N⊕RMES

The Role of School Climate in School Violence: A Validity Study of a Web-Based School Violence Survey

David P. Hurford and Rick Lindskog
Pittsburg State University

AmyKay Cole
Missouri Southern State University

Robyn Jackson
Andover Public Schools

Sara Thomasson
Joplin Public Schools

Amanda Wade
Blue Valley School District

The School Violence Survey (SVS) *was developed as an instrument to investigate students' perceptions of school environment, their experiences and interactions within diverse social groups, and their views on school violence issues including bullying. A total of 806 students across four Midwest high schools and middle schools completed the paper version of the survey while at school. Of those students, 130 also completed the same survey online. The goal of utilizing two formats was to examine the validity of the relationship between the responses on the paper version versus the online version. The results indicated that the online SVS was a psychometrically valid instrument. In addition, an important factor emerged, Group Control, that indicated that as the adult administration and teachers allowed one group of students to maintain the behavior of other groups of students, the likelihood of violent behavior, such as bullying and witnessing students being threatened with weapons, increased. In addition, as the Group Control variable increased, so too did the students feelings that they were less safe at school, and that they were more likely to think of ways to make schools safer. The present study indicated that school environment and climate play a critical role in the development of violent behavior.*

The increase in school shootings which occurred in the 1990s focused national attention on safety in schools. Although lethal school shootings are rare, the shootings illuminated the larger issue of school safety. Forms of aggression in the school system, including fighting and bullying, have been found to negatively affect students and have been increasingly addressed in current literature. (e.g., Olweus, 1993; Olweus, 1996; Nansel, Overpeck, Haynie, Ruan, & Scheidt, 2003)

Violence and aggression in the schools has been a growing concern over the last twenty years. The U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Justice have compiled statistics on current risks in schools. In 2003, an assessment of students ages 12-18 revealed that there were 740,000 victims of violent crimes. Thirteen percent of students had been in a fight on school property while 9% of students were threatened or injured with a weapon on school property (DeVoe, Peter, Noonan, Snyder & Baum, 2005). Despite a general increase in public awareness, school administrators may actually underestimate the threat facing students. Sheley and Wright (1998) surveyed 48 school administrators and found that only 2% believed that guns pose at least a somewhat serious school problem. However, "58% could recall incidents involving guns on school grounds during the past 3 years, and 45% reported that at least one of their students had been shot, on or off school grounds, during the past 3 years" (p. 7).

There is a link between school violence and suicide. Bullies and victims both are at increased risk for suicidal ideation and attempts (Nickerson & Slater, 2009). The Secret Service analysis of school shootings indicated that 78% of school shooters had suicidal ideation, (Vossekuil, Fein, Reddy, Borum, & Modzelski, 2002). Conduct disorders, especially fighting and related behaviors, obviously reflective of school violence, were also related to suicide (Swahn, et al., 2008)

Following the Columbine shootings, efforts were made to identify students who might be possible shooters. McGee and DeBernardo (1999) developed a profile of individuals who had committed multi-victim, non-traditional homicides in a school in which personal vengeance was the motive. McGee and Debernardo referred to these individuals as *classroom avengers*. Characteristics of the classroom avenger include being a white, physically healthy male who lives in a rural area or small city and is frequently viewed as a social outcast with interests in violent forms of media. A history of being teased and victimized and having chronic difficulty with anger were also associated with this profile. It is important to note that few students with this profile are actually involved in violent school-related tragedies. A central problem with any type of profiling involves risk of false positives and false negatives. In addition, identifying individuals who are at risk for low base-rate behavior is exceedingly difficult and often inaccurate (Megargee, 1984). In truth, most students are much more likely to experience less dramatic forms of violence such as bullying, which are not lethal but are often incredibly disruptive.

There has been a greater national focus on bullying and how this behavior can lead to violence in schools since the rash of school shootings in the 1990s. Olweus (1996) states that "generally, bullies have a more positive attitude toward violence than students in general" (p. 18). Spivak and Prothrow-Stith (2001) indicate that less aggressive behaviors, like bullying, can lead to more violent behaviors. Skiba, Simmons, Peterson, and Forde (2006) point out that many reports on school violence

prevention have indicated that these less severe behaviors may be more important in predicting overall school safety than actual violence. When examining the school shooting incidents, the U.S. Secret Service found that in more than two thirds of school shootings the perpetrator viewed the shootings as retribution for bullying and harassment (Vossekuil, Fein, Reddy, Borum, & Modzeleski, 2002).

Definitions of bullying are generally agreed upon. According to Olweus (1993) "a student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students" (p. 9). This behavior has multiple negative associations including delinquency and alcohol abuse (Nansel et al., 2001) as well as anxiety, depression, psychosomatic symptoms and low self-esteem (Kaltiala-Heino, Rimpela, Rantanen, & Rimpela, 2000). Despite the common assumption that there is a clear distinction between bullies and victims, one study found an 8% group of bully-victims, associated with particularly more difficult issues (Holt et al., 2007). Both bullies and victims are associated with co-morbidity and poorer outcomes, although some suggest that bullies are sometimes associated with higher peer status (Rose, Swenson, & Waller, 2004). Victims of multiple bullying incidents have been found to have a generalized cognitive hostility (Dupper & Meyer-Adams, 2002). Bullies have also been found to struggle with a number of problems which include academic (Nansel et al., 2001) and criminal aspects (Olweus, 1993). Olweus (2003) found that between 1983 and 2001, the percentage of bullied Scandinavian elementary and junior high school students increased approximately 50%. Furthermore, the percentage of children involved in weekly bullying incidents increased by 65%. Based on Olweus' large scale survey of students in grades 1-9, it is thought that 9% of students are regular victims of bullying and that 6-7% of students engaged in bullying others with some regularity. Although there have been fewer studies on the prevalence of bullying in United States, Nanel et al., (2001) found that 30% of students in grades 6-10 reported moderate or frequent involvement in bullying. Bauman and Del Rio (2006) estimate that number to be higher in elementary grades, where bullying is believed to be more prevalent. Finkelhor, Ormond, Turner, and Hamby (2005) found a similar incidence of bullying when examining a nationally representative sample of children age 2 to 17 years. In the previous year, 25% of those students reported having been emotionally bullied while 22% reported having been physically bullied.

Of particular concern is the possibility that a considerable amount of bullying exists without the knowledge of parents and school personnel. Barone (1997) interviewed 847 eighth-graders and 110 school staff members in upstate New York regarding bullying. He found that 58.8% of students reported being bullied while staff members estimated that 16% of students had been victims of bullies. Skiba et al. (2006) assessed a large group of secondary school students and found that students rated the school climate and connectedness as being worse than did teachers. Students reports also reflected higher rates of dangerous or disruptive behaviors, including threats, fighting, and possession of guns or knives. On a number of items, there was a student/teacher discrepancy of greater than 40%. These discrepancies are puzzling and suggest that adults are not assessing school threat and climate in the same way or as accurately as students.

It has become clear that issues of bullying and the school climate both contribute to violence in schools (Vossekuil et al., 2002). Identifying areas of concern within each school is an important step in implementing change. The process of identifying problematic areas is complicated and requires more than anecdotal reflection. Furlong, Morrison, Cornell, and Skiba (2004) stated that "very few reports on existing school safety surveys use empirical procedures, such as factor analysis, to derive their dimensions or subscales" (p. 10). The present study addresses this concern with the development of an instrument to measure potential contributions to violence in schools. The purpose of the study was to examine the psychometric properties of the resulting survey, the School Violence Survey (SVS). The survey was developed to ask students their opinions and beliefs concerning several aspects of their schools including student and administration relationships, student behavior and violence. After establishing the psychometric validity of the SVS, the data were assessed to determine the nature of intraschool relationships and how those relationships relate to school violence.

Study Objective

The objective of the study was to develop an instrument that could be utilized to obtain data on our nation's public middle and secondary schools. This instrument, the SVS, was developed to examine (a) students' perceptions of school climate, particularly with regard to safety and violence levels in their schools, (b) their experiences and interactions within diverse social groups, (c) their encounter(s) with and view(s) on bullying, (d) students' level of involvement in activities. Surveys are the most direct assessment measures of these areas. This study collected survey data from two sources, online and paper-pencil.

For a survey to be reliable, the individuals being surveyed should respond to items in a similar manner across time and space. Highly reliable surveys produce highly consistent response agreement across item scales and the item alternatives. (Punch, 2002). Fowler (2003) itemized error into several sub-factors. He cautioned that words must have consistent meaning to responders. Fowler further notes that items with two questions imbedded are inherently unreliable, and items that evoke a response are to be avoided. Punch (2002) cautioned that broad response ranges offer more response variability on items, but to have too broad a range for items interferes with reliability. He also argued that too broad a response range could detract from a 'meaningful' item, which means an examinee could respond rapidly and with conviction.

According to Punch (2002) framing a questionnaire should examine the use of other existing items or instruments, agree on indicators that represent variables to be measured, pilot test new items and scales, and have questionnaires reviewed by experts. He recommended that items follow some basic guidelines: Short items that are simply worded, each item should convey one idea or concept, do not use items that contain negatives or double negatives and provide clear relevant unbiased appropriate terms Punch (2002) cited extensive reviews of survey item reliability, and advises "…pilot testing, first with a small group of respondents where the emphasis is on improving clarity, removing ambiguity, confirming interpretations, and checking that respondents can easily answer the questions. Secondly, with a larger group so the distribution of item responses and inter-item relationships can be investigated" (p. 54).

The SVS items were framed by thorough review of the published work in school violence, and subsequently examined by two Doctoral level Licensed School Psychologists, and one Clinical Psychologist for feedback regarding the above criteria to validate item content. Feedback was incorporated into revisions, and the scale was reviewed again, with those responses considered in this pilot version of the SVS. This version satisfactorily underwent a limited trial sampling out in both paper and computer versions prior formal data collection.

The SVS was administered in a paper version as well as an online version. Administering the SVS in both formats allowed for an examination of possible differences based on response modality. The mode of delivery has affected respondents' reports in previous studies. For example, Sheley and Wright (1998) found that responses from students who completed the survey at school differed from surveys mailed. In their study, onsite respondents reported more problematic behaviors in the school such as a larger number of victimized students, more gun possession and poorer school performance. In light of the potential format modality bias, the present study compared surveys which were completed on paper to those completed online.

Method

Participants. Eight hundred and six students between the ages of 12 and 18 years from two middle schools and two high schools participated in the paper version of the survey. The intention of the first experiment was to examine the psychometric properties of the on-line survey. Therefore, only the students who participated in both administrations of the School Violence Survey were included in this aspect of the study. As a result, the responses of 130 students were assessed.

Of the 130 students who completed the paper and on-line versions of the survey, 64 were females and 42 were males, 32 were high school students and 74 were middle school students (see Table 1). Although the entire sample will be considered, provided the survey is psychometrically sound, the most important aspect of the present study was whether the results of the on-line version of the SVS resembled the results of the paper version of the SVS.

Materials. The SVS consisted of 56 questions. As can be seen in the appendix, there were several questions concerning demographic information, which included gender, grade, age, ethnic group, school name, school size, city and state. Twenty-one questions assessed school climate, violence, and violence prevention with a Yes-No format. This format was intended to help prevent equivocal responses to sensitive questions. The last part of the survey utilized a Likert scale which ranged from: (A) Almost Always True, (B) Mostly True, (C) Sometimes True, (D) Mostly Not True, (E) Not True. The intent of this scale was to obtain a more sensitive measure of participant's responses, hence to increase statistical variability. The questions on this section of the survey examined self-esteem, participation in extracurricular activities, and community involvement. The web version of the SVS was identical (https://go.pittstate.edu/psych/sch.violence.survey.html) except mode of presentation.

Procedure. The survey was administered in two Midwest middle schools and two Midwest high schools. Once parent informed consents were collected, the students were fully informed of their rights, both orally and written through the consent statement.

Specifically, they were informed that their participation was strictly voluntary, that they could withdraw at any time, and that their responses were completely anonymous and confidential. Students who consented to participate were provided with the SVS. Once the SVS was completed, students were instructed to detach the accompanying instructions in order to access the web version of the SVS, which they could do at any time that they had access to a computer that had access to the web.

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics of the Participants who Completed Both the Paper and Web-Based Versions of the School Violence Survey

				Grade			
Variable	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
M/F	5/2	12/23	17/15	2/5	1/7	5/7	0/5
KS/OK	80/20	2.9/97.1	9.4/90.6	100/0	100/0	100/0	100/0
Ethnicity (%)							
White	100	51.4	68.8	100	87.5	100	100
Hispanic	0	11.4	6.3	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	8.6	0	0	0	0	0
African	0	2.9	6.3	0	0	0	0
Native	0	0	15.6	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	12.5	0	0
Live With (%)							
Both	60	54.3	78.1	75	37.5	66.7	40
One	40	31..4	18.8	12.5	25	16.7	20
Another	0	14.3	3.1	12.5	25	8.3	40
Other	0	0	0	0	12.5	8.3	0
Group (%)							
Athlete	0	48.6	46.9	25	25	16.7	40
Christian	60	20	6.3	0	0	41.7	0
Scholar	0	2.9	0	0	0	16.7	0
Skateboard	20	2.9	3.1	0	12.5	0	0
Gang	0	2.9	0	0	0	0	0
No Group	20	14.3	0	25	25	8.3	60
Alternative	0	0	0	0	25	0	0
Rebel	0	2.9	9.4	25	0	0	0
Preppy	0	5.7	6.3	25	0	0	0
Gothic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	6.3	0	12.5	0	0
Games (%)							
Never	0	22.9	12.5	25	37.5	25	60
Sometimes	80	54.3	53.1	75	50	50	40
Frequently	20	22.9	34.4	25	12.5	25	0

Table 1 (continued)

Music (%)							
Alternative	0	0	9.4	0	12.5	25	0
Country	0	40	28.1	25	37.5	8.3	0
Pop	80	34.3	31.3	37.5	37.5	41.7	60
Rap	0	22.9	28.1	37.5	12.5	8.3	40
Spiritual	20	2.9	3.1	0	0	8.3	0
Swing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gothic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rock	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Movie (%)							
Animated	60	28.6	9.4	12.5	0	16.7	0
Documentary	0	2.9	0	12.5	0	0	0
Graphic	0	2.9	0	0	12.5	16.7	0
Romance	0	8.6	18.8	0	25	25	40
SciFi	0	14.3	6.3	0	0	25	20
Violence	40	42.9	25	62.5	37.5	8.3	0
Comedy	0	0	3.1	0	0	0	0
Sex	0	0	6.3	12.5	12.5	8.3	40
Several	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parent (%)							
Not Enough	20	28.6	22.7	12.5	25	50	80
A Lot	80	54.3	60	37.5	37.5	50	0
Too Much	0	17.1	17.3	37.5	12.5	0	20
Money (%)							
Allowance	20	34.3	40.4	50	25	33.3	20
FT Job	0	0	1.8	0	0	0	40
Odd Jobs	20	22.9	40.4	25	37.5	16.7	0
PT Jobs	20	11.4	17.5	12.5	25	33.3	20

Results and Discussion

The first question to be addressed in the present study was whether participants respond differently when completing the SVS on-line compared to the traditional way of gathering survey data with a paper and pencil survey. To address this question, the psychometric properties of the surveys were addressed. The main focus was on the relationship between the two methods of survey completion.

Reliability. Reliability was assessed by several means. The mean for each question can be seen in Table 2. Most of the means are very similar with respect to type of

administration (paper versus online). A 42 (Variable) x 2 (Administration Type) multivariate analysis of variance indicated that there were main effects of variable, $F(42, 9) = 544.00$, $p < .0001$ and Administration Type, $F(1, 50) = 6.02$, $p < .02$, but no interaction of variable and administration type, $F(42, 9) = 2.17$, $p > .10$. Post-hoc analyses of the administration type main effect found only one significant effect, that for the variable of whether students believed that they could stop their friends and peers from bullying (paper = .660, web=.446, $p < .001$). A mean of .660 indicates a moderate belief that the student could stop his or her friends or peers from bullying, while a mean of .446 indicates a moderate belief that he or she could not stop friends or peers from bullying. None of the other variable differences reached significance. The results of these analyses indicated that there were no significant differences in the way that students responded to the survey due to administration type. An inspection of Table 2 reveals very small differences between the means.

Table 2
Means on each Variable on the School Violence Survey by Survey Type

| Variable | Survey Type | | Variable | Survey Type | |
	Paper	Web		Paper	Web
Grade	8.33	8.31	Prevent	.612	.533
Age	13.8	13.75	Help	.827	.686
Web	2.41	2.32	Tell	.779	.635
TV	3.13	3.13	SchAct	2.41	2.46
Special Ed	.09	.238	Extra	2.15	2.31
Gifted	.12	.264	GrFit	1.81	1.88
Safe	.839	.679	Race	1.84	1.97
Visible	.811	.737	Teacher	2.42	2.58
GrLike	.491	.533	Extra	3.02	2.81
GrRun	.377	.462	CAdults	1.71	1.65
GrCont	.274	.358	Comm	3.52	3.25
GrDis	.481	.485	Future	1.78	1.73
Conflict	.713	.648	Social	1.99	1.91
Bully	.267	.324	Sex	2.17	2.17
Stop	.660	.446	Culture	1.59	1.59
Adult	.442	.438	Class	2.62	2.43
Weapon	.095	.252	Valtch	2.68	2.58
Shown	.210	.305	Peers	2.40	2.13
Threat	.219	.343	Input	2.50	2.58
ScSafe	.276	.398	Honest	.978	.953
Idea	.650	.552	Partime	1.84	1.819

Reliability was also addressed by examining Chronbach's Alpha. For the paper and web administrations alphas were .738 and .733, respectively. In addition, Table 3 contains the correlation coefficients for each variable by type of administration. The correlations range between .123 and .886, with an average of .512. Further inspection of the responses of the students indicated that when there was not agreement between the two types of administrations, the responses were very similar. For example, to the question, "Do you feel that your parents spend: a. too much time with you, b. a lot of time with you, or c. not enough time with you," the differences between the paper versus the online administrations might change from "too much time with you" to "a lot of time with you" or "a lot of time with you" to "too much time with you." The disagreements between the responses for the two types of administrations were relatively close. As an example, no students responded "too much time with you" on the web version to "not enough time with you" on the paper version or vice versa.

Table 3

Correlations between the Paper and Web Administrations of the School Violence Survey

Variables						
Grade	Age	Web	TV	Sped	Gifted	Safe
.886	.869	.730	.814	.123	.363	.361
105	105	102	106	105	106	106
Visible	GrLike	GrCont	GrDis	Conflic	Bully	Stop
.260	.336	.336	.485	.424	.409	.447
99	105	106	101	80	104	99
Adult	Weapon	Shown	Threat	Idea	Prevent	Help
.277	.135	.420	.391	.350	.477	.234
104	102	104	104	103	103	104
Tell	SchAct	Extra	GrFit	Race	Tchr	CExtra
.363	.739	.662	.693	.491	.694	.730
103	106	104	104	104	105	104
Cadlts	Comm	Future	Social	Sex	Culture	Class
.624	.716	.627	.581	.530	.420	.701
104	101	103	104	101	105	105
Valtch	Peers	Input	Honest	1Time	Partime	
.638	.625	.411	.334	.393	.838	
103	105	106	94	94	102	

Note. All values > .23, $p < .01$; > .33, $p < .001$ and > .39, $p < .0001$; Overall mean = .512.

Validity. Since the two versions of the survey each purported to measure the same constructs, similarity in responses to some extent provides evidence for validity. As mentioned above, the results of the multivariate analysis of variance indicated that the mean responses by administration type were very consistent. This can be seen by inspecting Table 2. In addition, validity was assessed by factor analysis. Of particular interest was whether the results of the factor analysis of the two administration types produced similar factors.

The primary concern of the following analyses was to determine the validity of the SVS. Most importantly, however; was to determine the amount of congruence between the two administration types (paper versus web). In this regard, the data from both administrations were combined to assess the relationship between the data sets with factor analysis. That is, the variables from the paper and web administrations of the SVS were all entered into the factor analysis together. In the present study, it is hoped that the two data sets are indeed related indicating that the two administration types yield similar results.

A common factor analysis (principal factors) with varimax rotation was used to determine the structure underlying the SVS. Common factor analysis does not assume, as does principal components, that all of the variance is reliable. As a result, common factor analysis uses squared multiple correlations as the initial communality estimates rather than assuming communality estimates of 1s as does principal components.

A Scree plot determined that five factors should be retained, which accounted for 40.39% of the variance. The SVS items and their loadings for each of the five factors can be seen in Table 4. Only items with loadings greater than .40 were included for the five factors. However, for comparison purposes, if a variable from one type of administration (Paper versus Web) was included, its companion variable was included as well. Although, in most cases, all of the variables exceeded the criterion of .40, there were some companion variables whose loadings were smaller than .40. For example, the paper version of Future was .4105 while the Web version of Future was .2144. Since the factor solution provided information regarding validity of the SVS, both variables were included for comparison.

Theta, a measure of the reliability of the factor solution, was .9289, which is quite good. Generally, reliability of factor solutions greater than .70 is considered sufficient.

The factors, listed in descending order of explained variance were: School Participation, (14.19%) Social Sensitivity-School (8.11%), Demographic Information (7.12%), Group Control (5.88%), and Social Sensitivity-Culture (5.09%).

The first factor, School Participation, consisted of items "I participate in a variety of school sponsored activities," "I have been able to participate in any extracurricular activity I desired," "I feel I fit into a group at school," "I participate in extracurricular activities for 3 or more hours each week," "I socialize with groups other than my own," and "I know the names and interests of all of my classmates." Responses to these items indicate a strong participation in school activities and a general positive feeling toward school. All of the loadings on this factor for these items were strong ranging between .28 (Social-paper version), which was the companion to .4530 (Social-web version), and .8641 (Activities-web version), which was the companion to .8590 (Activities-paper version).

The second factor, Demographic Information, concerns the students' grades and ages. The loadings for this factor were .8527 and .9471 for the paper and web versions of the variable grade, respectively, and .8527 and .9524 for the paper and web versions of the variable age. In addition, the last variable that loaded on this factor was "Do you feel that bullying is a problem in your school?" with loading of -.2958 (paper version) and -.4013 (web version). Younger students feel that bullying is more of a problem at their schools than do older students.

Table 4

Factor loadings for the paper and web administrations of the SVS

	Factors									
	Paper Administration					Web Administration				
Variable	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
SchAct	.859					.847				
Extra	.764					.805				
GrFit	.462					.660				
CExtra	.726					.637				
Social	.284					.453				
Class	.440					.400				
Grade		.865					.935			
Age		.860					.932			
Bully		-.296					-.401			
Safe			-.484					-.218		
SexOr			.807					.858		
Culture			.681					.685		
ValTch			.339					.400		
Peers			.462					.516		
GrLike				.853					.483	
GrRun				.610					.507	
GrCont				.549					.244	
GrDis				.770					.336	
Conflict				.600					.323	
ValTch					.537					.495
Tchr					.867					.734

The third factor, Social Sensitivity-School, was defined by items "I value the ideas of my teachers and school administration," "I listen to the ideas of my peers and appreciate their sharing," "I accept or honor every person regardless of race or culture," "Do you feel safe at school?" and "I accept or honor every person regardless of sexual orientation." The loadings for these variables ranged from .33394 (ValTch-paper version), the companion to .4000 (ValTch-web version), to .8576 (SexOr-web version) the companion to .8074 (SexOr-paper version). This factor is concerned with how students feel about their fellow students, teachers, administrators, and how safe the students feel at school.

Group Control, the fourth factor, consisted of items "Is there a group of students who are liked more than other by the adults in your school?" "Does a particular group of students seem to run your school?" "Do school authority figures allow this group to control other groups of students?" "Is there a student group that is generally disliked by most or all in your school?" and "Is there conflict between groups in your school?"

The loadings on this factor by the variables were quite strong ranging from .2444 (Group Control-web version) the companion to .5488 (Group Control-paper version) to .8532 (GrLike-paper version) the companion to .4825 (GrLike-web version). This factor has to do with particular adult-sanctioned groups controlling other less favorable groups and the conflict that arises from this situation.

The last factor, Adult Effectiveness, was comprised of the variables "I value the ideas of my teachers and school administration," "I feel my teacher(s) know who I am and what my interests are," "Do school authority figures allow this group to control other groups of students?" Loadings for this factor were quite strong (.5366, .4949, .8660, .7342, -.0571, and -.4900) for the paper and web versions of valuing teachers and administrators, students believing that teachers knew them, and group control, respectively. The Adult Effectiveness factor indicates that the more students believe their teachers and administrators support them, the less likely students believe that certain student groups will be allowed to control other student groups.

The results of Experiment 1 indicated that the SVS is a reliable and valid instrument to assess issues related to school environment and violence. Experts in the area of school violence who assessed the content of the SVS believed it to be valid in terms of content and construct. Reliability was assessed by internal consistency (Chronbach's Alpha, .738 and .733, for the paper and web versions, respectively). In addition, the average correlation coefficient for each variable by type of administration was .512. Analyses of variance indicated that the means for the two types of administrations were similar. Had the means been appreciably different, one could reasonably argue that administration type produced different values. This was not the case. Lastly, common factor analysis indicated that five factors accounted for 40.39% of the variance. The factor solution was reliable with a value of theta of .9289. The factor solution was also meaningful and consistent with the intended structure of the SVS. In summary, the SVS was determined to be a psychometrically sound instrument that is capable of examining issues relevant to school violence.

Analyses of Entire Data Set

The following analyses included the entire sample of individuals who completed the paper version of the School Violence Survey ($n = 806$, see Table 5).

Descriptive analyses revealed that 10% of the students surveyed were enrolled in special education classes. In addition, 10% of the students were enrolled in gifted education. Further information obtained regarding the student body surveyed indicated that 84 % of middle school students and 74% of high school students participated in a variety of school sponsored activities, 85% of all students felt they fit into a group at school and 87% reported they have at least three significant adults in their life.

When students were asked if they felt safe at school, 16% of middle school students and 12% of high school students reported that they did not. Additionally, 37% of middle school students and 22% of high school students felt that bullying was a problem in their school. Twenty-five percent of the overall student body claimed that bullying had occurred in their building. Bullying is one of the best predictors of further school violence. A positive school environment has been consistently found to be effective in

the reduction of bullying (Hazier, 1996; Olweus, 1993).

Seventeen percent (17%) of students reported that they had been shown a weapon while at school and 23% claimed they knew of someone who had been threatened with a weapon at school. However, only 10% of students felt that weapons were a problem in their school. This raises the concern that the issue of violence and weapons is taken too lightly by students.

The concerns regarding the students' perceptions on violence are further supported through the finding that 26% of students reported that they would not tell an adult if they saw or heard anything that might lead to violence in their school. Furthermore, 15% of students claimed they do not know where they could get help if they had concerns regarding possible acts of violence. In the cases of Paducah, Jonesboro, and Littleton students had been warned prior to the incidents of school violence and failed to report the information. The main issue; however, is to know when a threat needs to be communicated to adults.

Table 5

Demographic Characteristics of the Participants who Completed the Paper Version of the School Violence Survey

Variable	Grade						
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
M/F	44/23	32/40	48/26	62/92	83/68	70/73	63/65
KS/OK (%)	51.5/48.5	47.2/52.8	46.1/53.9	100/0	100/0	100/0	100/0
Ethnicity (%)							
White	88.7	70	75.6	84.2	78.9	86.7	83.8
Hispanic	1.6	3.3	5.4	5.3	5	1.9	3.8
Asian	1.6	6.6	0	2	0.62	0.7	1.5
African	0	3.3	5.4	3.3	2.5	1.4	1.5
Native	8.1	16.7	13.5	1.3	1.9	1.4	1.5
Other	0	0	0	3.9	11.2	4.9	7.7
Live With (%)							
Both	67.2	63.4	69.3	61.3	53.9	60.4	55.2
One	25.4	29.6	29.3	33.5	32.5	31.3	29.6
Another	7.5	7	1.3	5.2	9.7	4.9	3.2
Other	0	0	0	0	4	3.5	12
Group (%)							
Athlete	53.7	47.9	49.3	33.5	22.1	22.9	25.6
Christian	16.4	11.3	8	3.2	11	7.6	3.2
Scholar	4.5	2.8	2.7	5.8	3.2	5.6	7.2
Skateboard	7.5	7	4	5.2	8.4	3.5	1.6
Gang	3	1.4	2.7	0	2.6	0.7	0.8
No Group	13.4	12.7	14.7	27.7	22.1	19.4	31.2
Alternative	1.5	1.4	0	5.2	8.4	7.6	6.4
Rebel	0	5.6	5.3	2.3	5.8	4.9	6.4
Preppy	0	7	9.3	5.2	3.9	9	6.4
Gothic	0	0	0	1.9	0	2.1	0.8
Other	0	0	1.3	0	0	10.4	10.4
Games (%)							
Never	2.9	8.5	6.6	23.2	24.7	25	28.1
Sometimes	60.3	68.6	64.5	58.1	56.5	55.6	61.7
Frequently	36.8	22.9	28.9	18.7	18.8	19.4	10.2

Table 5 (continued)

Music (%)							
Alternative	1.5	0	5.3	8.6	18.7	16.8	13.9
Country	32.5	23.9	26.3	15.1	10.7	16.8	22.1
Pop	33.8	39.4	31.6	44.7	37.3	38	40.2
Rap	29.4	33.8	32.9	27	26.7	22.6	17.2
Spiritual	2.9	2.8	2.6	2	4.7	3.6	1.6
Swing	0	0	1.3	0	0	0	0
Gothic	0	0	0	2	1.3	1.5	4.1
Rock	0	0	0	0.66	0.67	0.73	0.82
Movie (%)							
Animated	34.3	19.7	10	11.6	9.7	4.5	8.7
Documentary	7.5	9.9	2.9	2.1	3.5	5.2	1.7
Graphic	10.4	2.8	17.1	8.9	6.3	10.4	6.1
Romance	7.5	7	14.3	21.9	17.4	25.4	28.7
SciFi	16.4	14.1	7.1	13.7	20.1	18.7	13
Violence	23.9	46.5	35.7	32.9	26.4	23.1	25.5
Comedy	0	0	1.4	0	0	0	0.87
Sex	0	0	11.4	8.9	16.7	12.7	13.9
Several	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.7
Parent (%)							
Not Enough	24.2	23.6	22.7	14.4	25.3	27.9	27.6
A Lot	66.7	66.7	60	72.5	62.7	65.7	61
Too Much	9.1	9.7	17.3	13.1	12	6.4	11.4
Money (%)							
Allowance	61.5	52	40.4	52.2	39.7	28.5	15.1
FT Job	3.8	4	1.8	0	2.9	0.77	12.6
Odd Jobs	23.1	26	40.4	38.6	31.6	25.4	21
PT Jobs	11.5	18	17.5	9.1	25.7	45.4	51.3

A similar factor analysis (i.e., common factor analysis with varimax rotation) as was performed in the validity study was also performed on the data to determine the robustness of the factors that were identified in the previous analysis. The earlier analysis examined only the individuals who responded to the SVS in paper *and* web forms (*n* = 130). The entire data set included those individuals who responded to the paper version of the SVS (*n* = 806).

A Scree plot of the results also determined that five factors should be retained, which accounted for 89.60% of the variance. The SVS items and their loadings for each of the five factors can be seen in Table 6 along with the loadings for each item. Only items with loadings greater than .40 were included for the five factors and the bolded loadings indicate loadings that were consistent between the factor analytic solution involving the entire sample and the factor analytic solution involving only the individuals who responded to the paper and web versions of the SVS.

The five factors, listed in descending order of explained variance were: Social Sensitivity-School (41.89%), School Participation (17.01%), Group Control (14.03%), Social Sensitivity-Culture (9.19%), and Demographic Information (7.48%). Examination of Table 6 reveals the striking similarity of the factor solutions. Although the factors occupy different ordinal positions, the factor patterns are nearly the same. The variables load on each of the factors in nearly the same way and strength between the two solutions. The results also indicated a very similar factor pattern with strong

Table 6
*Factor Loadings for the Total Sample (*n = 806)

	Factors				
Variable	1	2	3	4	5
SchAct		.6789			
Extra		.5870			
GrFit		.4296			
CExtra		.7374			
Future					
Safe					
CExtra					
ValTch	.7132				
Peers	.5572				
Input	.5687				
Class	.5181				
Idea	.5058				
Prevent	.4276				
Tell	.5673				
Tchr	.5292				
Comm	.4327				
Grade				.9487	
Age				.9442	
GrLike			.5952		
GRun			.6793		
GrCont			.6339		
GrDis			.5720		
Conflict			.4333		
SexOr					
Culture					.5381
Social					.4111
Race					.4064
Help					.4105
Safe					.4013

reliability (theta = .8544).

The factor solution for the larger data set included additional variables to the Social Sensitivity-School and Social Sensitivity-Cultural factors. The Social Sensitivity-School factor included valuing the ideas of teachers and administrators, Listening to the ideas of my peers and appreciated their sharing, and School administration is open to student input about making school safer, just like the factor solution for the paper and web only analysis. As can be seen in Table 7, this factor included the additional variables that also relate to school-based social sensitivity. The Social Sensitivity-

Table 7
Variables that loaded on Social Sensitivity-School factor

Both Solutions
I value the ideas of my teachers and school administration.
I listen to the ideas of my peers and appreciate their sharing.
I feel that the school administration is open to student input about how to make the school safer.

Paper and Web Both Solution
Do you feel safe at your school?
I participate in extracurricular activities for 3 or mores hours each week.

Entire Data Set Solution
I know the names and interest of all my classmates.
If you had an idea, would you mention it to the appropriate person?
Would you be willing to participate in violence prevention activities?
Would you tell an adult if you saw or heard anything that might lead to violence in your school?
I feel my teacher(s) know who I am and what my interests are.
I often participate in community service-volunteer work.

Note. Bolded indicates variables that loaded on the factor for both solutions.

Culture factor also included additional variables for the larger data set. These variables include more information about the school environment, asking for help, and school safety. The School Participation and Demographic factors were nearly identical. The only difference between these factor solutions was the inclusion of "I feel I can become anything I want and it is just a matter of deciding" on the School Participation factor for the paper and web only solution.

One of the most important variables to emerge from both factor solutions was the Group Control factor. The same five variables were highly loaded on both solutions (see Tables 4 and 6). The questions represented by these variables can be seen in Table 8. All of these variables are related to groups, and directly or indirectly are related to group control issues. As mentioned previously in the present manuscript, profiles of individuals who were classroom avengers share characteristics of many students across the United States. Perhaps one salient characteristic of these individuals is that they felt that they had no recourse for what they believed to be personal violations to themselves. The social and cultural climates of school settings may be significant contributors to school violence. Fortunately, only 5.85% of the respondents indicated

Table 8

Variables that loaded on Group Control factor

Both Solutions
Is there a group of student who are liked more than others by the adults in your school?
Does a particular group of students seem to run your school?
Do school authority figures allow this group to control other groups of students?
Is there a student group that is generally disliked by most or all in your school?
Is there conflict between groups in your school?

Note. Bolded indicates variables that loaded on the factor for both solutions.

Table 9

Correlation Coefficients for the Variables that Loaded on the Group Control Factor

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
1. Group Run					
2. Group Like	.411				
3. Group Control	.347	.555			
4. Group Dislike	.423	.330	.321		
5. Conflict	.302	.258	.208	.320	

Note. All of the correlation coefficients are significant at the $p < .0001$ level.

that there was a severe amount of conflict between various groups at their schools.

Not surprisingly, there were strong relationships between all of the variables that loaded on the Group Control factor (see Table 9, $p < .0001$). The strongest relationship between these variables concerns the two variables: "Does a particular group seem to run your school?" and "Do school officials allow this group to control other groups of students?" ($r = .555$). In addition, the variable asking students if there was conflict between groups at their schools was significantly correlated with both "Is there a group of students who are liked more than others by the adults in your school?" and "Is there a student group that is generally disliked by most or all in your school?" (.302 and .320, respectively). In addition, there was a significant relationship between the latter two variables indicating that if the students believe that the adults in their school like a particular group more than others, the students reported that there was a group of students that nearly everyone generally disliked. These responses indicate that as one group is seen as preferential, to others are seen as less favorable. Of the respondents who believed that a particular group "ran the school," 25.6% believed that

"preps" ran the school and 12.0% believed that athletes ran the school. The next two groups that were nominated were girls (.9%) and seniors (.9%). Of the respondents who believed that a particular group was disliked by all, 14.1% believed that group to be the "skanks," 5.6% the "gothics" (5.6%), the "nerds" (5.1%), the "preps" (4.6%), and the "poor" (3.0%). There were several other nominations for both groups, however, those nominations were very small in their percentages and quite dispersed.

The Group Control factor is quite important in what it portrays. That is, the school environment created by the adult administration and teachers seems to foster either an equitable group atmosphere or a detrimental one. In severe cases, in which one group is preferred by the adult administration and teachers, there is a perception of students that this group will be sanctioned to "run" the school and control other students. Additionally, a less desirable or 'out' group also appears, when there is more conflict between groups. One could argue that the relationship between these variables indicates that an administration is either tacitly or overtly, providing license to one group of students to control other students. The appearance of a "disliked" group might provide the mechanism to educate students how students will be disciplined by the controlling group if an individual's behavior does not conform to the controlling group's expectations. This could also be a sign of weakness in the administration given that the administration is allowing a student group to "control" other students rather than address the offending students' behaviors. Although these are tentative hypotheses they are nonetheless supported by the data.

To further assess the impact of the effect of the administrative environment, factor scores for the Group Control factor were generated and entered into a stepwise regression model including variables listed in Table 10. The results indicated that the regression solution was significant, $F(6, 511) = 42.32$, $p < .0001$, $R^2=.335$. The following six variables were significantly related to the Group Control factor: Safe (Do you feel safe at your school?, $R^2=.1121$), which was inversely related, Bully (Do you feel that bullying is a problem at your school?, $R^2=.064$), Threat (Do you know of anyone who has been threatened with a weapon at your school?, $R^2=.053$), Input (I feel that the school administration is open to student input about how to make the school safer, $R^2=.045$), ScSafe (Do you have ideas about how to make your school safer, $R^2=.032$), and SexOr (I accept or honor every person regardless of sexual orientation, $R^2=.028$). The results indicate that the higher the Group Control factor score the less safe the student feels at school, the more likely that the student feels that bullying is a problem at his or her school, and that someone that he or she knows has been threatened by a weapon at his or her school.

If the administrative environment influences students' behaviors as indicated in the Group Control factor, the three variables (above) are precisely the ones that are problematic. Therefore, there seems to be a complex relationship between how the administration and faculty handle students, student groups, managing student behaviors, and how safe the students feel. As the Group Control factor varied, so too did how safe students felt, student knowledge of weapon threats, and if bullying was a problem. In addition, as the Group Control factor increased, students were more likely to have ideas about how to make their schools safer, and they were less accepting of individuals without regard to sexual orientation, but felt that the administration was open to student input about how to make their schools safer.

Table 10
Variables entered into the Stepwise Regression with the Group Control Factor

Variables				
Grade	Gifted	Adult	Idea	Extra
Age	Safe	Weapon	Prevent	GrFit
Web	Visible	Shown	Help	Race
TV	Bully	Threat	Tell	Tchr
Special Ed	Stop	SCSafe	SCHAct	CExtra
CAdlts	Comm	Fukture	Social	Sex
Culture	Class	ValTch	Peers	Input
PartTime				

Summary

The SVS was demonstrated to be a reliable, valid measure. In addition, unlike other surveys on school violence (Sheley & Wright, 1998), the SVS produced similar findings regardless if it was administered online or in a paper version. The implication for larger-scale, less expensive testing is considerable. Online screening can be much more convenient and less expensive for schools. Online data collection is also more flexible and would allow for less intrusion during standard instruction time in school. Another benefit of online screening is the opportunity to create a large scale database to better assess national trends and needs.

Most measures of school safety narrowly focus on actual or potential criminal violations and occurrences of physical harm (Skiba et al., 2006). These measures do not typically address school climate. Skiba et al. point out that measures of school climate do not typically address school violence issues. The SVS addresses both violence and school climate which gives a more comprehensive view of what is happening in schools and highlights how school climate and violence are related.

The final factors of the SVS, Social Sensitivity-School, School Participation, Group Control, Social Sensitivity-Culture, and Demographic Information, provide insight as to concerns and issues relevant to students. Students are clearly sensitive to the receptiveness of school administrators. Three of the five SVS factors, Social Sensitivity-School, Social Sensitivity-Culture and Group Control as well as the web-based factor of Adult Effectiveness include students' perspective on administration. Receptive teachers and administrators are an important aspect of a positive school climate and there has been an increasing emphasis on school climate in recent years for good reason.

In particular, the factor of Group Control highlights how crucial administrator behavior is to school climate. This factor sheds light on the importance of avoiding favoritism and treating all students in a similar fashion regardless of their social status or involvement in school activities. When administration favors a particular group of students, it models favoritism and treating some groups of individuals less well than other groups. The Group Control factor includes some telling items such as whether some groups of students are liked less by adults and if some student groups

are generally disliked by most or all in the school. This is similar to the notion of the "culture of the athlete" which was discussed in the Washington Post following the Columbine shootings. Adams and Russakoff (1999) investigated the murders and concluded that the school was dominated by a "cult of the athlete" where athletes received preferential treatment and were not disciplined as the nonathletes were. The murderers at Columbine were reportedly angered by this preferential treatment and were reported to demand that the athletes stand during their rampage.

There are many ways in which administrators can contribute to a bullying culture. In some cases, school administrators and staff can model inappropriate behavior by ignoring or otherwise condoning problematic behavior such as bullying. Yoneyama and Naito (2003) have found that, in many Japanese schools, teachers may tolerate bullying as part of normative behavior. They suggest that schools are similar to prisons and military establishments in that there are clear divisions of socially defined roles within hierarchical and authoritarian relations. They suggest that "conformity and low tolerance to individual differences can be intrinsic to school life" (p. 317). They suggest that this institution framework can actually cultivate bullying. Administrators can also model the inappropriate behavior in their own social structure. Swearer et al. (2006) report that "if there is a bullying culture at the adult level, chances are there will be bullying at the student level" (p. 271).

Strong perceptions of preferential student treatment by administration (Group Control) were associated with feeling unsafe, bullying, and reports of being threatened with a weapon at school. The need for equality in student treatment by school staff and administration should clearly be a priority. Consistent opportunity and discipline across student groups is essential. Jimerson, Morrison, Pletcher, and Furlong. (2006) noted that a disorderly school environment, with vague rules and expectations, is one indicator of an ineffective school. Consistent consequences for problematic behavior have been identified as essential for a positive emotional climate in schools (Sprague & Horner, 2006). Hazler and Carney (2006) identified two types of bullying prevention programs: Targeted programs that focus on select groups of high-risk students, and universal bullying programs that focus on how all students are treated. There has been a general acceptance over the last ten years that universal programs are far more effective over the long run. In light of the identification of the Group Control factor, it is clear that treating a high-risk group differently would only serve to increase the perceptions of preferential treatment.

Osher et al. (2004) emphasize the importance of "consistently communicated and applied consequences for rule breaking behavior" (p. 18) which avoids preferential treatment of some students over others. They also found that unsafe and ineffective schools suffered from disrespectful treatment of students as well as disrespect between students, which included bullying and fighting. Beyond the overall school environment, they stressed the importance of the emotional climate of the classroom and indicated that the frequency of pleasant social exchanges, along with voice tone and eye contact, affect the climate of the classroom. In addressing student progress, Osher et al. encouraged obtaining objective data on "school ecology" that focuses on understanding student development and how schools are promoting or undermining effective practices.

When addressing the climate within a school, it is important to consider the social support available to students. Strong social support can serve as intervention for, as well as prevention of, bullying. Victims of multiple bullying incidents have been found to have poorer social support networks with peers and teachers compared to non-victims (Furlong et al., 1995). Demaray, Malecki & DeLong (2006) suggest that victims of bullying need social support that buffers the effects of stress and can limit the negative consequences of stress. According to Demaray et al. (2006), if bullies receive adequate social support, they will function "more effectively and be healthier in general" (p. 22) which could make them less likely to lash out at others.

The SVS factor of Adult Effectiveness was obtained when analyzing the surveys of students who completed the online and paper versions of the SVS. Students appear to be in tune to whether they feel supported by their teachers and the implications for not feeling supported can be dangerous and lead to an unsafe school environment. For example, it is disturbing to think that students are aware of the presence of guns but do not inform adults. In the present study, 17% of students had been shown a gun and 23% knew of someone who had been shown a gun, but only 10% felt that weapons were a problem in the school. A sizable 26% of students would not tell an adult of potential violence in the school. Clearly, the lines of communication between students and administrators are not always open. If students felt that school administrators were receptive toward student ideas, students might be more likely to report potential threats without fear their concerns would be dismissed.

In line with the current findings, Furlong et al (2004) indicated that student perceptions of climate might be a better predictor of perceptions of overall school safety than serious violence. Swearer et al. (2006) found that students involved in bullying (as perpetrator or victim) perceived the school climate as more negative. Bradshaw, Sawyer, and O'Brennan (2007) also reported differences in student-staff perceptions of bullying and peer victimization. The present study suggests multiple ways to improve school climate. In particular, decreasing the perception of administration favoritism, increasing receptivity to student ideas and modeling respect for students could significantly improve the school climate and, as a result, decrease bullying and other behaviors which are associated with school violence. Further research could utilize the psychometrically sound SVS to assess school climate and associated vulnerability to bullying and violence. The SVS would be an appropriate tool to measure school progress in improving climate and decreasing violence. More specifically, students could complete the SVS before and after administrators make changes to improve climate in order to assess progress. Demonstrated psychometric soundness and ease of administration make the SVS an effective measure of school climate and violence.

References

Adams, L., & Russakoff, D. (1999, June 12). Dissecting Columbine's cult of the athlete. *The Washington Post*, p. A1.

Barone, F. J. (1997) Bullying in school. *Phi Delta Kappan, 79*(1), 80-82.

Bauman, S. & Del Rio, A. (2006). Preservice Teachers' responses to bullying scenarios: Comparing physical, verbal, and relational bullying. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*(1), 219-231.

Bradshaw, C. P., Sawyer, A. L., & O'Brennan, L. M. (2007) Bullying and peer victimization at school: Perceptual differences between students and school staff. *School Psychology Review, 36, (3),* 361-382

Demaray, M. K., Malecki, C. K., & DeLong, L. K. (2006). Support in the lives of aggressive students, their victims, and their peers. In S. R. Jimerson & M. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety: From research to practice* (pp. 21-29). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

DeVoe, J. F., Peter, K., Noonan, M., Snyder, T. D., and Baum, K. (2005). *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2005* (NCES 2006-001/NCJ 210697). U.S. Departments of Education and Justice. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Dupper, D. R., & Meyer-Adams, N. (2002). Low-level violence: A neglected aspect of school culture. *Urban Education, 37*(3), 350-364.

Finkelhor, D., Ormond, R., Turner, H., & Hamby, S. (2005). The victimization of children and youth: A comprehensive, national survey. *Child Maltreatment, 10*, 5-25.

Fowler, F. J. (2002). Survey research methods. 3rd Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers, Inc.

Furlong, M. J., Chung, A., Bates, M., & Morrison, R. L. (1995). Who are the victims of school violence? A comparison of student non-victims and multi-victims. *Education and Treatment of Children, 17*, 282-298.

Furlong, M. J., Morrison, G. M., Cornell, D. G., & Skiba, R. (2004). Methodological and measurement issues in school violence research: Moving beyond the social problem era. In M. J. Furlong, G. M. Morrison, R. Skiba, & D. G. Cornell (Eds.), *Issues in school violence research* (pp. 5-12). New York: Haworth Press.

Hazler, R. J., & Carney, J. V. (2006). Critical characteristics of effective bullying prevention programs. In S. R. Jimerson & M. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety: From research to practice* (pp. 275-291). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Holt, M. K., Finkelhor, D., & Kaufman Kantor, G. (2007). Hidden forms of victimization in elementary schools involved in bullying. *School Psychology Review, 36*(3) 343-358.

Jimerson, S. R., Morrison, G. M., Pletcher, S. W., & Furlong, M. J. (2006). Youth engaged in antisocial and aggressive behaviors: Who are they? In S.R. Jimerson & M. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety: From research to practice* (pp. 3-19). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpela, M., Rantanen, P., & Rimpela, A. (2000). Bullying at school: An indicator of adolescents at risk for mental disorders. *Journal of Adolescence, 23*, 661-674.

McGee, M. P., & DeBernardo, C. R. (1999). The classroom avenger. *The Forensic Examiner, 8*(5-6), 16-18.

Megargee, E. I. (1984). Predication of dangerous behavior. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 3*(1), 3-22.

Nansel, R. R., Overpeck, M. D., Haynie, D. L., Ruan, J., & Scheidt, P. C. (2003). Relationships between bullying and violence among US youth. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 147*, 348-353.

Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth: Prevalence and association of psychosocial adjustment. *The Journal of the American Medical Association, 285*, 2094-2100.

Nickerson, A. B., & Slater, E. D. (2009). School and Community victimization as predictors of adolescent suicidal behavior. *School Psychology Review*, *38*(2)*,* 218-232.

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Olweus, D. (1996). Bully/victim problems at school: Facts and effective intervention. *Reclaiming Children and Youth: Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Problems, 5*(1), 15-22.

Olweus, D. (1997). Bully/victim problems in school: Facts and intervention. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 12*(4), 495-510.

Olweus, D. (2003). A profile of bullying at school. *Educational Leadership, 60*(6), 12-18.

Osher, D., VanAcker, R., Morrison, G. M., Gable, R., Dwyer, K., Quinn, M. (2004). Warning signs of problems in schools: Ecological perspectives and effective practices for combating school aggression and violence. *Journal of School Violence*, *3*, 13-37.

Punch, K. F. (2003). Survey research-the basics. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.

Rigby, K. (1997). Attitudes and beliefs about bullying among Australian school children. *The Irish Journal of Psychology, 18*, p. 202-220.

Rose, J., Swenson, L. P., & Waller, E. M. (2004) Overt and relational aggression and perceived popularity: Developmental differences in concurrent and prospective relations. *Developmental Psychology, 40,* 378-387.

Sheley, J. & Wright, J. (1998). High school youths, weapons, and violence: a national survey. *National Institute of Justice,* October, 1998. NCJ 163497.

Skiba, R., Simmons, A. B., Peterson, R., & Forde, S. (2006). The SRS Safe Schools Survey: A broader perspective on school violence prevention. In S.R. Jimerson & M. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety: From research to practice* (pp. 413-427). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Skiba, R., Simmons, A. B., Peterson, R., McKelvey, J., Forde, S., & Gallini, S. (2004). Beyond guns, drugs and gangs: The structure of student perceptions of school safety. In M. J. Furlong, G. M. Morrison, R. Skiba, & D. G. Cornell (Eds.), *Issues in school violence research* (pp. 149-171). New York: Haworth Press.

Spivak & Prothrow-Stith (2001). The Need to Address Bullying – An Important Component of Violence Prevention. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 285*(16), 2131-2133.

Sprague, J. R., & Horner, R. H. (2006). Schoolwide positive behavioral supports. In S. R. Jimerson & M. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety: From research to practice* (pp. 413-427). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Swearer, S. M., Peugh, J., Espelage, D. L. Siebecker, A. B., Kingsbury, W. L., & Bevins, K. S. (2006). A socioecological model for bullying prevention and intervention in early adolescence: An exploratory Examination. In S. R. Jimerson & M. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety: From research to practice* (pp. 257-273). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Swahn, M. H., Simon, T. R., Hertz, M. F., Arias, I., Bossarte, R. M., Ross, J. G., et al. (2008). Linking dating violence, peer violence, and suicidal behavior among high-risk youth. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine, 34,* 30-38.

Vossekuil, B., Fein, R., Reddy, M., Borum, R., & Modzeleski, W. (2002). *The final report and findings of the Safe School Initiative: Implications for the prevention of school attacks in the United States*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Secret Service National Threat Assessment Center.

Yoneyama, S. & Naito, A. (2003). Problems with the Paradigm: The school as a factor in understanding bullying (with special reference to Japan). *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 24*(3), pp. 315-330.

Appendix

School Violence Survey

This is a completely confidential survey. We are interested in gathering information regarding some of the problems faced by students in school. Please answer each question as best you can. No one will be able to identify you from the information you give us.

(*) Indicates required information

*Gender: Male   Female   ***Grade:** _____   Age: _____

School Name: _____   City: _____   ***State:** _____

Please circle the answer that is most appropriate for you:
Ethnic Group: Hispanic, African American, Caucasian, Asian American, Other
          If Other, please specify: _____

*School Size:

Who do you live with: Both parents, One parent, Another family member,
                  Someone other than a family member
*Others would describe you as a member of which following group:
                  Athlete, Scholar, Preppy, Rebel, Gang member, Gothic,
                  Alternative, Skateboarder, Christian, No group, Other
          If other please explain: _____
Do you have a personal computer that you access the web with:
            Never, 1-5 hours per week,
            6-10 hours per week, 11-25 hours per week,
            more than 25 hours per week
Do you play video games: Never / Sometimes / Frequently
Do you watch television: Never,   1-5 hours per week,   6-10 hours per week,
                  11-25 hours per week,   more than 25 hours per week
What is your favorite type of music to listen to: Country, Pop/Rock, Rap,
                        Alternative, Gothic, Spiritual/Inspirational
Which of the following movie contents do you prefer: Animated fiction, Science
            fiction, Graphic, Violent, Romance, Sexually Explicit, Documentaries
Do you feel that your parents spend: Too much time with you,   A lot of time with you,
                        Not enough time with you
How do you earn money: Allowance from parents, Regular part-time job, Full-time job,
                  Odd jobs when money is needed, Other
          If other please explain: _____

Please circle Yes (Y) or No (N):

Are you enrolled in special education classes at your school?	*Yes / No*
Are you enrolled in gifted education classes at your school?	*Yes / No*
Do you feel safe at your school?	*Yes / No*
Are school personnel highly visible in the hallways and large gathering areas?	*Yes / No*
Is there a group of students who are liked more than others by the adults in your school?	*Yes / No*
* If so, which one?* _____	
Does a particular group of students seem to run your school?	*Yes / No*
* If so, which group?* _____	
Do school authority figures allow this group to control other groups of students?	*Yes / No*
Is there a student group that is generally disliked by most or all in your school?	*Yes / No*
* If so, which groups?* _____	
Is there conflict between groups in your school?	*Yes / No*

There is: A lot
             Some
             A little conflict
             Does not apply

Is this conflict: Verbal
                Physical
                Both
                Does not apply

The conflict is: Mild
                 Moderate
                 Severe
                 Does not apply

Do you socialize with other groups other than your own?	*Yes / No*
Do you feel that bullying is a problem in your school?	*Yes / No*
Do you feel that you can stop your friends and peers from bullying?	*Yes / No*
When a student bullies or puts down another student, does an adult always intervene?	*Yes / No*
Do you feel that weapons are a problem in your school?	*Yes / No*
Has anyone ever shown you a weapon at school?	*Yes / No*
Do you know of anyone who has been threatened with a weapon at your school?	*Yes / No*
Do you have ideas about how to make your school safer?	*Yes / No*
If you had an idea, would you mention it to the appropriate person?	*Yes / No*
Would you be willing to participate in violence prevention activities?	*Yes / No*
Do you know where you can get help if you see or hear anything that might mean that a violent act is about to occur?	*Yes / No*
Would you tell an adult if you saw or heard anything that might lead to violence in your school?	*Yes / No*

Please answer the following questions using this system:

A- almost always true	**B-** mostly true	**C-** sometimes true	**D-** mostly not true	**E-** not true

1.	**I participate in a variety of school sponsored activities**	A	B	C	D	E
2.	**I have been able to participate in any extracurricular activity I desired**	A	B	C	D	E
3.	**I feel I fit into a group at school**	A	B	C	D	E
4.	**I feel that other students accept me for my race and culture even though it may be different than theirs**	A	B	C	D	E
5.	**I feel my teacher(s) know who I am and what my interests are**	A	B	C	D	E
6.	**I participate in extracurricular activities for 3 or more hours each week**	A	B	C	D	E
7.	**I have at least 3 significant adults in my life other than my parents**	A	B	C	D	E
8.	**I often participate in community service-volunteer work (e.g., food drives, beautification projects, etc.)**	A	B	C	D	E
9.	**I feel I can become anything I want and it is just a matter of deciding**	A	B	C	D	E
10.	**I socialize with groups other than my own**	A	B	C	D	E
11.	**I accept or honor every person regardless of sexual orientation**	A	B	C	D	E
12.	**I accept or honor every person regardless of race or culture**	A	B	C	D	E
13.	**I know the names and interests of all my classmates**	A	B	C	D	E
14.	**I value the ideas of my teachers and school administration**	A	B	C	D	E
15.	**I listen to the ideas of my peers and appreciate their sharing**	A	B	C	D	E
16.	**I feel that the school administration is open to student input about how to make the school safer**	A	B	C	D	E

* I was completely honest when I filled out the answers to this survey: YES / NO
* This was the first time I filled out this survey: YES / NO