

THE MEASUREMENT AND PREVENTION OF SCHOOL-BASED VICTIMIZATION IN GRADES 7 THROUGH 10

Robert Gutierrez
Florida State University

John J. Kerbs, East Carolina University

Stephen A. Rollin
Isabelle Potts, J.D., Jayme Harpring
Alia Haque Creason, Kyubeom Choi, Tam Dao, and Amanda Wolf
Florida State University

Abstract

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) requires that schools use (1) self-report survey protocols to determine if schools are “persistently” dangerous and (2) evidence-based interventions to increase student safety when schools are deemed persistently dangerous. In response to these NCLB requirements, Florida State University’s School Violence Prevention Project developed both a self-report survey protocol to measure student-on-student victimization (ssv) dynamics and a curricular intervention for middle-school students. The self-report survey protocol and the curricular intervention aim to prevent psychological, property, physical, and sexual ssv. This presentation will review the structure and theoretical basis of both the survey (i.e., the Adolescent Index for School Safety or AISS protocol) and the curricular intervention.

The AISS protocol is a valid and statistically reliable survey instrument that measures various aspects of psychological, property, physical, and sexual ssv in grades 7-12. In this paper, recent research stemming from the AISS will be presented along with a detailed discussion of how this protocol can be used by states and local school districts to comply with NCLB requirements.

The curricular intervention is rooted in a social-science inquiry model that guides students through a series of inquiries to identify (1) where violence happens, (2) how it happens, (3) why it happens, (4) to whom it happens, and (5) how to prevent it. After each lesson plan is completed, students take action to reduce school violence and make recommendations to school administrators to implement policy changes for the reduction of school violence. Because the intervention empowers and teaches students to advocate on their own behalf for policy changes, this curriculum aims to advance a Jeffersonian notion of participatory democracy among middle-school students.

This paper was made possible by a grant [#97-MU-FX-KO12 (S-1)] from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. This grant was administered through the Hamilton Fish Institute on School and Community Violence at The George Washington University. This specific study was implemented through Florida State University’s Center for Educational Research and Policy Studies. All points of view and opinions in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice, the Hamilton Fish Institute, or Florida State University.

Introduction

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) requires that schools use (1) self-report survey protocols to determine if schools are “persistently” dangerous and (2) evidence-based interventions to increase student safety when schools are deemed persistently dangerous. In response to these NCLB requirements, Florida State University’s School Violence Prevention Project developed both a self-report survey protocol to measure

student-on-student victimization (ssv) dynamics and a curricular intervention for middle-school students that aims to prevent psychological, property, physical, and sexual ssv. This presentation begins with a review of the empirical, structural, and theoretical bases of the survey (i.e., the Adolescent Index for School Safety or AISS protocol) and is followed by a description of the curricular intervention, the Social Science Anti-Violence Inquiry Curriculum. Thereafter, it concludes with a discussion of how the survey and curricular intervention can be used to comply with NCLB requirements.

Creating a New Self-Report Survey Protocol to Measure School Violence: The AISS

Because the FSU School Violence Prevention Project historically examines the efficacy of school-violence prevention programs, there was a significant need to find or develop a survey protocol that would clearly document changes in school-safety dynamics for common types of student-on-student victimization (psychological, property, physical, and sexual) and for multiple dimensions of victimization (i.e., self-reported incidents, fear of victimization, perceived risk of victimization, environmental factors that may affect victimization dynamics, and coping strategies for dealing with potential victimization). After an extensive review of the literature and surveys that contained victimization questions for students, FSU's research staff identified four survey protocols as potential instruments for the Project's ongoing evaluation process.

- The Olweus Survey (Olweus, 1996)
- the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2000)
- the 1995 School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey (Chandler, Chapman, Rand and Taylor, 1998)
- the National School Crime and Safety Survey - Revised (Hamilton Fish Institute, 2002)

Although each survey had definite strengths, not one survey simultaneously covered multiple types of victimization and the corresponding dimensions of victimization that were of interest to the Project's research staff. Hence, the staff decided to develop their own survey protocol called The Adolescent Index for School Safety or the AISS protocol (Kerbs, Rollin, Potts, and the FSU School Violence Prevention Project, 2003). The AISS is a self-administered survey protocol with five parts that measure various aspects of school safety and victimization as reported by students in grades 7 through 12. The flexibility built into the protocol allows schools to administer it in part or in whole and always obtain useable information. Each part takes between 12 and 15 minutes to complete. Because some schools may choose to administer only one of the five parts, each stand-alone section begins with the same six socio-demographic measures for age, gender, grade, race/ethnicity, household composition, and socioeconomic status (i.e., whether or not the respondent gets free or reduced-cost lunches).

Thereafter, each section of the AISS survey addresses a unique set of issues. For example, the first section primarily measures 30-day prevalence rates for 50 types of self-reported ssv. These 50 items cover various forms of psychological, property, physical, and sexual ssv. A few additional questions document the presence of weapons in schools, the availability of adults to consult about problems, and students' perceptions of the most dangerous places in their school.

The second section measures the students' *perceived risk* of victimization for the same 50 items in the first section plus one additional measure for the perceived risk of being killed by another student. More specifically, this survey asks students to cognitively appraise the likelihood of experiencing each of the 51 noted events during the rest of the school year. All responses are recorded on a four-point scale: (1) not at all likely; (2) a little likely; (3) pretty likely; or (4) very likely.

The third section measures the students' *fear* of victimization for the same 51 items in the second section. All responses are recorded on a four-point scale: (1) not at all scared; (2) a little scared; (3) pretty scared; or (4)

very scared. Because fear of crime may be linked to psychological distress among students, this survey also contains a scale called the K10, which includes ten questions developed by Ronald Kessler and Bederhan Ustan to measure nonspecific psychological distress (depression and anxiety) among adolescents (Kessler et al., in press).

The fourth section contains questions regarding environmental factors that may affect the prevalence, perceived risk, and fear of victimization. This section of the survey also contains questions about coping strategies that may increase or decrease a student's exposure to high-risk situations with the potential to lead to student-on-student victimization. These questions generally tap two domains of coping behaviors (i.e., aggressive and avoidant behaviors).

The final section of the AISS contains questions regarding each student's perpetration of crimes and offenses against other students. For consistency, these questions parallel the scope of questions contained in the first section. Additional questions are added at the end of this section to examine each student's level of integration into school-related activities and his/her status among his/her peers.

The Role of Criminological Theories in the Development of the AISS

The FSU School Violence Prevention Project developed the AISS protocol to reflect the most current literature in the fields of criminal justice, juvenile justice, criminology, psychology, sociology, and victimology. Although researchers have created a number of instruments to measure victimization dynamics, Ferraro (1995) developed one of the most advanced structured interview schedules for use with community-based surveys of non-institutionalized adult populations. Ferraro's survey included questions regarding direct and indirect victimization, fear of victimization (with specificity as to the type of victimization), perceived risk of victimization (specifying the potential type of victimization), behavioral changes related to victimization, etc. The AISS protocol represented a significant adaptation of Ferraro's survey methodology because the AISS was developed: a) for adolescents; b) for school settings; and c) to examine psychological, property, physical, and sexual victimization. Although Ferraro's survey focused exclusively on index crimes (e.g., murder, rape, attacks with weapons, sexual assault, robbery), the AISS protocol added measures for psychological ssv. The AISS includes psychological measures because research suggests that while boys are more likely to engage in physical forms of ssv, girls are more likely to engage in relational forms of ssv such as social exclusion, the spreading of rumors, and social manipulation (Bjorkvist, Lagerspetz, and Kaukiainen, 1992; Crick and Grotpeter, 1995; Lagerspetz, Bjorkvist, and Peltonen, 1988; Owen, 1996). Hence, AISS measures permit the exploration of gender differences in victimization dynamics.

The AISS protocol was also designed to test (in part) the ability of "criminal opportunity theories of victimization" to explain ssv among students in grades 7 through 12 (Meier and Miethe, 1993; Miethe and Meier, 1990, 1994). According to this theoretical perspective, the probability of victimization increases when a potential victim is (1) attractive in terms of potential payoff versus risk of apprehension and resistance; (2) in close geographic proximity to motivated offenders; (3) exposed to high-risk situations as a result of his/her behavioral routines and activities; or (4) poorly guarded against victimization by either formally-charged guardians (e.g., police, staff, and teachers) or informal agents (fellow students). The AISS protocol contains questions that examine the latter two constructs, i.e., questions regarding the quality of guardianship within schools and in students' behavioral activities that may increase or decrease exposure to high-risk situations for victimization.

Pilot-Test Results from AISS Data

To examine the psychometric properties of the AISS and determine if it had scales that were internally consistent (i.e., reliable), FSU's research team conducted a pilot test with over 300 children in grades 7

though¹⁰ at Florida State University's Developmental Research School (DRS). The DRS is a K-12 setting that is designed to support pedagogical and instructional research initiatives. The DRS is a unique place to pilot such an instrument because all children in the school are selected via lottery to assure that the student population is demographically representative of the larger population of K-12 students in the Tallahassee area.

To date, FSU's research team has completed reliability analyses (using Chronbach Alphas to measure internal consistency) on scales that measure (1) perceived risk of student-on-student victimization; (2) perceived fear of student-on-student victimization; (3) perceptions of the school environment; and (4) non-specific psychological distress using the K10 as developed and copyright protected by the World Health Organization. All scales developed in these reliability analyses were informed by exploratory factor analyses (EFA) using *Maximum Likelihood Estimation for the extraction method* and *Oblimin rotation with Kaiser Normalization*. Oblimin rotation was used with the assumption that the factors were correlated (i.e., not orthogonal) within any given analysis for fear of ssv, perceived risk of ssv, perceptions of environmental problems that might be associated with ssv, and the K10's measures for non-specific psychological distress. In sum, the Chronbach Alphas were acceptable and ranged from a minimum of 0.67 to a maximum of 0.94, but most fell between 0.80 and 0.92, which support good to excellent internal consistency.

In part or in whole, the AISS protocol can be used to collect baseline data on ssv dynamics in any given school. Additionally, it can be used to provide students with access to data from their own school. Students engaged in the Inquiry Curriculum used AISS data as a learning tool within the Inquiry Curriculum as described in the next section.

Social Science Anti-Violence Inquiry Curriculum

In order to provide a curricular response to school violence for middle-school students, researchers at Florida State University's Center for Educational Research and Policy Studies developed a classroom instructional package on the subject. To this end, the researchers initiated a multiphase effort. First, the research team reviewed curriculum development strategies. Second, the team selected a model of instruction as the basis for all curriculum materials. Third, using the chosen model, actual curriculum units were created with lesson plans, student materials, assessment plans and materials, and teacher materials. Fourth, the units were initially implemented at FSU's DRS, and important feedback from students and teachers was used to revise all units. Fifth, the revised units were implemented during a second year of research and development at a Tallahassee public middle school primarily composed of low-income students. The complex design and array of activities contained in the curricular intervention required a second year of research and development aimed at identifying strengths and eliminating problems within the intervention. Finally, the FSU research team conducted a series of focus-group discussions with students, teachers, and administrators to clarify its pedagogical strengths and weaknesses and made revisions to the curriculum based on the findings from these discussions.

Initial Critical Questions

Using the Tyler (1949) model of curriculum development, the research team began to develop the Inquiry Curriculum by asking and answering the critical questions examined below.

What were the anticipated relevant characteristics of the targeted students?

The research team targeted schools with low-income and disadvantaged students for the curricular intervention. Not only were these schools more likely to experience problems of violence, in all its forms (psychological, property, physical, and sexual), but as Brophy (1991) pointed out, such students were the more likely to be among the lowest achieving students in the most poorly funded schools. Research has

shown that low-achieving students who find themselves in these conditions typically lack many of the resources available to higher achieving students (Thernstrom and Thernstrom, 2003).

What were the relevant social aspects of the issue under study?

To develop an engaging curriculum, the research team determined that materials had to be socially relevant to students and avoid overly abstract social science content that would not resonate with the realities and concerns students' everyday lives. Indeed, even content based on issues at large (e.g., national poverty, hunger, crime, and even violence) can be seen as too abstract and irrelevant to this at-risk student population, which has been noted for being very concrete in their perception of the world. This is reflected in the works of Knapp et al. (1990), Lee-Pearce, Plowman, and Touchstone (1998), and Ramey and Ramey (1998) who found that low achieving students were more likely to learn if curricular efforts were more relevant to these students' cultural beliefs and values, personal needs, and their real-life experiences. Hence, the research team decided to focus students' attention on specific people, places, and events that they found in their own school. Although events from the national stage are studied, the curriculum is fundamentally designed to move students from more remote realities back to the conditions that exist at their own schools. Given this focus, the units directed students to engage in exercises to develop real solutions for violence prevention measures that would ultimately be presented to the administration for implementation or implemented by students in their respective classrooms.

What social-science and historical information was helpful for students to know and use in their study of school violence?

The curricular intervention did briefly expose students to highly-publicized cases from various states around the country, to affectively engage them in an inquiry focused largely on violence in their own school. The curriculum also provided students with exposure to criminal opportunity theories of victimization, which gave students a concrete framework for studying the occurrence of school-based violence.

What social theories will provide the breadth and depth for curricular content?

The curriculum was conceived as an adjunctive curriculum for social studies courses in which teachers could pick and choose portions that were suitable for their content areas while meeting any time restraints they might face. At the same time, the curriculum was intended to have a holistic quality so that, if it was used in its entirety, it would constitute a meaningful and fairly comprehensive study of school violence. To build a holistic curriculum, multiple theoretical paradigms were woven together in a series of applied exercises within the various units.

For example, criminal opportunity theories of victimization (Meier and Miethe, 1993, and Miethe and Meier, 1994) and socio-environmental approaches to mapping violence in schools (Astor, Meyer, and Behre, 1999; also see Astor, Benbenishty, and Meyer, 2004) informed student inquiries and exercises aimed at identifying the dangerous places in any given school and the reasons why these places were dangerous. The curriculum also included notions of what some describe as Jeffersonian democratic thought. Jeffersonian democracy refers to a healthy respect for individual rights, but an equally strong call for local collective ownership or responsibility for conditions facing a society or community (i.e., a town, city, place of work, or a school). Jeffersonian democracy posits that the individual is expected, as a duty, to participate in devising the solutions for any issues or problems facing such collectives.

Accordingly, the Inquiry Curriculum calls on students to not only to determine what level of violence exists at their particular school, but to define those conditions as theirs, and accept their corresponding duty to address these conditions. Students are instructed to begin developing a "federated" approach to school

violence that forms a caring community of students who advance the school's safety and productivity. This method reflects Jefferson's idea about a civil morality, ". . . [O]ur interests soundly calculated, will ever be found inseparable from our moral duty" (Jefferson's Second Inaugural Address).

What learning theory will provide the curriculum's sequence for exercises and materials?

To establish a logical sequence for the curricular exercises and materials, the research team thought it would be useful to utilize an active, as opposed to passive, learning theory. If the goal of the curriculum was to encourage in students a sense of ownership and responsibility in seeking and implementing courses of action to decrease school-based violence, then the instructional model needed to promote students' active role as learners and change agents. In order to achieve this goal, the research team decided to utilize an inquiry/constructivist approach to instruction. They looked at existing models including the Engle and Ochoa model (1988), the Massialas and Cox model (1966), and the jurisprudential model by Oliver and Shaver (1966). Even though each contained viable learning strategies, each also focused on solving broad social issues that were too abstract for the target population. Hence, Gutierrez (a member of the research team) developed a model that instructed students to (1) attend to specific "real-world" problems in their school environment that reflected larger issues and (2) devise solutions to these problems from an array of alternative options which they themselves developed. More specifically, the model was founded on the following steps:

1. Identify an issue relevant to students (in Jeffersonian terms, a state of affairs harmful to the commonwealth), in this case, student-on-student victimization
2. Develop a specific incident that exemplifies the issue in everyday life. In the original model, the scenario highlights an action character who is called upon to make a decision to solve or alleviate a problem depicted in the incident—In this curriculum, students examine various scenarios to address school violence on different levels, at the personal, group, and school levels.
3. Design probing questions that analyze the key definitional issues, basic philosophic positions, and values involved in the incident
4. Gather data to respond to the probing questions—This curriculum directs students to conduct, e.g., self-examinations, student surveys, and environmental observations.
5. Brainstorm possible courses of action
6. Conduct inquiries in small working groups from which information useful in evaluating the alternative solutions is obtained
7. Debate the favored alternatives
8. Plan and apply the chosen alternative(s) to conditions at the school
9. Present alternatives requiring adult assistance to school administrators, teachers, and parents

Guidelines for Implementation

As the Inquiry Curriculum evolved, the research team also identified several guidelines to help assure its successful implementation.

- obtain "buy-in" from the school administration
- select problem situations that exemplify problems associated with school violence and which are relevant to the students
- initially orient students to the notion of inquiry
- have students engage in metacognitive reflections on their inquiry processes
- conduct a debriefing for students to ascertain their reactions of the total experience

Overarching Goals

Through adherence to these guidelines and the modified planning steps outlined earlier, the Inquiry Curriculum was designed to meet the following goals:

- Engage students in the issue of school violence in all of its different manifestations (physical, property, emotional, and sexual) using activities grounded in social science inquiry and the principles of Jeffersonian democracy
- Enable students to present recommendations to the school’s administration that address manifestations of violence at school
- Teach students to identify and analyze, through the use of an ecological model (Lewin, K., 1946, 1947), the relevant and accessible spheres of influence on themselves, their peers, their school environment, and society at large

To accomplish these goals, each curricular unit applied an inquiry process. Each unit also ended with students devising a solution that promoted violence prevention at their school. In addition, each lesson asked students to engage in core learning skills (e.g., each lesson has a writing element), many of which fulfill state education requirements in Florida and other states.

Curriculum Content

To date, the Inquiry Curriculum has taken the following form. In the first two units, students engage in activities that help them recognize how school violence has personally affected each of them and other students. Learning activities are designed to help students “buy-in” to the problem; experience empathy; and experience a moral duty to advance school safety through democratic processes implied within the Jeffersonian tradition. Students develop a “covenant” with their teachers and the school administration in which all parties make personal commitments to help alleviate the problem of school violence.

Next, the curriculum explores how students—as individuals, members of groups, and citizens of the school community—can and do have an impact on school violence and school safety. Students learn about the impact of school violence on victims, and the ways that group dynamics affect school violence. To learn more about these group dynamics, the students design and conduct a survey of their peers. Students also develop a “bill of rights” for a violence-free classroom where they determine peer-based consequences for violent acts committed by students. To complete this unit, students propose activities for their classroom as well as the broader school community to help break down barriers among competing groups.

In a culminating section, the curriculum presents a unit incorporating criminal opportunity theory that more formally transforms students into social scientists. As such, students conduct research on the school’s social and physical environment, make inferences about characteristics of the environment that may contribute to school violence, and formulate research-based solutions. Finally, the curriculum calls on students to advocate solutions they believe will promote school safety for all to school administrators, as well as other stakeholders represented by the Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO) and school board (a first-time experience for most students).

The Inquiry Curriculum is based on four pedagogical elements that have been found through research to typify effective instruction.

- The unique *understandings, preconceptions, and beliefs* of students form the starting point for most of the curriculum’s activities
- The relevance of the *central subject matter* to the prevention of school violence is made clear
- The hands-on and creative activities build on a *foundation of factual knowledge* provided for students in materials appropriate to their grade level

- The curriculum incorporates *metacognitive learning strategies* that help to maximize the student's capacity to reflect on their decision-making process

Results from the First Year of Research and Development

The first-year pilot run resulted in three major observations.

- students disliked redundancy,
- students most enjoyed the interactive activities in the curriculum, and
- students tended to see adults as almost exclusively responsible for preventing violence in the school community.

In response to this feedback, the FSU research team rewrote much of the curriculum to make it more experiential and less didactic. Because the students did not see themselves as directly responsible for prevention, the research team specifically created experiential exercises that “empowered” the students to take an active role, both individually and collectively, in the advancement of their own safety at school.

Following the first-year pilot study, the researchers also identified a number of administrative changes that took place due, in part, to the curricular intervention. For example, the school administrators created an anonymous online reporting system for students so that they could report ssv. This system has led to the increased reporting of both minor and major ssv incidents. The school administration also created a sexual-harassment workshop for staff and students. Interestingly, this workshop has now been utilized by both male and female students identified by their peers as perpetrators of sexual harassment such as “booty patting” and inappropriate sexual remarks. For peer-referred perpetrators, attendance is mandatory.

Future Directions

Both the AISS protocol and the curricular intervention hold much promise for national implementation as outlined in Title IV (Part A) of NCLB. More specifically, Part A of NCLB aims to improve the overall academic performance of students, in part by promoting the advancement of “Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities.” To this end, states must create a uniform management and reporting system for collecting information on school safety and they must report on school safety issues on a school-by-school basis to determine which, if any, are “persistently dangerous.” States that deem any given school as persistently dangerous must then implement evidence-based interventions (e.g., the curricular intervention described herein) as corrective measures and re-survey students thereafter to document any changes in school safety. Although states are given complete flexibility in how they measure school safety, they are required to use anonymous self-report surveys with students to collect data on the incidence and prevalence of drug use, violence, related risk factors, protective factors, and the efficacy of interventions that promote student safety. The AISS protocol would appear to be one of the most advanced survey systems to date, and one that clearly meets all NCLB goals and objectives for self-report survey data. When used in combination with the curricular intervention, the two conjoin to create an elegant package for complying with NCLB requirements.

Beyond the NCLB applications, schools can use the curricular intervention to comply with state mandates for character education in middle school. Many states, like Florida, now have statutorily-mandated character education programs for students in their schools. In fact, this is a growing trend. As of 2002, eighteen (18) states have enacted legislation that allows, encourages, or requires schools to teach character education; additionally, 39 states allow, encourage, or require citizenship education (Council on Educational Policy Research and Improvement, 2002). When one examines the legislation for character and citizenship education, it becomes clear that the curricular intervention described herein can meet the content requirements for many of these statutorily-mandated programs. Additionally, the direct link between the

Inquiry Curriculum and Jeffersonian traditions bodes well for training the next generation of students to embrace their duties as citizens, which include the advancement of school safety.

This curriculum also has utility for guidance counselors. Given the breadth and depth of discussions fostered by this intervention, it is not uncommon for victimized students to come forward and request help from teachers and school staff (i.e., counselors and school social workers). Given the clear need to provide counseling services for identified victims and those at risk of ssv, it makes common sense to have school counselors engaged in the implementation of the intervention. Counselors can provide needed consultation and technical support to teachers as they implement the curriculum and identify victimized students and those at risk of ssv. To expand this window of opportunity, FSU is currently developing a training video that outlines the ways in which school counselors and social workers can support teachers in implementing the intervention.

Finally, this curricular intervention appears to hold promise for increasing parental involvement in the prevention of ssv. To this end, FSU is currently working on the expansion of parental activities related to the intervention. For example, students in one lesson are taught some basic interviewing skills and instructed to interview a parent or guardian in order to learn about their experiences with school violence. In another lesson, students are given the opportunity to present the results of their own in-school field research at a Town Hal” meeting of parents and administrators. Whether such meetings take the form of an informal gathering of interested parents or a formal meeting of the school PTO, they would give students the opportunity to publicly present their findings and suggest interventions to prevent school violence. To extent that parents become more actively engaged in activities promoting the prevention of school violence, schools will become safer places for all children.

References

- Astor, R. A., Benbensishty, R., and Meyer, H. A. (2004). Monitoring and mapping student victimization in schools. *Theory Into Practice*, 43(1), 39-49.
- Astor, R. A., Meyer, H. A., and Behre, W. J. (1999). Unowned places and times: Maps and interviews about violence in high schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 36(1), 3-42.
- Bjorkvist, K., Lagerspetz, K.M.J., and Kaukiainen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Developmental trends regarding direct and indirect aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 18, 117-127.
- Brophy, J. E. (1991). Effective schooling for disadvantaged students. In M. S. Knapp and P. M. Shields (Eds.), *Better schooling for the children of poverty: Alternatives to conventional wisdom* (pp. 211-234). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2000). *Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance - United States, 1999*. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Chandler, K. A., Chapman, C. D., Rand, M. R., and Taylor, B. M. (1998). *Students' reports of school crime: 1989 and 1995*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education and Justice.
- Crick, N.R., and Grotpeter, J.K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social psychological adjustment. *Child Development*, 66, 710-722.
- Council on Educational Policy Research and Improvement (2002). *An Issue Brief on Character Education*. Tallahassee, FL: Author.
- Engle, S. H., and Ochoa, A. S. (1988). *Educating citizens for democracy: Decision making in social studies*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ferraro, K. F. (1995). *Fear of crime: Interpreting victimization risk*. Albany, NY: University of New York Press.
- Hamilton Fish Institute. (2002). *The National School Crime and Safety Survey - Revised*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Kerbs, J. J., Rollin, S. A., Gutierrez, R., Potts, I., Choi, K., Dao, T., Creason, A., and Wolf, A. (2003). *The predictors of perceived risk for student-on-student victimization reported by students in*

- grades 7-10. A paper presented at the American Society of Criminology's Annual Conference. Denver, CO: American Society of Criminology.
- Kessler, R. C., Andrews, G., Colpe, L. J., Hiripi, E., Mroczek, D. K., Normand, S. T., Walters, E. E., and Zaslavsky, A. M. (in press). Short screening scales to monitor population prevalences and trends in nonspecific psychological distress. *Psychological Medicine*.
- Knapp, M. S., Thurnbull, B. J., and Shields, P. M. (1990). New directions for educating the children of poverty. *Educational Leadership*, 48(1), 4-9.
- Lagerspetz, K.M.J., Bjorkvist, K., and Peltonen, T. (1988). Is direct aggression typical of females? Gender differences in 11- and 12-year-old children. *Aggressive Behavior*, 14, 403-414.
- Lee-Pearce, M. L., Plowman, T. S., and Touchstone, D. (1998). Starbase-Atlantis, a school without walls: A comparative study of an innovative science program for at-risk urban elementary students. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 3, 223-235.
- Lewin, K. (1946). Behavior and Development as a Function on the Total Situation. In Lewin K., Resolving Social Conflicts and Field Theory in Social Science, (1997). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in Group Dynamics. In Lewin K., Resolving Social Conflicts and Field Theory in Social Science, (1997). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Massialas, B. G., and Cox, C. B. (1966). *Inquiry in social studies*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Meier, R. F., and Miethe, T. D. (1993). Understanding theories of criminal victimization. *Crime and Justice: A Review of the Research*, 17, 459-499.
- Miethe, T. D., and Meier, R. F. (1994). *Crime and its social context: Toward an integrated theory of offenders, victims, and situations*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Miethe, T. D., and Meier, R. F. (1990). Criminal opportunity and victimization rates: A structural choice theory of criminal victimization. *Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency*, 27, 243-266.
- Oliver, D. W., and Shaver, J. P. (1966). *Teaching public issues in the high school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Olweus, D. (1996). *E01-Junior: Questionnaire for Students*. Place: Author.
- Owen, L. (1996). Sticks and stones and sugar and spice: Girls' and boys' aggression in schools. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counseling*, 6, 45-55.
- Ramey, C. T. and Ramey, S. L. (1998). Early intervention and early experience. *American Psychologist*, 53, 109-120.
- Thernstrom, A. and Thernstrom, S. (2003). No excuses: *Closing the Racial Gap in Learning*. New York: Simon and Shuster.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- U.S. Department of Education. 2002. Indicators of School Crime and Safety 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Biography

Robert Gutierrez, Ed.D., was a classroom teacher for 25 years. He taught every grade from 7th to 12th within two different school districts, Pinellas County (St. Petersburg) and Miami-Dade County, Florida. His assignments during that period included membership on the state textbook adoption committee, authorship of test items on the initial teacher certification exam, and hosting of a television educational program--"Dial-a-Teacher" in Miami. He received his Ed.D. from Florida International University in 1998, and is currently an Assistant Professor in the Department of Middle and Secondary Education at Florida State University. Dr. Gutierrez is the Principal Investigator for the FSU School Safety Project and provided the pedagogical basis for the newly-developed curriculum, "Students Address Violence Prevention through Participatory Democracy" that addresses social problem resolution, through a combination of inquiry, jurisprudence, concept development, and social action models. His areas of specialty include civic education, multiculturalism, and moral education. Gutierrez, Kerbs, Rollin, Potts, Harpring, Creason, Choi, Dao, and

Wolf, "The measurement and prevention of school-based victimization in grades 7 through 10" [105602]

John Johnson Kerbs, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor who holds a joint appointment in the Department of Criminal Justice and the Carolyn Freeze-Baynes Institute for Social Justice at East Carolina University. As co-principal investigator on two federally-funded research projects, he has developed and evaluated interventions to prevent student-on-student victimization in middle- and high-school settings. Additionally, he has conducted research that examines the safety and victimization of older prisoners in state-level correctional facilities. To date, he has published several book chapters and articles in journals such as *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *Crime & Delinquency*, *Hamline Journal of Public Law and Policy*, and *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*. He can be contacted at East Carolina University via email (kerbsj@mail.ecu.edu), phone (252-328-5546), or at the following address: Dr. John J. Kerbs, East Carolina University, Department of Criminal Justice, College of Human Ecology, 279-D Rivers Building, Greenville, NC, 27858-4353. Gutierrez, Kerbs, Rollin, Potts, Harpring, Creason, Choi, Dao, and Wolf, "The measurement and prevention of school-based victimization in grades 7 through 10" [105602]

Stephen A. Rollin, Ed.D., is a Professor Emeritus in the Department of Educational Psychology and Learning Systems at Florida State University. Dr. Rollin received his Bachelor of Arts degree at the University of Illinois, his Masters at Indiana University and his Ed.D. at the University of Massachusetts. Dr. Rollin joined the FSU faculty in 1971 and served as both a Department Chair and the Associate Dean for the College of Education. As the Principal Investigator for the FSU School Safety Promotion project, Dr. Rollin was responsible for the development of the curriculum. Dr. Rollin's research has focused on prevention programs for high risk behavior among children and adolescents. His research has been supported by the US Department of Justice and Education as well as various agencies within the State of Florida. He has worked internationally in New Zealand, Australia, Indonesia, and Venezuela to name a few. Locally, Dr. Rollin has been President of Capital City Youth Services, the Neighborhood Network and the Literacy Volunteers of Gadsden County. Dr. Rollin is broadly published and has presented the results of his work in various forums both nationally and internationally. Gutierrez, Kerbs, Rollin, Potts, Harpring, Creason, Choi, Dao, and Wolf, "The measurement and prevention of school-based victimization in grades 7 through 10" [105602]

Isabelle Potts, JD is Project Director and co-Principal Investigator for Florida State University's School Safety Promotion project. She was awarded a *Juris Doctor* from the University of Texas at Austin and was admitted to the Texas Bar in 1984. Ms. Potts joined the faculty of Florida State University as an Assistant in Research in 1998. Ms. Potts' efforts have focused on school violence research, legal issues related to school violence, the development of an inquiry-based curriculum to address school violence, the development of an arts curriculum for middle school, as well as legal issues related to the death penalty. Prior to joining FSU, Ms. Potts managed federal grants for nine years. She started her legal career investigating and litigating securities and consumer fraud cases. Ms. Potts received her Bachelor's of Art with Honors. She is a member of Phi Beta Kappa. She is an officer of an off-beat theatrical company that seeks to give voice to disaffected members of the community. Gutierrez, Kerbs, Rollin, Potts, Harpring, Creason, Choi, Dao, and Wolf, "The measurement and prevention of school-based victimization in grades 7 through 10" [105602]

Jayne Harpring's academic background reflects her long-standing interest in the fields of psychology, education, and communication. Jayne earned a B.A. in psychology with a minor in education from Barnard College, an M.A. in Community Psychology from Temple University, and a Ph.D. in Communication Theory from Florida State University (FSU). After working for several years as a mental health counselor with drug-involved adolescents and families, Jayne studied and worked in prevention and public communication at FSU and specialized in qualitative research and analysis. As the parent of two children, she became interested in alternative education and eventually homeschooled her two children for three years. Jayne later worked as the director of the Born to Read program, an early literacy program funded by the Leon County Public Library, and as a freelance editor of books and dissertations. She currently serves as vice-chair of the

Board of Directors of the School of Arts and Sciences in Tallahassee, Florida. Gutierrez, Kerbs, Rollin, Potts, Harpring, Creason, Choi, Dao, and Wolf, "The measurement and prevention of school-based victimization in grades 7 through 10" [105602]

Alia Haque Creason, M.P.H., Florida State University, Research Assistant

Kyubeom Choi, M.S., Florida State University, Research Assistant

Tam Dao, M.S., Florida State University, Research Assistant

Amanda Wolf, M.A., Florida State University, Research Assistant