

Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion
Healthy People 2020 Spotlight on Health:
Bullying Among Adolescents Webinar, September 27, 2012, 12:00 p.m. ET

DR. DON WRIGHT: Welcome to the Healthy People 2012 Spotlight on Health Webinar Series. The theme of today's webinar is Bullying Among Adolescents. During today's webinar you'll hear from distinguished speakers. Dr. Dorothy S. Espelage, Professor of Child Development in the Department of Educational Psychology at the University of Illinois, Urbana Champagne, who will present on cyberbullying, populations at risk, prevention and systemic change.

You'll also hear from David Aponte, who turned his personal experience into action. David is a Regional Facilitator and a National Speaker for the Anti-Defamation League (ADL). In addition to his work with ADL, David is also serving as the co-chair of the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network, GLSEN, as well as the chair of the Northern Virginia chapter of GLSEN.

You'll also hear from Marci Feldman Hertz. As a health scientist in the Division of Violence Prevention at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Ms. Hertz is the Lead for the Division's programmatic effort to prevent youth violence before it starts in communities nationwide. Ms. Hertz will also be moderating today's discussion. Full presenter bios will be made available to the participants in today's webinar. HHS is committed to addressing bullying among adolescents.

According to the Secretary for Health, who recently spoke to the Congressional Black Caucus Anti-Bullying forum, we need to make sure every child can grow up without intimidation, without violence, without fear in their lives. We know that bullying is not only dangerous in the moment but the harm it does can last a lifetime. And so with that I'll turn it over to our first presenter and moderator Marci Hertz.

MARCI HERTZ: Good Morning or Good Afternoon, depending upon what part of the country you are in and thank you Dr. Wright so much for that introduction and for hosting this webinar on this very important topic. As Dr. Wright said my name is Marci Hertz and I am a Health Scientist here at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in the Division of Violence Prevention. And I am honored to be the moderator of this morning's broadcast.

I think that you will enjoy it. I think you will learn a lot of new information as you hear from my co-presenters this morning. Next slide.

Here's the overview of what we're going to go through this morning. I'm going to present an overview, the data, about bullying among adolescents and then I'm going to turn it over to Dr. Espelage to talk about cyberbullying and electronic bullying to give you some information those populations at highest risk to talk about prevention and systematic change. And then we will transition over to Mr. Aponte to talk about his story about how he turned his experience into positive action. And then I will address the last issue about solutions and action steps to identify, prevent, and address bullying. And then we will open it up for the questions and answers from all of you. Next slide, please.

So what is Healthy People? You have here some points about what it is. It's a national agenda that communicates a vision for improving health and achieving health equity for the entire country. It's frequently called a roadmap for health promotion and disease prevention. It's really about understanding where we are now and taking informed action to get where we need to be. And really

the guiding principle behind Healthy People is that by setting national objectives and by monitoring our progress we can motivate action.

And I think the prior experience with the Healthy People 2010 objectives has shown us that that is possible. Preliminary data suggests that of the 2020 objectives about 71 percent has positive progress made or were achieved. So that's encouraging for these 2020 objectives. Next slide, please.

These are the different ways that folks have used the Healthy People 2010 objectives in the past and ways that we anticipate that they would use the 2020 objectives moving forward, as a tool to measure program performance, as a framework for both program planning and developing new programs, as a tool to set agendas and goals, and these really apply at both the national, state and local levels, as well as a tool to teach public health courses as benchmarks for which states and locals can compare their data and as a way to develop and encourage non-traditional partnerships.

So here's the <http://www.healthypeople.gov> website. I think most of you or many of you have visited that site in order to register for this webinar. Highlighted here at the top of your screen as well is a plethora of other webinars that you should definitely investigate. And this is the site that you need to go to to find out more information about Healthy People 2020 and more information specifically about the injury and violence goals if you are interested. Next slide.

Here is the specific goal related to bullying prevention within the Injury and Violence Prevention subsection. You see here that the 2009 Youth Risk Behavior or YRB data had about 20 percent of students indicating they were victimized on school property during the year before the survey. Our target setting method is a ten percent improvement upon that goal. And that leads us to a target of 17.9 percent. Of course any amount of victimization is unacceptable, but this is what we feel is a reasonable and achievable objective over the next ten years. Next slide, please.

So what is bullying? Bullying really falls under the big umbrella of what we call youth violence. And the way CDC defines youth violence is violence by any person ages 10 to 24 years old against either, another person, a group or a community, with that youth behavior likely to cause physical or psychological harm. And under the umbrella you see different types of youth violence with bullying being one, just one of those subtypes.

I also want to note that although we define youth violence as violence committed by a person aged 10 to 24, that certainly does not mean that we believe that prevention efforts need to wait until age 10 to be initiated; they should certainly begin well before that. Next slide, please.

So what is bullying? This has actually been a subject of much debate. But generally it's agreed upon that there are three characteristics that define bullying. And that's that the behavior is unwanted and aggressive behavior, usually among school age youth. The second characteristic is that it's repeated over time or there's a concern that it could be repeated and it involves a real or a perceived power imbalance that favors the perpetrator. And by perceived we mean it could be something, for example, of perceived social status; someone being of a higher social status than someone else. It includes actions like making threats, spreading rumors, attacking someone physically or verbally or excluding someone from a group on purpose. And we'll talk about these subtypes in just a minute.

So why does this all matter? Is this just a bunch of researchers discussing theoretically what bullying is? No, that's not the case. It actually matters significantly how we define bullying. First it has significant implications for prevalence; if different surveys define bullying differently than we get widely varying

estimates of how prevalent bullying actually is. Second of all if it's defined differently we get varying risk and protective factors, varying things that might increase or decrease the likelihood that someone is a victim or perpetrator of bullying. And third all of this informs prevention strategies, what might be most effective. For example, if it's general peer aggression as opposed to bullying then a conflict resolution strategy might be appropriate whereas with bullying with the power imbalance, that type of strategy would not be appropriate. Next slide.

So as I said there are different subtypes of bullying. There's the physical bullying that I think was the more traditional form that folks think of, with the larger, physically larger child being physically aggressive towards the smaller child. There is verbal bullying. Indirect bullying, sometimes called relational aggression where the intent of the perpetrator is really to harm relationships.

And then there is electronic aggression. And we intentionally hear at the CDC have called it electronic aggression rather than bullying only because in the electronic environment it's sometimes difficult to tell if the behavior meets those three criteria. In other words, is it repeated, if it's just posted once but viewed hundreds of times, then if there is a power differential. Next slide, please.

So how prevalent is bullying? The 2011 Youth Risk Behavior Survey, which is a nationally representative survey of kids in public and private schools in grades 9 through 12 found the overall prevalence to be just over 20 percent. And here you see the breakdown by sex, with girls significantly more likely to indicate having been bullied on school property during the 12 months before the survey than boys.

The 2008-2009 School Crime Supplement data where we see the prevalence a bit higher, which makes sense because the subjects, the participants were slightly younger and we know that bullying actually peaks in middle school around sixth grade. And again we see the sex difference here with girls more likely to indicate victimization. And then the 2008 National Children's Exposure to Violence survey, which actually goes down to kids ages 10 through 17. And we see here that the most prevalent form of victimization is emotional.

And then finally the 2005 Health & Behavior of School-age Children, another nationally representative survey, shows here that boys are actually more likely to experience physical bullying than girls and report being more likely to experience verbal bullying than girls. But for the remaining three types, girls indicate that they are more likely to be victimized. Next slide.

So this is the YRBS data, again kids in grades 9 through 12. And then we see here the sex differences I mentioned earlier. But we also see here some racial/ethnic differences, with White youth being more likely than Hispanic or Black youth to indicate victimization on school property, and Hispanic youth being statistically more likely than Black youth to indicate victimization on school property during the 12 months before the survey. Next slide.

This is data from the School Crime Supplement. And the males are in the purple color and the females are in the aqua color. And here we want to see it similar in terms of females being more likely to indicate victimization either at school or being cyberbullied anywhere. What I wanted to draw attention to here is certainly cyberbullying is prevalent and is an increasing public health issue that we need to pay attention to. It still remains that kids are generally about four times more likely to experience bullying victimization at school than they are to experience cyberbullying anywhere, which certainly does not mean that we don't need prevention and intervention strategies for cyberbullying; it just means we certainly can't ignore the bullying victimization that occurs on school property. Next slide, please.

Here is the Healthy People 2020 bullying goal juxtaposed with the Youth Risk Behavior Survey data. And here we see the trend as I mentioned earlier in terms of bullying peaking in middle school and then decreasing with each subsequent year. So we see it's more prevalent in ninth grade and decreases in each year. And then that black line represents the ten percent decrease that we are hoping to bring about by the year 2020. Next slide, please.

Again we have data from the School Crime Supplement. Students here reported being bullied at school and that is the purple bar. And those that reported being cyberbullied anywhere, the aqua bar here. Here I want to draw your attention to the fact that for those who indicated they were bullied once or twice a month that's still more likely to happen at school than cyberbullying, although those who indicate bullying once or twice a week, it was slightly more likely that they reported that for cyber bullying.

I also just wanted to draw your attention to the adult notified, the far right bars, that those that are bullied at school were slightly more likely to notify an adult than those who were cyberbullied, which makes sense assuming that there's more increased supervision at school as opposed to wherever a young person might be, for example, when they receive a text message. Next slide.

So this is data from actually the 2001 Health Behavior of School Age Children Survey. The reason that I'm including it even though it's somewhat outdated data is because this is the last time from a nationally representative survey that we have data about the reasons that the victims thought they were bullied. And here we also see the importance of the definition. If we look at the other column, for example, if we look at males bullied ever, you'd see the most prevalent type of victimization with being hit, slapped or pushed. But if we look at frequent, which is once a week or several times a week, then the most frequent type is being belittled about looks or speech, followed by being the subject of sexual comments or gestures.

And being belittled about looks and speech and being the subject of sexual gestures are the types of reasons why females indicate they were bullied most frequently as well. Next slide, please.

So that concludes my portion of this first presentation. If you have questions at this time, please go ahead and submit them using the Q&A or question and answer function located on the right hand side of your viewing screen. We will respond to questions following all of the presentations.

Now I'd like to turn the presentation over to Dr. Dorothy Espelage, a long-time colleague of mine and a subject matter expert in the field of youth violence prevention and youth bullying, more specifically. And she's going to discuss cyberbullying, electronic aggression, the populations at risk, and bullying prevention strategies and systematic change strategies. Dr. Espelage.

DR. DOROTHY ESPELAGE: Great, thank you very much. I just also want to echo that I am excited to be part of this very, very important webinar and hope that my comments in the next 29 minutes will be informative and have you thinking differently about some of the things that you're doing on the ground and in the field, and looking at some of the most recent research. So we're going to cover a lot of ground in the next 30 minutes and I hope that some of this is useful.

When we think about the short and long term effects of bullying involvement, whether being a target or being the one that is directing the aggression toward other children, you know there's a number of cross sectional studies that have been reviewed and reporting here a meta-analysis by colleagues, and what they found overall that those kids that are the targets or those youth that are bullied have lower peer

status, lower social competence, negative community factors, meaning neighborhood factors that may compromise their risk and negative school climate.

On the other hand, we also see risks for those kids that are perpetrating the bullying and they have significant externalizing behavior, issues with social competence and academic challenges. They have a negative attitude toward others and their families can be characterized by conflict. However, I want to point out if you look closely at this meta-analysis you'll see that there's moderating affect at age. And essentially what that means by peer status.

What it means is that adolescents who bully have higher peer status than children who bully others, which supports this notion that during their early adolescence bullying could be a way to establish social status and that bullies might actually be popular. Now I want to turn back to what Marci was talking about a little bit and that is cyberbullying. Next slide.

To reiterate that you know the definitions are changing tremendously, cyberbullying Internet aggression, given that the phone is actually a computer now. But we know that it's a different mode of reaching out and deliberately and repeatedly directing hostile behavior or aggression toward another. Next slide.

If we look at some national data, longitudinal data, you'll see that the percentage when we look, we'll look at Internet victimization and cell phone text messaging victimization for kids 11 years to 18 years old in this nationally representative sample. When we look at the extent to which do we have an increase in bullying victimization on the Internet or cell phone text messaging. And as you can see that although in 2010 there's a little bit of an uptake in cell phone text messaging victimization, the rates have remained relatively stable. So again echoing Marci's comments that as much as we do want to attend to cyberbullying victimization we also have to recognize that the face to face bullying that kids are reporting tend to be much more prevalent. Next slide.

And here when we do think is cyberbullying victimization inescapable, you'll see that the percent of youth reporting bullying in person is much higher according to the data that were presented earlier in that in person bullying is 39 percent, by phone 10 percent, text messaging 14 percent, 17 percent online and ten percent in some other ways. And when we look at the pie chart to the right, when you look at the number of different modes that one is bullying in you'll see an overwhelming majority, 56 percent, are not bullied at all, cyberbullied at all. And then as we think about the other modes, increasingly the prevalence goes down. So we do want to put that in perspective. Next slide.

Well, where is it happening when kids are the victims of cyberbullying or Internet aggression? Overwhelmingly, 83 percent report that this is happening at home. We should be somewhat concerned about the 15 percent at school, but if you talk to administrators, they're feeling like they're losing the battle as far as monitoring cell phone usage. So increasingly schools are allowing cell phones in the schools and classrooms. And so that could be the 15 percent in those schools that are really struggling to monitor that. And again we see that an overwhelming number of kids when they're experiencing cyberbullying victimization they're experiencing this in one place, and it appears to be in the home. Next slide.

So I didn't present all of that research but if we were to look deeply into that growing up with media and that other study, what would we conclude? Well, we conclude that cyberbullying affects between 15 to 17 percent of youth each year. And harassment defined in other ways affects 38 percent. But the

bottom line is more than four in five youth who use Internet are not cyberbullied. So in some ways we need to put it in perspective.

And about one third of bullied and harassed youth are very upset. So two thirds report that sometimes when it happens, it may be rude behavior that they may just disengage in the IMing or somehow it's not distressing enough to kind of bring it to a level of concern. But we are concerned about a minority of eight percent of kids that report being bullied in person online and via text. So it's going to be very, very important as social media and other types of the network sites become, the world that kids live in we have to understand who are those youth that are at risk for getting victimized in various domains.

And there is a cause for concern that some of this data that's being presented here, that there is an uptake in Internet victimization, I mean, in text messaging victimization, excuse me, but Internet victimization doesn't seem to be increasing. But again as the phone becomes a computer, I think we're going to have to watch this data very carefully.

Now I'd like to shift us to two populations that are particularly at risk. And the first population, and these do not necessarily represent all of those populations that are at risk, certainly we just have highlighted two. And one is the population at risk includes the students with disabilities. If you know anything about the bullying research literature, you would know that in 1992 much of the research in the United States was focused on students with disabilities.

And only now recently, now in the last few years have we begun to become as concerned again. And what do we know? Well, students with disabilities were twice as likely to be identified as perpetrators and victims than students without disabilities. In addition, students with disabilities that are characterized or have diagnostic criteria associated with low social skills or low communication skills have a higher likelihood for involvement. So as the diagnostic criteria includes challenges around interacting with peers and integrating into networks, we see an increased risk for those students.

In a 2009 survey of families of children on the autism spectrum found that almost 40 percent of these students experience bullying. So this is something that we really need to pay attention to and focus our research endeavors on. Next slide.

There was a meta-analysis conducted with children with learning disabilities and eight of the ten children with a learning disability were peer-rated as rejected. And so we see that the kids having academic challenges within the context of our classrooms appear not to be integrated into peer groups. And eight of ten were rated as kind of deficient, if you will, in social competence and social problem solving, which may be leading to the further peer rejection that places them at risk for victimization. In addition these students were less often selected as friends by their peers. And we know from developmental research that as kids are isolated and do not integrate into the peer group that places them at risk for serious, subsequent victimization, especially during early adolescence. Next slide.

Now when we look at emotional behavior disorders among students, these students are three to four times as likely to be identified as a bully then a student without a disability. However, if you look at some of their most recent research that my colleagues and I have been doing, we have to be concerned about how it is that we receive that. It could be that they're engaging in reactive aggression, given the social competence challenges that they have. So much more research needs to be conducted on this. Also, students with learning disabilities experience comorbid psychiatric diagnoses have reported significant higher amounts of peer victimization. So it's not just simply the diagnostic criteria and the

label but it may be the kind of comorbid psychiatric diagnosis that challenged their integration within classrooms and school communities.

And so these children may stand out as targets. So there's a number of concerns that we have around students with disabilities and I encourage everyone to think about this, but think deeply about how it is that the environment's may be contributing to the manifestation of both bullying perpetration and how we can create safe climates in schools for kids to be included so we can prevent victimization over time.

The second group, (next slide), that I'd like to talk to you about are those LGBT, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgendered or Gender nonconforming youth. And there's been quite a bit of interest in understanding how our schools and school climates may place these students at risk. So what do we know? A large percent of bullying among students in middle school involves the youth of homophobic teasing and slurs. And for the purpose of this webinar we'll call this homophobic teasing or victimization and really kind of the use of homophobic epithets.

We also know that bullying and homophobic victimization occur more frequently among LGBT youth in American schools than among students who identify as heterosexual. In a recent study we found 85 percent of LGBT students reported being verbally harassed, 40 percent reported being physically assaulted in the past year because of their sexual orientation. So clearly the research is demonstrating that this is cause for concern. Next slide.

In a California study they found that 7.5 percent reported being bullied in the last year because they were gay or lesbian or someone thought they were. So clearly the numbers are specific to samples and the data collection method. But we do know that there's a pervasiveness of anti-gay language in schools that suggests that most school environments, not all, are hostile for LGBT students and create negative environments for even hetero-straight identified peers. Next slide.

I'm presenting some results here of a large study of seventh through twelfth graders. And what was nice about this study in some ways is that it started to show some heterogeneity. So as opposed to saying that all LGBT youth have risk profiles it was true that the findings said that compared to straight identified youth LGBT were a greater risk for suicide thoughts/attempts, victimization by their peers and unexcused absences. But follow up results actually found that there were different types of risk profiles that not all LGBT youth reported all of these outcomes. At the same time it highlighted that even when we consider the victimization that they experience within the context of school there was still some disparities for those most at risk LGBT youth. What does that mean? It means that other things are happening in their lives beyond victimization that might be contributing to suicidal thoughts, attempts, victimization, it could be issues around coming out to their family, it could be you know the church that they belong to, faith based organization, or society in general that's contributing to some of these adverse outcomes.

So we have to be very cautious about pointing to just victimization, but recognize that for the majority of LGBT youth they do experience victimization over time. But if they're placed in supportive school environments where there might be a gay straight alliance or they come from a family that's accepting then these kinds of adverse outcomes are minimized. Next slide.

Okay, so we talked about two at risk populations and certainly there are others that we don't have time to discuss, so I apologize if I left out a group that someone and you can ask questions about that. But I want to shift to, and is a nice transition because when we think about lesbian, gay and bisexual student issues within the context of schools, it's not always the sexual orientation, it could be those kids that are

gender non-conforming and that they're not fitting into that box. It also could be a result of our schools not being sensitive to different ways of gender expression. And it also could be that there's just an association between bullying victimization, this homophobic teasing and what we're going to talk about now is potentially subsequent sexual violence.

So I want to take you through a study here where we have followed fifth through eighth graders across five ways of data collection. And this is a sample in the Midwest. And there are three cohorts, fifth, sixth and seventh. We followed them over a two year period. They included 51 percent Black, students who identified as Black, and 34 percent that identified as White, and 60 percent of the sample were receiving free and reduced lunch. We gave them self-report measures across spring 2008 and 2010.

And given the time that we have, I can't go exactly through the methods. But let me give you some flavor for what these middle school students were reporting, as we think about the extent to which bullying is associated with subsequent sexual violence perpetration. When we look at the entire sample of the 1,300 kids, we find that those, both males and females that are reporting bullying others at high rates were about 12 percent. When we look at the extent to which kids are reporting directing homophobic epithets at other students, next slide, we actually find a nice contrast and differential. Here we have a middle school sample thinking between the ages of 10 and 14, depending, but 34 percent of the boys reported directing homophobic epithets at other students, whether their friends, not their friends, someone they thought was gay, someone they didn't know, someone they didn't even think about being gay, so 34 percent of them.

So you can see that this is as we have found in the last ten years of research homophobic bantering is alive and well, at least within this middle school context in the Midwest of the U.S. For females they're also contributing to this banter as well. Twenty percent of them are reporting this on a regular basis. And these figures are in the last month that they're engaging in these behaviors.

So when we look at the extent to which, next slide, on the ground rape prevention educators are engaging in bullying prevention because it's much more palatable for principals and superintendents to have someone come in and say I'm going to help you with your bullying problem, but yet we know that homophobic bantering and even sexual harassment is quite prevalent in our schools. Will those bullying prevention programs that might be garden variety that do not talk about gender non-conformity or they do not talk about sexual orientation as being a target, will they be effective? Well, I think the jury is still out on that, but this particular paper that we published here is clearly showing a connection longitudinally between those kids that perpetrate bullying here where it's defined as name calling, rumor spreading, and some threats of harm is associated with sexual harassment perpetration over that two year period. Now sexual harassment perpetration within the context of middle school, we're not talking about rape or sexual assault, we're talking about a lot of commentary.

And so, what we find here is that bullying perpetration, homophobic name calling is prevalent to start with, and then youth who bully resort to homophobic name calling over the middle school years. And we've actually found a real causal link between those kids that engage in bullying and those that engage in homophobic kind of bantering. And then we also find that there are strong longitudinal associations between bullying, homophobic bantering, and sexual harassment perpetration. So it's very clear that as you're implementing bullying prevention programs at the ground, there must be a consideration about this homophobic language that seems to be a precursor to sexual harassment perpetration. And those are kind of your take home, take away messages on there.

In addition to that, next slide, we don't have time to talk about this but research is starting to show that that relationship between bullying and sexual harassment perpetration in the middle school years is actually moderated or moderated by traditional masculinity, and I'll say it this way, students who bully others are more likely to also sexually harass. But this longitudinal association is strongest for those boys and girls that adopt traditional masculine ideology. Put another way, if boys and girls think that boys should be stoic, not express emotion then they're bullying of others will lead to an increase in sexually harassing behavior, because the best way to demonstrate that perhaps you're not straight identified and heterosexual in response to homophobic bantering that may be in that middle school climate may be to publicly sexually harass another student.

So we need to think about traditional masculinity. It's encouraging because it's something that we can, it's a point of intervention in our schools, that we can talk to kids about the gender box and traditional masculinity and its role.

Now we're going to shift a little bit and talk to you about what is working. Where do we need to go from here? Have we done a good job? Well, in the first meta-analysis in 2008 evaluated the effectiveness of 16 bullying efficacy studies across six countries. Six studies in the U.S. And fortunately, only two of those six U.S. studies were published. And the results are very, very clear. There was small, to negligible effects in these programs. If we were to you know, be more optimistic about whether or not there would be long term effects and we would you know, use a different error rate and look towards the future, there were small positive effects found for enhancing social competence and peer acceptance, and then increasing teacher knowledge and efficacy.

So we have to keep this in mind, if in fact those programs are frameworks, are going to be implemented by teachers. It appears that if we increase our knowledge and efficacy we might see a movement. But the reality is this study found that we're having no impact on decreasing bullying behaviors. If we draw to a larger, the Campbell collaboration where they are looking at a number of programs across multiple countries, again the U.S. doesn't fair very well in that particular report. But they also found that programs that are effective in European countries include parents, use of multimedia, and then again more evidence that targeting those teacher's competence in responding to bullying led to significant reductions in bullying in those European countries in those studies. I'm going to speak more to that study in just a few minutes. Next slide.

So where do we go from here if in fact we're having limited success, although I'm going to talk to you a little bit later about some promising social emotional learning approaches to bullying prevention. What we need to recognize that bullying co-occurs with other types of aggression and other risky behavior, like delinquency and alcohol and drug use. So maybe there's over, we know there's overlapping risk and protective factors that need to be targeted in school-based programs, in order to address the spectrum of problem behavior. We need to really consider interventions that would target all of these in protective factors and help us with multiple outcomes, especially given the constraints on schools to do this type of programming. We also have to recognize the research that strongly shows that programs should address the peer and social norms going back to the meta-analysis that shows that actually bullying behavior could be associated with popularity or high social status. Next slide.

In addition to this we need to recognize that our schools are changing tremendously and they're not only changing but they're just different across the geography of the United States. And we have to evaluate the extent to which these programs and frameworks are effective and whether or not demographics affect the efficacy. For example, in one of the studies of the well-known OBPP program,

reductions in victimization were found only for White students and not for the large sample of Asian or Black students. And we need to be sensitive to demographic impacts.

We also need to consider how classroom management skills and implementation levels impact a program's effectiveness. If in fact we're going to put these programs in the hands of teachers and they have compromised classroom management skills, this might impact their efficacy. I think we've come a long way in raising the public awareness of Healthy People but I also still have comments from schools, administrators and parents about whether or not they're really seriously motivated to have a serious conversation about bullying prevention.

But overall what we need to recognize is that research evidence must inform the next generation, so some of the research that I've presented here, this must inform the modification and enhancements to the programs that are out there on those lists that schools are selecting. We also have to pay much more attention to implementation and sustainability and we must infuse innovation into our basic applied scholarship as we move forward in bullying prevention. Next slide.

One example is there's quite a bit of discussion around bystander empowerment. And so we wanted to conduct a meta-analysis to show, okay, are these bystander intervention programs that directly target those kids intervening to help a victim, do they work? And very optimistically we found that they do. In this meta-analysis we were able to find 12 school based interventions that directly targeted interventions among about 13,000 kids. And it revealed that overall the programs were successful, .21. That's really good. We're happy usually with .13, so this is good.

With larger effects for high school samples, you see the effect size is .44, meaning that in high school there might be more consideration of intervening and taking that risk versus in K-8, which was the typical effect size of .13. But the bottom line, this meta-analysis indicated that programs were effective at changing bystander behavior both at a practical and a statistical significant level. I would add there that also in that paper, we found that the shorter duration of one to two months actually is more effective than long term extended interventions. But again, that's the first meta-analysis to look at bystander intervention.

If we take all of this kind of research together about what we're doing and what's starting to work, we also need to think about when there's that large meta-analysis out of the Campbell collaboration made it very, very clear that the reductions are associated with parent training, increased playground supervision, non-punitive disciplinary methods, meaning do not use suspension. Those programs that worked had a component of home school communication; they focused on classroom rules, classroom management. But they also embedded this material within the curriculum, so it wouldn't just be this add on, but in fact it was integrated. And many of these approaches were social-emotional, focused on social-emotional learning.

So in the time that we have remaining, I want to talk to you a little bit about some of these promising social-emotional learning approaches. We do know from research that schools that have social-emotional learning programs in place, whatever that might look like, there is an 11 percent increase in academic functioning. We know there's a decrease in disruptive behavior.

Well, what is social-emotional learning, which is an umbrella term that came out of a 1994 conference? It really is, the goal is to develop self-awareness and self-management skills in children to achieve school and life success by being able to identify and manage their own emotions and behaviors, recognize

personal qualities and who they have in their social support system, and demonstrate skills related to achieving personal and academic goals.

The next goal of social-emotional learning is to take that, use that social awareness and interpersonal skills to establish and maintain positive relationships. So we in social-emotional learning programs, we encourage the recognition of feelings and perspectives of others, recognizing individual and group similarities and differences, using the communication and social skills that are taught repetitively within these programs to interact effectively with others and trouble shoot conflictual situations. And then demonstrate an ability to prevent, manage and resolve interpersonal conflicts in constructive ways.

Goal three is to demonstrate decision-making skills and responsible behaviors in personal, school and community contexts. So we want to teach ethics and safety and making good decision making to ultimately contribute to a well-being of one school and community. So really social-emotional learning framework, next slide, is based on the risk and protective factors that we've discussed, bullying research, also understanding brain research and the development of the adolescent brain, taking a positive approach to problem behavior, instead of just saying stop bullying or intervene, actually encouraging positive approach to this. And then taking a developmental need lends to understanding social-emotional learning programs.

So I'm going to highlight here in the time that we have, two studies. And one is a randomized clinical trial of the Steps to Respect. And this was a randomized clinical trial in 33 elementary schools, so essentially this is third through fifth grade classrooms. It's a one year pre-post data collection from school staff, teachers and students, so multiple reporting. And here you see that this sample, 25 percent were rural, 10 percent small towns, 50 percent suburban and 15 percent mid-sized cities. Next slide.

And so what were the program components of Steps to Respect? There's a program guide developing an anti-bullying policy for the school wide and parent component, gaining that staff buy-in and then implementation information and training. The staff training was quite extensive to introduce them to the SEL framework and then how to implement and trouble shoot implementation; and then added to this, remembering again back to the previous meta-analysis that parents are very, very pivotal. There's an annual letter from the principal, there's parent night materials and parent handouts; continual communication with the parents to understand what's happening.

There's ten skills, lessons that focus on friendship skills, recognizing bullying, refusing and reporting bullying, but also bystander skills and identifying barriers to bystanders. And literature lessons which reinforce the Steps to Respect concepts while addressing language arts objectives, so integrating within the curriculum.

So what did they find? They actually, next slide, they found from a teacher report that teachers evaluating the kids, there was an increase in social competence and a decrease in over physical bullying, with an effect size of .13. Next slide. From a student report they found that teachers and staff were implementing bullying prevention, which makes sense; there was an intervention, and they found that students intervened and they did it through positive bystander behavior. And also the teachers and staff were responsive to the bullying that happened. And remarkably overall there was an improvement in their perceptions of school climate, so school connectedness and staff climate.

Now, next slide, I'm going to talk to you about now moving to middle school, the Second Step, a program that a randomized clinical trial that's funded by the Centers for Disease Control. And here we

have a group of sixth graders that we have now followed who are in eighth grade. They have received 15 lessons in sixth grade, 13 lessons in seventh grade and 13 lessons in eighth grade. And next slide. Within these, there's five programs themes across this middle school curriculum from sixth to eighth grade. And that includes empathy and communication, bullying prevention, emotion management, problem solving. And because both bullying victimization and being a perpetrator of bullying is increasingly becoming associated with substance abuse prevention there is substance abuse prevention programming within each grade level as well. Next slide.

So what did we find? And I'm presenting here the pre-post and the first year where the kids received 15 lessons of social-emotional learning. And what we found at randomized clinical trials that individuals in the intervention schools were 30 percent less likely to report fighting other students. So physical, again that physical form of aggression and bullying was reduced substantially in intervention schools in comparison to control schools. And so those are showing some promising results of the use of social-emotional learning. And so I am optimistic that these types of programs will be considered. So overall, as we've talked today, there's lots of things that we can talk about implications for prevention programs, but it's very, very clear that just giving kids definitions of bullying and knowledge about bullying may not be pushing us in the right direction that we need to give them life and social skills and communication skills around the social-emotional learning kind of goals that we have. We also need to consider developing secondary and tertiary programs, not just these universal prevention programs, but think about what else kids might need.

It is very clear that anyone that's doing bullying prevention within middle schools in the United States needs to not only consider but definitely incorporate a discussion of sexual harassment and homophobic language. If it's just do not allow that homophobic bantering to occur. That's a good start. And then we have to recognize that the peer norms within the context of middle schools is not only contributing to the onset of bullying in our schools, but is contributing to the sustainability of that. And so we have to think about what are those pro social ways that we can encourage peers to engage in that pro-social behavior. I thank you very much for your time.

MARCI HERTZ: Great, thank you so much Dr. Espelage. Again if you have questions, please go ahead and submit those using a Q&A function at the right hand side of your viewing screen. And we will respond to those questions following all of the presentations. Now, I'd like to go ahead and turn it over to David Aponte.

DAVID APONTE: Thank you for taking the time to be here today. And I just wanted to thank the Department of Health and Human Services for inviting me to be part of this webinar. It truly is an honor to speak about this cause. Go to the next slide. So what I'm going to share about this is turning experience into action. And I'm going to incorporate a lot of personal examples from myself as well as some examples from what I hear when I talk to students around the country.

And to start off I'm going to talk a little bit about me and what drives me and other students, so a little bit about my past and what has driven me to really join the causes that I'm a part of now. Next I'm going to talk about what experiences mean and that's taking all of the amazing research that people like Dr. Espelage has done and going beyond the numbers and seeing exactly how this goes in school. Also next would be what goes wrong. So taking programs that already exist in the country and improving them. And then we'll talk about what's being done, so some student ideas that are currently going on or student programs and developing them, and making them be our bullying programs. Also for the last topic, how we get there, so personal takeaways for the future. Next slide, please.

So a little bit about me, what I'm currently doing. I serve as a Regional Facilitator and a National Speaker for the Anti-Defamation League, which was originally created as an organization to combat anti-Semitism. But now that's various forms of bullying and harassment around the world, and specifically has A World of Difference Institute to focus on K-12 schools. I also serve as a Co-chair of the National Advisory Council as well as the Chair of the Northern Virginia Chapter of the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network, which is an education organization for K-12 students and sponsors gay straight alliances throughout the country, as well as events like the Day of Silence and the Ally Week, which is coming up in a few weeks. And then of course personal background I am currently a junior at George Washington University in Washington, D.C. and I am pursuing a major in integrated information science and technology. Next slide.

So a little bit about my past and what drove me to do what I'm doing now. And that would be that unfortunate I was bullied severely in elementary school for being Jewish, short and for being intelligent. Now living in a conservative area, a roughly conservative area I did hear a lot of anti-Semitic comments in high school and throughout my school career as well. And as a result of the bullying and victimization, I did see a severe drop in academic performance, I was depressed for several years and also I was suicidal for several years as a result of everything that was going on. Next slide, please.

So now a little bit about experiences. So what do experiences mean? As far as students go when they're impressionable and learning everything about themselves; it can do a lot of to have different types of experiences in school. So it can drive things like self-image, it can dictate what and how students do what they do. It can dictate how they interact. It can drive us as adults and supporters to be better. It can drive students themselves to be better. And it can seriously help the world if we see positive experiences. Next slide.

So self-image. Experiences drive a lot with self-image. And when somebody gives a negative experience or when somebody has a negative experience, it can be something immediate, life changing and it's superficial, constant, generally you constantly hear things about yourself and it can constantly be breaking you down. Whether someone is making a comment or not, it's easy. And it can be influenced by one person. So whereas other forms of victimization and other experiences can be or have to be driven by a lot of people. Somebody can make one negative comment about your appearance and it can really destroy your self-image. Next slide.

So experiences can dictate what students do. It can dictate the clubs that they join in schools, the leadership positions that they hold their out of school activities, their relationship with their parents. And if they have a significant amount of negative experiences, what we see is that it can drive substance abuse as well as a continuation of illegal activities. Next slide.

It can dictate how students do. So I mentioned this as something personal for me before. It can dictate how their grades are, whether they drop or get higher based on their experiences. It can dictate the job that they hold, how their social life is, their mental health, the current positions that they hold within the world, whether they're seen as "a member of good standing", whether people like them and get along with them. And also very importantly it can dictate the position of the family member. Next slide.

It can dictate how students interact. And I think the picture really kind of says it all here. A really important relationship during a child's development is with their parents. And a negative experience at school when you don't want to listen to your peers, they can really turn off from their parents as well. You can stop listening to your parents. And overall this can cause negative impact to student

relationships, also student/teacher relationships, and at worse it can cause a negative relationship with yourself, which can include self-harm and depression and a variety of other things. Next slide.

Positive experiences can drive adults to be better. And with this we see better interaction between adults and other adults as well as adults and students. Higher awareness amongst adults, a broader approach when we deal with things like bullying and harassment, more effective approaches or more willing to help out and support students on a variety of issues. And overall as adults and as students you see a happier environment. Next slide.

Also it can drive students to be better. So I decided to take this picture of Zach Walsh from the Democratic Convention which was a few weeks ago. And in that we saw Zach who is a young American speaking about his two lesbian parents, which for me sitting there watching TV was completely motivating. And this kind of thing is what we see motivate students when they see their fellow peers in leadership positions it can lead to more positive experiences in school. So with that comes higher graduation rates, more college success, better jobs that the students are holding, leading to more student achievement, more leaders amongst the students and very importantly we see more student voices at the table for a variety of things. Next slide.

And last, but not least, it can certainly help the world. When we see positive experiences around the world, especially in schools, we improve our quality of living. So we see a better economy, with that people are driven to hold higher jobs and do more, happier people, a better global relationship, especially with the Internet now and victimization as was mentioned before can happen on the Internet, the Internet is a lot safer with the better relationships amongst people throughout the world.

Also leading by example, where we see students and adults alike leading by example and the United States being a beacon really, of hope as it was before. And also we see more leadership amongst students and more intervention when issues of bullying and other issues of victimization occur. Next slide.

So now a little bit about what goes wrong. So there are a lot of programs out there as Dr. Espelage mentioned. She has some benchmarks for ones that work really well and then also there are some that don't work as well. And what we see that goes wrong in a lot of those that don't work quite as well are that student experiences are ignored, there's just a one-sided approach completely to the issue of bullying, generalization of students, tokenizing of one student or a couple of students, labeling of a student's issues, suppression of their voice, dramatization of the actual problem and then adultism between both adults and students. Next slide.

So as far as examples go, bullying lectures where students are basically herded into a classroom or an assembly, hear a lecture that ultimately amounts to bullying is very, very bad, and that's about it. Also, unilateral bullying policies that are bullying policies across the board, so no matter what happens it's treated the exact same way with the same discipline. Also, idea sheets where instead of actually going to a program, students are just handed ideas of how to deal with bullying; one student voice: the tokenizing of one student where this one person within the school community is expected to speak for all of the students in the community. Also targeted, bullying programs where school may just have a bullying program directed at LGBT students or high risk populations when really it could be a school wide problem. Also self-harm where we see students because their voices are suppressed or they think that nobody cares that can lead to self-harm for the student.

And then for dramatization when there's an automatic link to suicide, so if they talk to a guidance counselor and they say that they're depressed, they're being bullied the guidance counselor immediately thinks, or whoever it is within the school, immediately wants to link that to suicide and that can lead to even more self-harm for the students. And then lastly, the counselor knows best mentality where no matter what student comes in there with that experience, it's kind of like a scripted answer where the counselor really knows what's best for the student and they discount whatever the student believes. Next slide.

So as far as what's being done, positive examples, this may be a little bias to what I've had experience with, but the best one I've had is with the Anti-Defamation League World of Difference Institute, I was part of that since sixth grade. And that really was what turned me around when I was being bullied and when I was depressed and suicidal. If not for the World of Difference Institute I might not be here, certainly I wouldn't be in the position I am today.

And what they do with that program is they train student leaders all over the country to further go out and train their fellow students. So I know when I was part of the program we would get trained by somebody from the Anti-Defamation League, which is the role that I now serve, and then we would take that knowledge and go into freshman classrooms and teach them about what we heard and how to respect their students and how to create a safer school environment.

GLSEN student leadership is also a positive example. And what's great about this is that they have national and local teams. So for GLSEN Northern Virginia we have a team that this year will be about 20 students that go around and make sure that schools are safer for LGBT students as we saw earlier. There is a higher risk for LGBT students. And there's also a national team. And what that does is it creates a support network for students and lets them know that they have a place to go to if they do need support.

Also, the Trevor Project, which provides a variety of resources for students and adults alike and provides a suicide hotline, also for immediate help if a student needs it; and what's really important about the Trevor Project is that they have student employees and interns. So this is going back to earlier where you see students in leadership positions and it's a conversation amongst peers instead of having to talk to adults, which leads to better conversations. Next slide.

So also on a federal level I had the wonderful opportunity and some students that are part of my GLESEN chapter also had the opportunity to go to some White House conferences as well as a couple of the Department of Education conferences focus on bullying. And what was really great to see at this event were the student role models that were there. I know myself I'm a college student, but I learned a lot from the high school students and actually we had middle school students there as well, and I learned a lot from them. And it was amazing as always to see students as the leaders there.

Also Day of Action, I mentioned the Day of Silence earlier, which is usually held in April by GLESEN and is widely participated in. And it's a day to build awareness among students for LGBT issues. And it's something that mostly students organize. Suicide Prevention Day, which was just started actually a few weeks ago, is a completely student run event where students wear a certain color, I believe this year it was purple, and it's a simple way that students can organize to build awareness around the issue of suicide. And what this does is it really puts students at the forefront and shows their peers that they can organize as well. And also student organizations, so gay straight alliances or student run clubs that are forums for other students and act as again support networks students can join. Next slide, please.

So personal takeaways. Definitely these are some things that I thought were very important that whenever you have a bullying program or whenever you have an issue of bullying these are some things that in my opinion must be done and are certainly encouraged to do when dealing with an issue of bullying. So firstly student opinion, bringing students to the table whenever possible, making sure that their voice is not left out, if you're going to talk about youth and talk about bullying amongst adolescents then adolescents need to be a part of that discussion. And then leadership opportunities, letting students take ownership of the problem. So if you sit down with a good team of students and let them know, hey, bullying is a problem at our school, what can you guys do about it as students, putting them in that leadership position and giving them some of the, part of the task. Also resources, making sure that students have the right tools to lead, so if they need basic materials or if they need contacts or a method to contact other people about the issue, then giving them those tools.

Also encouragement, so taking a step back from whatever the situation is, reassuring the student that they're doing a good job as long as they are doing a good job. Of course, you don't want to tell them something that's false. And the supporting them in whatever it is that they're trying to do and making sure that they're successful. Next slide.

Also attending events. I know within Northern Virginia we're happy to have several student run events throughout the year. And it's always great to see adult presence at those events, that they're learning and making themselves more aware of what's going on within the school community and within the student community. And it's a great way to gain knowledge about that. Talking to the Anti-Defamation League. Again a little bit of bias here, but I have seen several situations where the Anti-Defamation League has turned a school around as far as bullying goes. And if it's an immediate problem the Anti-Defamation League, certainly a huge organization and they can respond very quickly to whatever that need is.

Also taking individual experience seriously, acknowledging each experience and what it brings. So not just thinking that one student's bullying experience is like everybody else's. And that student comes into your office or wherever it may be, take it seriously and acknowledge that it's their experience and what you can do about that experience, not necessarily everybody else. And prioritizing, so recognizing when as an adult or supporter to step up and take the leadership role within an event or within an organization and then step back as well and letting students take the lead. Next slide.

So understanding the role. This is just a little bit more basic of the last one, but just understanding whether a student or an adult should be involved. In some cases if the students are having a good discussion about issues that they may think are sensitive than maybe adults shouldn't be in the room at all, maybe students should just be able to talk it out, understanding when your role is appropriate.

And then building a student task force. This goes back to earlier, also letting students make the decision, putting them in a leadership position and developing a strong team of students to help out the entire school community, but make them also aware that they need to build on the experiences of their fellow peers. Remaining aware, keeping the relationship well maintained and up to date; so I know for me, again I'm 20, I'm in college, but my experiences in high school are very different than the experiences of students who are currently in high school. Things change very rapidly, especially with the technology world. So making sure that you keep that relationship well maintained and up to date and constantly asking the students questions, what's going on in school, tell me what's going on. I know I've heard a lot from hearing high school students, current high school students speak.

Also spreading the wealth, recognizing unique abilities and using them, so making sure that everyone is involved in some way, if somebody's not the best public speaker in the world that doesn't mean that they can't be involved, you can put them in a creative role where they're designing fliers or some sort of poster, something like that. But recognizing that everybody has different abilities and using them to the advantage of whatever you're trying to do. Next slide.

Also, the innovative approach. We've mentioned several times about bullying on the Internet being a problem. If you're going to tackle an issue you have to get to where the students are, which nowadays is online mostly, when they go home, they go online. And unfortunate, it's not enough to just do something in school anymore. For those who are using Facebook if you put something out on Facebook or if you follow the lead of Facebook and some other technology companies that has built ways to report bullying, that certainly helps, and getting on Twitter and other venues that students use to talk to each other is definitely helpful in a bullying prevention program.

Also remembering that this is prevention, not intervention, obviously we need to intervene whenever bullying happens, but our ultimate goal is to prevent and stop bullying all together, so we no longer have to intervene when it happens because it doesn't happen. We're trying to make sure that it completely stops. Constant evolution, making sure that you have fresh ideas and people, always going through and making sure that you're coming up with ideas that are good for students and that are current and that are not tired ideas that the students are no longer getting something from.

And then of course last, but certainly not least, is listening. And this is the most important thing is genuine listening to students and all leaders. In order for our community programs to work, in order for everybody to have positive experiences, everyone has to feel like they're listened to. And genuine listening where you count everybody's opinions, treat them all as individuals is going to be what's best. Instead of just listening to some, listen to everybody, that may sound long, but it's a lot easier, and making sure that those people who see themselves as leaders within the community are listened to as well. Next slide.

So that's it for me. I just wanted to thank you all again for being on the call and I really appreciate everything that you all are doing. And if you need anything from me, feel free to let me know. Thank you so much.

MARCI HERTZ: Great, thank you so much, David. And once again if you're a member of the audience and you have a question please go ahead and submit that using the question and answer function on the right hand side of your screen. And we will get to those questions at the conclusion of all of the presentations. Now it's up to me to talk about action steps, although you've heard several from David and from Dr. Espelage as well. Next slide.

These are action steps, action steps for schools. And these are all taken from <http://www.stopbullying.gov>, which is the one stop federal website for all resources related to bullying prevention. So I strongly encourage you to go there. The first action step is to assess school prevention and intervention efforts. You need a good sense of how often student occurs in your school, where it occurs, generally it occurs in unsupervised areas, like stairwells or bathrooms.

You need to take a survey to determine how your staff are responding when it occurs and how effective these efforts are. As David mentioned and as Dr. Espelage indicated in her remarks about characteristics of programs that work it's very important to engage parents and youth in these efforts. There are

school level health communities where parents and students sit on those and those folks should be involved and engaged in these efforts.

It's important to have school policies and rules related to bullying. There is a great document by the U.S. Department of Education that gives examples of what elements should be in state and local policies. And you can find that on <http://www.stopbullying.gov>. It's important to build a safe environment for all students. Although there are certainly prevention and intervention strategies that need to be targeted, we need to create environments where all students are respected, not just tolerated, but respected and where difference is seen as something that's special and unique and not something bad. And then finally all students and school staff need to be educated about policies and about effective prevention strategies. Next slide.

These are parent tips for electronic aggression. These can be found on the CDC website. Our main tip here is that parents frequently view the Internet as a place to go to get information and kids just view it as a place to go, like they're going to the mall. So we encourage parents to take the same stance and attitude when kids go online as they do when kids leave the house; that is to ask them where are you going, who are you going with and what are you going to be doing when you go there?

We encourage them to develop mutually acceptable rules for behavior. Technology can be a good thing, especially for kids who don't feel connected to other kids at school. So we don't recommend necessarily prohibiting use of it, but for developing rules. And we encourage parents to go to those sites that their kids are going to, to talk to the parents of other kids that they're friendly with and find out what behaviors they're engaging in and what things they're saying. Just like we're encouraging the school to connect with parents, we're also encouraging parents and other caregivers to connect with the school.

And then finally educate yourself about what is going on both with your child and more broadly, what prevention strategies would be most appropriate for your family. Next slide.

We encourage educators to examine current policies, as I said use the data, figure out what's working, what's not working to explore current programs to prevent both bullying and general use violence. I think Dr. Espelage did a great job summarizing the research related to both bullying prevention and more broadly use violence prevention strategies. Offer training for educators and administrators on electronic aggression. They're not familiar with the technology kids have and how they're using it. Talk to kids to find out what they are doing so you can tailor prevention and intervention strategies appropriately.

Work with the information technology support staff in schools. Sometimes classroom teachers are aware of the electronic behavior of the students, but this isn't passed onto the IT staff at the school who might be able to take preventive action in terms of educational strategies as well as perhaps blocking software. As I mentioned earlier, create a positive school atmosphere for all students. There's some promising evaluation results for positive Behavioral and Intervention Supports program or PBIS that works about creating a positive atmosphere.

And then finally have a plan in place for what should happen if an incident is brought to the attention of school officials, so that there are graduated, clear steps that all school staff are taking and implementing consistently.

Community prevention strategies. Again I'm going to encourage you to go to <http://www.stopbullying.gov>. Under the prevention tab there's a great tool kit for communities, a PowerPoint presentation and a tool kit for communities. I encourage you to go there. The take home messages are again work collaboratively with both youth and parents; study both community needs and strengths. Rather than just giving bad news about what's going on in your community, what assets do you have that you can build upon? And finally make sure you develop a comprehensive community strategy that has the community and parents and schools all working collaboratively together. Next slide.

In that strategy, you should describe your comprehensive strategy, what each partner will do and how they're going to respond to bullying and prevent bullying, how they're going to educate about prevention policies in school, raise awareness about your message and track progress over time to ensure that you're refining your approach based upon data, not just anecdotal evidence from individual students or parents. Next slide.

So in sum I think all of the presentations that you've heard today support the case that bullying is a public health problem. Regardless of how it's defined, the data here has shown that it's very prevalent among school aged youth. It has significant effects or associations with both physical health and mental health problems across actually victims and perpetrators. In terms of future needs as I mentioned at the outset there's a need to standardize the definition of bullying. The CDC has worked in partnership with the Department of Education to develop a standard definition and data elements, which is going to be used for surveillance and research purposes. That's due out in December.

There's a need to continue to build the evidence base of violence prevention programs related to bullying outcomes. And you heard Dr. Espelage talk about some of her research in that area. There's a need to assess policies and their relationship to bullying behaviors; what key elements of policies have been associated with decreases in bullying behaviors? And there's a need to examine the relationship between bullying and engagement in other health risk behaviors such as sexual risk behaviors as well.

And here is the contact information for all of your presenters, and, of course, their website for Healthy People as well. We are now ready to respond to your written questions. If you haven't already done so, please do so now, again using the Q&A function at the right hand side of your viewing screen. We have a plethora of questions here, so I'm going to read them out loud and we will have one of the presenters respond. I apologize, there are a lot of questions; we are not going to be able to get to all of them.

One of the participants asked, is there any data on bullying for children in grades K through eight? Dr. Espelage, do you want to respond to that?

DOROTHY ESPELAGE: Yes. Yes, as a matter of fact Laura Hanish, H-a-n-i-s-h, and her group at Arizona State have done a series of studies with preschool play groups and have found a remarkable high incidence of not just kind of normative physical aggression, but exclusion, social aggression. And so you know it used to be that we felt pretty good about kids having a good experience in early childhood and early elementary school years, and then we would be concerned about bullying involvement in the fifth grade. It appears that it's emerging early in those studies, earlier.

MARCI HERTZ: Great. There was a question about how efforts are coordinated or complemented with the Department of Education. I can say that the CDC and actually more broadly Health and Human Services works very collaboratively with the Department of Education. We have representatives who work together on the <http://www.stopbullying.gov> website. And there is also a federal partner in

Bullying Prevention Task Force, which convenes an annual meeting that just happened this past August, but we work very collaboratively together.

Okay. Let's see ... we have another question here about if there are efforts being made to deter bullying outside of the school or if there is a carryover effort to deter bullying in school to outside of the school. So I know the ADL and GLESEN work somewhat about bullying both in and outside of schools. So I don't know if both David and Dr. Espelage want to weigh in on that one.

DOROTHY ESPELAGE: I would. I'm actually very encouraged about the efforts that are going on outside of school. I think for the longest time we pointed to the schools to solve this problem, not recognizing that youth interact in different contexts. So in the last year with the raising of the public awareness of bullying I've been contacted by coaches, American Coaches Association to do some training around bullying prevention and how they might be contributing, in addition to that faith based organizations, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts.

And so much like the Canadian model there's PREVNET in Canada, and they involved everyone, right. We also have the Cartoon Network on board, we have Facebook. And so I would say, yes, I think we're looking beyond the school. But David you might want to add.

MARCI HERTZ: Great. Thank you. David?

DAVID APONTE: I would certainly agree with that. Dr. Espelage I think you and I have been to a lot of the same conferences. So I think we've seen a lot of similar things. But certainly, and with the two organizations that I mentioned GLESEN and the ADL, those are both community wide events. And developing this answer to another question, yeah, there certainly are events for libraries and for other places, but the goal for like GLESEN and for speaking about LGBT issues, T FLAG, and organizations like that, their goal is to get the whole community involved well outside of school. And then also programs like the World of Difference programs are designed to have a community effect and take what's going on in the school and build it to the entire community.

MARCI HERTZ: Great. Thank you. We have a question if there is any information on Native American children, either in general or from other races toward Native Americans? Dr. Espelage are you aware of any?

DR. DOROTHY ESPELAGE: No, there's actually a dearth of literature with that population. Although there are a number of Native American Indian reservations that are engaged in this type of work, especially as victimization is related to both sexual assaults and alcohol and drug use, but there's limited data as far as prevalence and the extent to which they're victims and who their perpetrators are.

MARCI HERTZ: Right. And I would add that the Youth Risk Behavior Survey is a representative survey, but it doesn't include schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Education. I know in the past they've kind of combined Native student data across years to find out about the prevalence of specific health risk behaviors. But since the bullying question was just added to the YRBS in 2009 I don't believe they've done any analysis with respect to bullying. But as Dr. Espelage said I know that Indian Health Service as well as BIE have both been very interested and engaged in our discussions about the issue.

Okay. Next question. This question is about funding sources. This person says they've been rolling out a bullying program in schools, can you recommend possible funding sources to look into? Certainly the CDC generally funds research related studies. There's a variety of different private foundations, there's

the W.T. Grant Foundation. There's the Highmark Family Foundation in Pennsylvania. Dr. Espelage or David, are you aware of any funding sources?

DR. DOROTHY ESPELAGE: I would just add that I think as funding becomes a challenge that we have to be creative and so not only foundations but also thinking about within your community if it's a small study think about corporate sponsorship. So I think we just have to be creative. But certainly what Marci has mentioned in addition to foundations and corporate sponsorships, something to pursue.

DAVID APONTE: And I think with funding, yeah, I agree it does have to be creative when funding kind of is a little bit lower now. What I've seen is the strength in there. Certainly some organizations that are willing to give funding for studies, a lot of them are DC based and then some are New York based, if you go to the top of a lot of nonprofit organizations.

However, a lot of the fundraising that I've done and I've seen has some at the local level and you've had to do it on a case by case basis where it's literally the old techniques of hey, let's do a bake sale to raise some money for this or something like that, obviously a little bit more developed. But certainly teaching fundraising and having members and people who are involved in the community help you with the fundraising has been a strong point.

MARCI HERTZ: Thank you. There's a question that my experience suggests that there is bullying within the immigrant community. However these parents don't seem aware of it and say it doesn't happen in the old country. How can immigrant parents be engaged in a program to prevent or reduce bullying?

DR. DOROTHY ESPELAGE: I'll take that one. This is a very, very important question, because there's very, very little research conducted on this. And so we need to have a handle of you know going in there and doing focus groups and interviews with these parents and their students to see exactly what are the barriers, right, because there's cultural kind of barriers to them you know reaching out to kids telling their parents, to lots of different things. I know that there is an increasing emphasis in the National Institutes of Health to fund these types of studies, to understand unique aspects of just the construct itself of the victimization and bullying.

But on the ground being in schools all the time, most certainly there are immigrant populations in our schools that are at great risk for victimization and you know who do they turn to and how are we using culturally sensitive prevention programs? In fact, we might not be. But this is definitely something that the federal government's going to have to fund research in.

MARCI HERTZ: Great. Thank you. And then we have another one for you Dr. Espelage. What would be an example of a secondary prevention intervention?

DR. DOROTHY ESPELAGE: Yeah. So now this is when we think about universal primary positive behavior supports within the school's context would be an example that or any kinds of foundations where you're laying the ground work for behavioral expectations. When that is you know implemented to fidelity then we need more targeted intervention, so even a social-emotional learning second step that I talked about in the Steps to Respect could be an example of a secondary program if in fact the primary program is high in fidelity. Unfortunately in some of my low resource schools and inner city, second step is the universal, right.

But then on top of that it might be something like CBITS, which is Cognitive Behavioral Intervention for Trauma in Schools. It might also include something like Co-Power or the Good Behavior Game or kind of

family checkup. There could be a long list. If you go to the SAMHSA National Registry to look at programs within a certain content area if you're concerned about depression or you know connecting with families or whatever, anger or bullying, it will pull up the program and it will describe exactly whether it's primary, secondary or tertiary. But there's a number of examples out there. But we don't know how it kind of plays in within the context of universal bullying prevention programs.

MARCI HERTZ: Great. Thank you. We have a number of questions about zero tolerance policies. Dr. Espelage do you want to take this one and explain what zero tolerance policies are and why they are or are not recommended?

DR. DOROTHY ESPELAGE: Right, so sometimes folks get confused about zero tolerance, right. We definitely want a zero tolerance, like we're not going to tolerate bullying, bullying shouldn't happen here. But the ways in which ... but that's one kind of definition, the layperson's definition, the way in which we think about zero tolerance leads to suspensions, right, it's that punitive methods. When in fact bullying we know occurs when adults aren't around and sometimes the story doesn't come out but we know there's an incident. And there's a tendency for parents of kids that are being victimized to put great pressure on administration, administrators, principals to suspend kids. And they will cry zero tolerance.

So what we do know is that taking that kind of an approach does not reduce bullying in the schools, did not promote a positive school climate, what it does is it kind of puts kids out on the street and puts them at risk for academic failure; if they're not in the classroom they're not learning so therefore they're at risk. And so the zero tolerance could actually happen both for those kids that are targets of victims, bullying, that in fact if folks didn't see it and there's a policy at the school that we're not going to tolerate it, and we don't know the he said, she said, so we're just going to suspend you. So it can impact actually those kids that are victims that might be defending themselves.

So zero tolerance we know, for a number of different reasons, it is not effective for a number of problems that we have in the schools. We must, must bank more preventive types of approaches to shift the school climate, to get kids in the seats in the classrooms and not use an approach of like we will shut them out from school.

MARCI HERTZ: Great. Thank you very much. And again I'm going to apologize for not being able to get to all of your questions. Obviously we have a lot and we are doing our best to get to most of the questions, as many questions as we can. There's a question here do bullies in schools grow up to be bullies in the workplace?

DR. DOROTHY ESPELAGE: I'll take that. Yeah, so there was a recent special issue of Criminal Mental Health Behavior and they showed that there is an association and cited some studies between bullying and kind of job status and offending status. But do we know their behavior's within the context of the workplace more specifically? We absolutely do not. We're getting closer to those types of studies as we fund longitudinal studies, but you know the workplace is a very different environment, so it's hard to know.

If we believe that in fact bullying, the unique aspect of bullying is an aggressive behavior that includes power and a need for control and dominance we could suspect that that workplace environment may actually tap some of those behaviors and there might be. But do we have the research? No, we do not.

MARCI HERTZ: Okay, great. So there's a question here about of the male and female teens that reported being bullied due to their looks or speech, did they say if the bullying was committed by people in their inner circle or people in their outer circle? In that specific study they did not ask that question. We know generally that boys are more likely to bully other boys and girls are actually more likely to be bullied by both girls and boys. But Dorothy has any of your work looked at, who the perpetrators were in their relationship with the victim?

DR. DOROTHY ESPELAGE: Yeah. We do know some work out of UC Irvine has actually showed that sometimes it's a blending, right, so it could be within your friendship circle, but then it could be another click as well. You know it tends to get more complicated depending on the structure of the school, so to say across the board we don't know. But we also are becoming much more concerned about the cross sex bullying that's occurring, Phil Rodkin done some of that work at the University of Illinois, especially as it becomes more sexualized, sexual harassment between boys and girls. But that's an excellent question.

MARCI HERTZ: We are approaching the 1:30 mark. Dr. Espelage or David did you have any last comments or thoughts that you wanted to make before I turned it back over to Dr. Wright?

DR. DOROTHY ESPELAGE: No, thank you.

DAVID APONTE: The last thing that I wanted to say and I'm actually addressing the question now by text is somebody who asked about inner city communities or low income communities. And with that I did a lot of the points were targeted at places where it's easier to create a program. But just to quickly address that point, with that it's crucial to have a supportive school staff there, because there are a lot of situations where parents are not supportive.

And if you have a good school staff there, even bringing in one of the programs that I discuss or building a coalition with another already existing organizations within the area, can create a positive experience. And if they can do some sort of a training to train the staff of that school or wherever you know you're working, whether it be, I think this person cited a health clinic, if they're working at a health clinic or whatever the venue may be, if you bring in another organization to train those people that can relate to a much more positive experience. And for that more direct involvement is certainly needed. Depending on how bad the issue is, if you have to bring in somebody to do a seminar or to do direct workshops at the school in that situation that might be better. But there are certainly programs targeted at low income areas.

MARCI HERTZ: Great. Thank you so much both to David Aponte and to Dr. Dorothy Espelage. And again thank you very much to the Healthy People office for hosting this webinar and to all of you who took time out of your busy day to participate and sending questions as well. Dr. Wright.

DR. DON WRIGHT: Thank you Marci. And I want to thank all the participants for joining today's webinar. If you've not already done so, I invite you to respond to our closing evaluation poll on your experiences with today's webinar. We encourage you to complete the survey so that we can improve future webinars in our series. The poll appears in the upper right hand side of your viewing screen.

On behalf of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and its Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, I'd like to express our sincere gratitude to today's presenters for sharing with us their expertise and insight. I'd also like to thank the Healthy People 2020 Injury and Violence Prevention topic area, Healthy People 2020 LGBT topic area and the Healthy People 2020 Adolescent Health topic area

for their contributions to the planning, implementation, and production of Healthy People 2020 and this important issue.

We hope you will join us for future Healthy People 2020 webinars. To receive notices about upcoming events, please sign up for our email announcements on the Healthy People website. That's <http://www.healthypeople.gov>. A recording of today's webinar will be available on the Healthy People website in a few weeks. Past webinars can be found on the ODPHP You Tube channel. Again, thank you for joining today's Healthy People 2020 Spotlight on Health webinar.

[END OF FILE]