show caring?” In this way, students were learning to use those standards to reflect on their personal character and conduct.

Parents were asked to make a more conscious effort to foster good character in family life. When teachers had parent conferences, they said, “We’re emphasizing courtesy and caring at school, but we need your help at home.”

At weekly school assemblies—part of the effort to shape a positive school culture—students performed skits on courtesy or caring or invited speakers from the community to come in and talk about one or another of those themes. Finally, another new schoolwide norm called for every Winkelman student to do community service by working with the elderly or the physically handicapped. Students were learning to care by engaging in caring actions.

Winkelman’s school culture and student behavior steadily improved. Parents I interviewed said that fights had become very rare. Students said they liked Winkelman because kids were “just nice” and “didn’t pick on you.” In the

cafeteria, students said that if you forgot your lunch or didn't have much, someone would always give you some of theirs. A veteran teacher who had taught in several Chicago-area schools and came to Winkelman after it began character education, observed that Winkelman students showed "an unusually high level of respect for teachers and each other." Three years after beginning its Let's Be Courteous, Let's Be Caring initiative, Winkelman was selected, in a Chicago-wide competition, to receive a "For Character" award in recognition of excellence in both academics and character.

The Good Deeds Journal

In *The Kindness Cure* (Lickona, in preparation), I describe more than 50 character-and-culture-building strategies that schools have used to reduce cruelty by cultivating kindness. The Good Deeds Journal is an example of a strategy an individual teacher can use to promote kind behavior even if the whole school isn't doing it. This classroom activity comes from St. Rocco (Catholic) School (K-8), a U.S. Department of Education Blue Ribbon School in Providence, Rhode Island.

At the start of every school day, students take out their Good Deeds Journal and record a good deed they did the day before—in their class, school, neighborhood, or family—or a good deed they intend to do that day. Consider the psychological effect of that exercise: If children begin every day by planning good deeds, anticipating the good feelings that will come from doing them, and recalling the satisfaction of having done many such good deeds before, they are likely to be developing a prosocial orientation toward other people that will function as a psychological inhibitor of cruelty.

At St. Rocco, throughout the day, teachers reinforce the focus on altruism by helping students become aware of the many good deeds being done in their community and around the world.

After St. Rocco began its Good Deeds initiative, it saw a general increase in prosocial behavior. Children were more considerate toward classmates and schoolmates. One student wrote in her journal: "I like the Good Deeds Journal because it helps me to be more aware of helping others. I can even see an improvement in my friends because they are trying to be more courteous and kind to each other." Parents remarked on how their children were trying to be nicer to siblings and did more good deeds for neighbors without expecting or accepting anything in return.

This promote-the-positive principle—build character, build culture—has been the core idea driving the national and increasingly global character education movement. Dozens of school success stories like Winkelman's—see, for example, *2015 Schools of Character* (Character.org, 2015)—and a growing body of educational research (Cohen, Espelage, Twemlow, Berkowitz, & Comer, 2015) find that this character-and-culture approach pays double dividends: better academic performance and better student behavior. Currently, the Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues (www.jubileecentre.ac.uk) at England's University of

Birmingham is the pre-eminent international example of this growing movement to restore character development to the center of the school's mission.

Clearly, we must work to prevent cruelty and promote kindness not only in our schools, but also in our families and communities. As one 15-year-old girl said, "Bullying doesn't just occur in school—it happens everywhere." It can take place in the dark corners of a school corridor or on the edges of a neighborhood playground. It can happen in any organization, team, or club where there's hazing. It can happen in Little League or the NFL. It can happen among siblings in the home behind parents' backs.

If we're serious about preventing peer cruelty, we must systematically nurture the core virtues that are its psychological opposites—most importantly, kindness and respect. We must be proactive and vigilant about creating school, family, and community environments that cultivate these virtues, develop every child's capacity for goodness, and effectively respond to cruelty whenever and wherever it happens. In a world where cruelty and violence are too much with us, there can be no higher goal than developing compassionate human beings who have kindness and its supportive virtues embedded deep in their hearts and souls.

References

- Brown, E.C., Low, S., Smith, B.H., & Haggerty, K.P. (2011). Outcomes from a school randomized controlled trial of *Steps to Respect*. *School Psychology Review*, 40 (3), 423-443.
- Character.org. (2015). *Schools of character*. Washington, DC: Character.org.
- Cohen, J., Espelage, D.L., Twemlow, S.W., Berkowitz, M.W., & Comer, J.P. (2015). Rethinking effective bullying and violence prevention. *International Journal of Violence and Schools*, 15, 2-40.
- COLF (Catholic Organization for Life and Family). (2013). *Bullying: A plague to combat together*. Ottawa, CA: COLF.
- Connolly, J., Pepler, D., Craig, W., & Taradash, A. (2000). Dating experiences of bullies in early adolescence. *Journal of the American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children*, 5, 299-310.
- Craig, W.M., & Pepler, D.J. (1995). Peer processes in bullying and victimization: An observational study. *Exceptionality Education Canada*, 5, 81-95.
- Faris, R., & Felmlee, D. (2011). Status struggles: Network centrality and gender segregation in same- and cross-gender aggression. *American Sociological Review*, 76, 48-73.
- Ferguson, C. J., San Miguel, C., Kilburn, J. C., & Sanchez, P. (2007). The effectiveness of school-based anti-bullying programs: A meta-analytic review. *Criminal Justice Review*, 32 (4), 401-414.

11 PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION – AN INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

- Frey, K.S., Hirschstein, M.K., Edstrom, L.V., & Snell, J.L. (2009). Observed reductions in school bullying, nonbullying aggression, and destructive bystander behavior. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*, 466-481.
- Graham, S., & Juvonen, J. (1998). Self-blame and peer victimization in middle school: An attributional analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 587-599.
- Hawkins, D.L., Pepper, D.J., & Craig, W. (2001). Naturalistic observations of peer interventions in bullying. *Social Development, 10*, 512-527.
- Hodges, E.V.E., Bolvin, M., Vitaro, F., & Bukowski, W.M. (1999). The power of friendship: Protection against an escalating cycle of peer victimization. *Developmental Psychology, 35*, 94-101.
- Kochenderfer, B.J., & Ladd, G.W. (1996). Peer victimization: Cause or consequence of school maladjustment? *Child Development, 67*, 1305-1317.
- Lereya, S.T., Copeland, W.E., Costello, E.J., & Wolke, D. (2015). Adult mental health consequences of peer bullying and maltreatment in childhood. *The Lancet Psychiatry, 2*, 524-31.
- Lickona, T. (1991). *Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Lickona, T. (In preparation). *The kindness cure: Building character and culture, our best hope for preventing peer cruelty*.
- Limber, S. (2012). Olweus Bullying Prevention Program: Update from U.S. director, *Excellence & Ethics*, winter/spring 2012, p. 5.
- Luxenberg, H., Limber, S.P., & Olweus, D. (2014). *Bullying in U.S. Schools*. Center City, MN: Hazelden Foundation.
- Merrell, K., Gueldner, B.A., Ross, S.W., & Isava, D M. (2008). How effective are school bullying intervention programs? A meta-analysis of intervention research. *School Psychology Review, 23* (1), 26-42.
- Nansel, T.R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R.S., Ruan, W.J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among U.S. youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 285*, 2094-2100.
- Napolitano, S.N., Espelage, D., Vaillancourt, T., & Hymel, S. (2010). What can be done about school bullying? *Educational Researcher, 39*(1): 38-47.
- Olweus, D. (1991). Bully/victim problems among schoolchildren: Basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program. In D. Pepler and K. Rubin (Eds.), *The development and treatment of childhood aggression*. (pp. 411-448). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Sharp, S. (1995). How much does bullying hurt? The effects of bullying on the personal well-being and educational progress of secondary-aged students. *Educational and Child Psychology, 12*, 81-88.

- Ttofi, M.M., & Farrington, D.P. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A systematic and meta-analytic Review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 7, 27-56.
- Vossekuil, B., Fein, R. A., Reddy, M., Borum, R., & Modzeleski, W. (2002). *The final report and findings of the safe school initiative*. Washington, DC: U.S. Secret Service.
- Wellman, S. (2002). Reducing relational aggression. *The Fourth and Fifth Rs*. Cortland, NY: Center for the 4th and 5th Rs. Downloaded from "Newsletter archives" at www.cortland.edu/character.
- Whitney, I., & Smith, P. (1993). A survey of the nature and extent of bullying in junior/middle and secondary schools. *Educational Research*, 35, 3-25.
- Wilson, W. (2009, April 16). A parent's worst nightmare: The real story behind Carl Walker-Hoover's suicide. *Essence*. Retrieved from www.essence.com/2009/04/16/a-parents-worst-nightmare-the-real-story
- Wolke, D. Quoted in Albernaz, A. (2015). Is Bullying Worse Than Abuse? *Boston Globe*. Retrieved from <https://www.bostonglobe.com/lifestyle/health-wellness/2015/06/07/study-being-bullied-may-more-damaging-than-parental-maltreatment/kwrlwacD3tL1dSHFRL0yH/story.html>
- World Health Organization. (2012). Risk behaviors: Being bullied and bullying others. In C. Carrie (Ed.), *Social determinants of health and well-being among young people*. (pp. 191-200). Copenhagen: World Health Organization.