1

Defining and Measuring Bullying across the Life Course

Jennifer Greif Green, Michael J. Furlong, and Erika D. Felix

Despite the prominence of the word "bullying" in educational settings and popular media, the term has been inconsistently defined. Many researchers and policymakers have called for greater precision in definition (Cornell & Bandyopadhyay, 2010; Felix, Sharkey, Green, Furlong, & Tanigawa, 2011; Furlong, Sharkey, Felix, Tanigawa, & Green, 2010), and some have questioned whether the term should be eliminated altogether (Finkelhor, Turner, & Hamby, 2012). The lack of consensus in defining bullying has implications for laws and policies that use varying definitions of the term (Stuart-Cassel, Bell, & Springer, 2011). This is further complicated for assessment tools that, because of their inconsistency, have made it difficult to generate precise data on trends in bullying involvement across time and settings (Gladden, Vivolo-Kantor, Hamburger, & Lumpkin, 2014).

Initially, research and discourse related to bullying were dominated by discussions about the elementary and secondary school contexts. Seminal research on bullying in Europe (for example, Olweus, 1978) was designed to understand a specific form of peer aggression among youth that often occurred within schools. In the United States, deeper interest and a larger volume of scholarly research on bullying emerged in the mid-1990s out of reports that linked a history of bullying victimization to several school shootings. Recently, research has expanded to focus on both bullying of children in nonschool contexts (for example, neighborhoods) and bullying in adulthood. For example, the first journal articles on workplace bullying (the main context in which bullying has been studied in adulthood) were not published until the mid-1990s. Research on bullying among adults has still primarily been conducted in Europe and has not been as widely studied as school-based bullying. In addition, although bullying is generally conceptualized as peer-to-peer aggression, more recent studies have considered the possibility of bullying between adults and children (Twemlow, Fonagy, Sacco, & Brethour, 2006), as well as between siblings (Menesini, Camodeca, & Nocentini, 2010). These expansions on the concept of bullying naturally evoke questions about the definition of the term, the extent to which the concept is

relevant and useful across the life course, the intersection of bullying with other related life experiences (for example, harassment, hazing, intimate partner violence), and the extent to which narrowly and broadly defined conceptualizations of bullying are useful for improving policy and practice. In this chapter, we first review definitions of bullying and discuss issues that arise in their application across the life course. Second, we describe measurement strategies and the relevance of these strategies across life course stages. Finally, we highlight examples of measures of bullying that practitioners might find useful in their work with children, adolescents, and adults.

DEFINITIONS OF BULLYING ACROSS THE LIFE COURSE

Efforts to define bullying have been guided by the foundational work of Dan Olweus, who is widely considered the pioneer of bullying research. He defined *bullying* as direct and indirect aggression that (a) is intentional, (b) is repeated, and (c) involves a power differential between the aggressor and the target (Olweus, 1978). These qualities were designed to distinguish bullying from the broader category of aggression, which might include playful behavior, one-time acts, and aggression between two equals. This definition is the most widely adopted one by both researchers and policymakers (Green, Felix, Sharkey, Furlong, & Kras, 2013); however, a number of questions have been raised about the effective use of this definition. For example, how is it determined whether there is a power differential between the aggressor and the target? Although this criterion was included to categorize cases in which the target cannot defend him- or herself, in reality it can be difficult to identify different sources of power in relationships, particularly when relationships are in flux.

There have been several recent efforts to expand and update the original definition proposed by Olweus, the most significant of which was initiated by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). In 2011, the CDC established a panel to develop a uniform definition of bullying, specifically for youth, with the goal of reducing discrepancies in methods for defining and measuring bullying. The CDC defines *bullying* as

> any *unwanted aggressive behavior(s)* by another youth or group of youth who are not siblings or current dating partners that involves an *observed or perceived power imbalance and is repeated multiple times or is highly likely to be repeated*. Bullying may inflict harm or distress on the targeted youth including physical, psychological, social, or educational *harm*. (Gladden et al., 2014, p. 7; emphasis in original)

This definition expands the subset of behaviors that can be defined as bullying to include a power differential that is either *observed or perceived* and aggression that is not actually repeated but is *highly likely to be repeated*. However, this definition of bullying is also restricted to relationships among youth (not adults) and specifies that those youth are not siblings or current dating partners. It is not yet clear how this revised definition is being integrated into and influencing practice, policy, and assessment.

Researchers defining bullying have further categorized aggression into direct (overt) and indirect (covert) forms (Gladden et al., 2014; Van der Wal, De Wit, & Hirasing, 2003). Bullying that is direct includes physical and verbal aggression (for example, hitting, shoving, name-calling) that transpires in the presence of the target. Indirect bullying is characterized as aggression that occurs through a third party (for example, exclusion, rumors, gossip) or when the target is not present and is typically designed to decrease social status.

Some studies have found that the experience of victimization by indirect bullying is more strongly associated with poor psychosocial outcomes than victimization that occurs by direct bullying (Van der Wal et al., 2003). Common types of bullying include physical, verbal, and relational aggression, destruction of theft or property, and cyberbullying (Breivik & Olweus, 2015; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Gladden et al., 2014).

At the core of debates about the definition of bullying are questions about the purpose and importance of clearly defining bullying. What began as a term developed to define a unique subset of victimization and aggression among children has steadily expanded into other contexts and relationships, such as workplace bullying and teenage dating violence. At what point is a term defined too broadly (or too narrowly) to be useful for research and practice? Is there a set of bullying experiences that are homogenous enough to be accurately classified under one name? Researchers studying bullying in either very young children or adulthood have needed to be particularly thoughtful about these definitional issues. In the following sections, we discuss critical definitional issues that arise in three life course stages: early childhood, school age, and adulthood.

Early Childhood

In early childhood, the primary challenges to defining bullying are determining the age at which it is possible for bullying to first emerge and identifying whether bullying can be effectively distinguished from other forms of aggression. Some studies have suggested that peer-directed aggression can be identified in children as young as 12 months old (for example, taking toys, pushing or hitting others; Hanish, Kochenderfer-Ladd, Fabes, Martin, & Denning, 2004). As children enter preschool, many experiment with cause and effect in relationships, trying out aggressive and exclusionary roles for brief periods of time. As such, involvement in peer aggression and victimization in this age group is commonly brief and unstable. Given the fluidity of social relationships among this age group and the continued development of core social skills, researchers are hesitant to label this behavior "bullying" (Hanish et al., 2004). In particular, because of yet-to-be-developed cognitive complexity, young children might not have sufficient perspective-taking skills to anticipate the emotional or physical harm caused by their behaviors or to sufficiently understand harm that they inflict. When this is the case, can behaviors be considered "intentional"?

Despite the definitional challenges, these early experiences of peer aggression can be significant and increase risk for later peer victimization (Godleski, Kamper, Ostrov, Hart, & Blakely-McClure, 2015), which suggests the importance of intervening in peer aggression in early childhood settings. Although not all aggressive young children will go on to behave as bullies, it seems reasonable to suggest that the majority of children who engage in bullying behaviors had some history of practice enacting aggression in preschool. Whether to call this behavior "bullying" or "pre-bullying" might depend on whether the term serves a useful purpose for an individual child or a school. Particularly in early childhood, it might be sufficient to address all aggressive behavior as a social learning opportunity, rather than labeling behavior as bullying specifically.

School Age

The majority of research on bullying has been conducted among school-age children and adolescents and has focused specifically on their experiences in the context of schools. In this age group, definitional issues have focused on the extent to which bullying overlaps

with other forms of violence or victimization and the distinction among forms of bullying behaviors. Youth experiencing multiple forms of victimization (for example, bullying and victimization at home) have worse psychological and academic outcomes than those who have experienced only one type of victimization (for example, just bullying; Holt, Finkelhor, & Kantor, 2007). Furthermore, among those who have been bullied, having experienced multiple forms of bullying (for example, physical and verbal bullying) is associated with poorer outcomes (Bradshaw, Waasdorp, & Lindstrom Johnson, 2015). These results are reminiscent of the broader literature on polyvictimization that consistently finds that exposure to a greater number of adverse events is associated with worse psychosocial and health outcomes (Finkelhor et al., 2007). Findings suggest the importance of defining bullying as a distinct phenomenon from other forms of aggression, so that it can be considered in relation to other victimization experiences. Similarly, definitions of bullying will be most useful when they incorporate the broad range of possible manifestations of bullying. For example, when Crick and Grotpeter (1995) introduced the concept of relational aggression (that is, aggression designed to damage peer relationships, such as rumor spreading and social exclusion), research and policy on bullying expanded to incorporate the aggression that girls tend to engage in more frequently than physical aggression (Espelage & Swearer, 2003).

One form of bullying that has recently received particular attention is cyberbullying (that is, bullying that uses electronic forms of contact; Smith et al., 2008). Researchers have generally defined *cyberbullying* as a type of aggression that, just as other forms of bullying, requires repetition, intentionality, and a power differential (Menesini & Nocentini, 2009). However, some of these definitional qualities can be difficult to identify in the context of cyberbullying. For example, is a single message posted on social media considered repetition if it can be viewed indefinitely by a broad audience (Menesini & Nocentini, 2009)? Furthermore, defining the power differential in an online setting can be difficult. For example, some targets of cyberbullying do not know the identity of aggressors. Can a power difference be assumed?

Adulthood

Although the impact of bullying involvement into adulthood is well documented (for example, Copeland, Wolke, Angold, & Costello, 2013; Holt et al., 2014), the study of bullying behaviors among adults is relatively new. A primary question to address is whether bullying among adults is fundamentally the same concept as bullying among children or adolescents. The fact that some studies have found evidence of continuity in bullying involvement from childhood through emerging adulthood (for example, Chapell et al., 2005) suggests that there might be some stability in the experience. The literature on bullying in adults contends with similar difficulties in terms of defining bullying, differentiating it from other forms of aggression, and identifying effective measurement tools (Hershcovis, 2011). For example, research on workplace aggression identifies several constructs, including bullying, incivility, abusive supervision, social undermining, and interpersonal conflict (Hershcovis, 2011). Many of these terms can be subtly differentiated on the basis of certain features of their definition, such as perceived intent, intensity, frequency, the relationship between the aggressor and victim, whether the behavior is overt or covert, and the outcomes of the aggression (Hershcovis, 2011). Even within the field of workplace bullying per se, investigators have used definitions of bullying (Nielsen et al., 2009) that vary on the degree to which they include different forms of aggression, harassment, and incivility.

Some researchers of adult bullying based their definition on the commonly used Olweus definition (Nielsen, Matthiesen, & Einarsen, 2010), stressing the repetition, chronicity, and perceived power imbalance of bullying. In their description of bullying, Nielsen and associates (2010) specifically excluded behaviors that are sexual in nature in order to differentiate bullying from sexual harassment. They also suggest that bullying among adults is largely nonviolent, perhaps to differentiate it from assault. However, both of these exclusions are open to debate.

CONSIDERATIONS IN MEASURING BULLYING ACROSS THE LIFE COURSE

Approaches to defining bullying have direct implications for measurement. Given disagreement over definitions of bullying and distinctions in how bullying manifests at different ages, a range of methodological strategies have been used to identify bullying involvement. Ultimately, the selection of a measurement strategy and tool should be guided both by the purpose of the assessment and by the age of individuals involved in the assessment. In particular, bullying measures may be used for monitoring and safety planning, identifying individuals who might be involved in bullying relationships (as targets, aggressors, bystanders), and providing information to inform clinical intervention efforts. The nature and structure of each of these forms of assessment vary.

First, methods for monitoring and safety planning typically use brief self-report measures of bullying that can be completed easily by large numbers of people to obtain prevalence estimates and track changes in those estimates over time. For example, the Olweus Bullying Scale uses these response options: "it hasn't happened in the past couple of months," "it has only happened once or twice," "2 or 3 times a month," "about once a week," and "several times a week" (Breivik & Olweus, 2015), with a frequency of two to three times a month or more indicating bullying. Many schools conducting schoolwide assessments use anonymous assessment methods for this purpose because of the greater likelihood that students will provide honest responses. Self-report measures that directly ask students if they have been bullied are, however, reliant on self-perceptions of bullying-involved youth who might or might not perceive aggression to be "bullying" and identify themselves as an involved student (Sharkey et al., 2015). To address this issue, some surveys do not use the term "bullying" and instead ask students to indicate whether they have experienced aggression that is repeated, is intentional, and involves an imbalance of power (Felix et al., 2011). The vast majority of bullying measures have been developed and used for this purpose—to track trends in bullying and to evaluate the effectiveness of bullying prevention and intervention efforts (for example, does the prevalence of bullying decrease following the administration of a bullying prevention program?).

Second, in contrast, efforts to identify individuals involved in bullying will by necessity be nonanonymous. In addition to self-report measures, schools often use peer nominations for this purpose, which ask students to nominate classmates who match a definition or description of bullying involvement. Using peer nominations eliminates some concerns that self-report methods might be inaccurate when children are reluctant to identify themselves as involved in bullying (Cornell & Bandyopadhyay, 2010). However, studies indicate that peer nomination and self-report methods identify different groups of students as being involved in bullying. For example, in a study of middle school students, Branson and Cornell (2009) found that approximately 5 percent of students were categorized as bullies on the

basis of their own self-report, whereas 11 percent were identified as bullying others when using peer nominations. Both self-report and peer nomination were significantly and independently associated with aggressive attitudes and negative school outcomes. These results suggest that using these measurement strategies in combination might be the most effective way to identify students at risk for poor outcomes (Cornell & Bandyopadhyay, 2010).

Finally, whereas self-report surveys typically assess whether an individual was involved in bullying, those in clinical practice may want more information to understand an individual's experience and design intervention efforts. Our team has developed a structured interview that is part of a multigating procedure to be used in schools to identify and respond to students involved in bullying. This interview, the California Bullying Victimization Scale—Gate 2 (Furlong, Felix, Sharkey, Green, & Tanigawa, 2006), is designed to be administered by mental health providers in a one-on-one interview with students previously identified by a schoolwide survey. Mental health providers ask about the frequency of different forms of victimization and then follow up with specific prompts (for example, was the aggression carried out "in a mean way"?) to determine intentionality and the presence of a power differential. Mental health providers also ask a series of questions about the impact of bullying on student well-being, reasons students believe they were involved, and help-seeking behaviors. This interview is designed to (a) facilitate a conversation in which mental health providers can assess bullying involvement and (b) obtain information that will provide actionable steps for interventions to address the bullying and respond to the impact of bullying on the student (Furlong et al., 2006).

Although we focus in this chapter on strategies for assessing bullying specifically, it is important to note that for intervention purposes, additional assessment of the impact of bullying, characteristics of individuals involved, and the broader landscape of those individuals' strengths and well-being is critical. As an example, for clinicians intervening with a person involved in bullying it might be less important to understand the details of the aggression experienced than to identify how that aggression influenced self-perception, mental health, social support, and intrapersonal strengths (Sharkey et al., 2015). Ideally, studies of bullying across the life course would include longitudinal measurement to identify the continuity of bullying and differential impact as individuals. However, with some exceptions (for example, Sourander, Helstelä, Helenius, & Piha, 2000), most longitudinal studies of bullying focus only on one life course stage (for example, childhood; Pelligrini & Long, 2002). Longitudinal studies are challenging to conduct, in part because measurement approaches vary by age. In the sections below, we describe critical issues in assessing bullying at different stages in the life course.

Early Childhood

Assessing bullying among young children presents a unique challenge. As described by Monks, Smith, and Swettenham (2003), the reliability of self-reported aggression among young children is questionable and researchers disagree about whether young children can effectively nominate involved peers. When asked directly, young children provide broader and less nuanced definitions of bullying than their older peers, often ignoring issues of repetition, intentionality, and power differential and focusing on the outcome of the action (Monks & Smith, 2010). For this reason, it can be particularly difficult to distinguish bullying from other forms of aggression and victimization among young children. Furthermore, although teachers can provide reliable reports, they might have limited knowledge of student involvement in aggression, particularly as targets (Monks et al., 2003).

Researchers of peer aggression in early childhood have therefore developed alternative strategies to study behaviors and identify involved students. For example, some studies have used live observers or audiovisual recordings to collect data on instances of physical and relational aggression in child interaction and then coded observations (Godleski et al., 2015). These methods provide the advantage of data collection in naturalistic settings and the opportunity to use trained and unbiased observers. However, they are limited in their documentation only to behaviors that are observable (for example, Godleski et al. found ratings of physical aggression more reliable than ratings of relational aggression). Furthermore, observational methods can be time-consuming and require prior training, making it more likely that they are used for research purposes than in practice. Collecting information from multiple informants (for example, observational methods, parent and teacher report, as well as student self-report) is particularly important because of measurement challenges among this age group. Ultimately, practitioners involved in assessing bullying behaviors among preschoolers need to determine whether it is useful to label behavior as "bullying" or if reported behavior is suggestive of children learning interpersonal and problem-solving approaches that could lead to bullying or other, less than optimal, developmental outcomes.

School Age

Bullying assessment among school-age children and adolescents has been widely studied, and a large number of tools are available that include self-report, peer nomination, and teacher–parent report (for recent reviews, see Cornell & Bandyopadhyay, 2010; Furlong et al., 2010). In 2011, the CDC published a compendium of assessment tools measuring bullying victimization, perpetration, and bystander experiences (Hamburger, Basile, & Vivolo, 2011). Debate continues on questions about the choice of informant source (Cornell & Bandyopadhyay, 2010), decisions about whether to use the term "bullying" in assessments (Felix et al., 2011), and how to effectively measure an imbalance of power (Green et al., 2013).

Similar to the issues in early childhood measurement, efforts to examine the extent to which measurement approaches consistently identify youth involved in bullying (Green et al., 2013) have generally found that different measurement tools identify different groups of bullying-involved youth. Without a "gold standard" measure of bullying, it is difficult to determine the relative validity of different approaches. A series of studies by Cornell and colleagues (for example, Cornell & Mehta, 2011) have used interviews conducted by school counselors to confirm the status of students identified as being involved in bullying by either self-report or peer nomination methods. Still, there is no clear way for schools and researchers to identify the "true" set of bullying-involved youth because (a) the nature of bullying is that of a dynamic peer relationship, (b) defining bullying is reliant on student perceptions (for example, of intentionality and power), and (c) many forms of bullying are not equally observable to all potential reporters (for example, students might not tell their parents about bullying). Studies seeking to determine the true population of bullying-involved youth, such as the approach by Cornell and colleagues, are critical to moving research and practice in bullying assessment forward.

Adulthood

Conceptual overlap and definitional issues also affect measurement of adult bullying for both victims and aggressors (Hershcovis, 2011). This can have an impact on prevalence rates (Nielsen et al., 2010) and associations with mental health, postsecondary success, and

work-related outcomes (Hershcovis, 2011). There is a wide variety of methods to assess and understand the nature of bullying among adults, and the choice of method depends on the purpose (for a review, see Cowie, Naylor, Rivers, Smith, & Pereira, 2002). The purpose of assessment can include the goal of understanding a target's experience, establishing prevalence of bullying on a college campus or in a workplace, discerning whether culture and climate is conducive to bullying, elucidating interpersonal dynamics associated with bullying, and evaluating intervention success (Cowie et al., 2002). Self-report surveys are a popular, cost-effective, and efficient way to collect information from large groups of adults. Paralleling the discussion in the child literature, there is debate over the best self-report methods—questions about a series of behaviors experienced or a one-item question asking whether a person has ever been bullied (Nielsen et al., 2010). This one item can be given with or without a definition of bullying, with implications for prevalence rates. Nielsen and associates (2010) found the lowest prevalence rates for self-labeled bullying victimization when a definition was given and higher rates for self-labeling when no definition was presented. Thus, the choice of measure has implications to be considered.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE AND POLICY

Practitioners are better prepared to meaningfully engage in bullying assessment when they are aware of the challenges researchers have faced in developing measures. In some ways, "bullying" is defined by the instrument that is used; hence, it is important to examine a specific measure's content and decide whether it is appropriate for its intended application, particularly when it is considered that a recent review identified 27 youth self-report bullying instruments alone (Vessey, Strout, DiFazio, & Walker, 2014). Having stated this, such nuanced critiques of bullying measurement are not as critical in applied practice because a practitioner's primary interest is to identify individuals who are experiencing social or psychological distress and to address their needs. However, measuring bullying specifically adds an increased awareness of the role that interpersonal power differences might play in aggression, recognizing that this type of victimization is associated with poor developmental outcomes across the life course (Ttofi, Farrington, & Lösel, 2012). Given the large number of bullying instruments available, we suggest the following four considerations:

1. Be familiar with a range of bullying assessments, keeping in mind the life course context and your assessment needs. The CDC compendium (Hamburger et al., 2011) is a readily available resource that is updated periodically. Other comprehensive reviews are provided for bullying and cyberbullying (Vessey et al., 2014; Vivolo-Kantor, Martell, Holland, & Westby, 2014), as well as workplace bullying (Galanaki & Papalexandris, 2013).
2. Recognize that the optimal use of bullying assessments is within the context of a coordinated approach that collects information to inform ongoing prevention and intervention efforts. Totten, Quigley, and Morgan (2004) provide a detailed best practice guide on how to administer and use bullying assessments within schools.
3. Be mindful of special populations, such as children with disabilities (for example, Fink, Deighton, Humphrey, & Wolpert, 2015), youth and adults who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer (for example, Kosciw, Greytak, Palmer, & Boesen, 2014), and college-age young adults (Holt et al., 2014). Measurement strategies should be considered in the context of the population assessed and modified or supplemented to effectively address specific needs.

Table 1.1: Commonly Used Measures of Bullying

Resource	Grade or Age Group	Description and Access
Authoritative School Climate Survey (Cornell, 2014)	Grades 3–5 and 6–12	**Self-report:** This measure was developed to assess an Authoritative School Climate model. Psychometrically supported subscales address the prevalence of bullying, reactions to bullying, aggressive attitudes, and victim experiences. There is also a staff version. **Availability:** http://curry.virginia.edu/resource-library/ authoritative-school-climate-survey-and-school-climate-bullying-survey
Bully Survey (Swearer & Cary, 2003)	Grades 3–12	**Self-report:** Section A assesses the type, frequency, location, perpetrator, and reasons that the student attributes to being victimized. Section B asks about bullying observed at school. Section C asks whether students have engaged in bullying others. Section D inquires about general attitudes toward bullying. Individual sections could be used for program evaluation and counseling purposes. Staff and parent versions are available. **Availability:** Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/ pub/measuring_bullying.html An online administration system is published by H & H Publishing. http://www.bullysurvey.com/ description_.html
Olweus Bullying Questionnaire (Solberg & Olweus, 2003)	Grades 3–12	**Self-report:** The Olweus Bullying Questionnaire is available with the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. This is the most widely used bullying assessment worldwide. **Availability:** Hazelden Publishing. http://www.hazelden .org/itemquest/search.view?srch=Y&start=0&HAZLWEB_ STORE_SELECTED=EDU&kw=olweus+bullying+ questionnaire
PREVNet Bullying Evaluation and Strategies Tool (BEST; Pepler & Craig, n.d.)	Grades K–12	**Self-report:** The PREVNet (Promoting Relationships & Eliminating Violence Network) assessment system includes instruments for Grades 4–12. In addition, a K–3 version includes an audio component and interactive graphics so that the young child does not need to read the questions in order to respond. This comprehensive online system includes parents and teacher instruments and a principal reporting option. **Availability:** http://www.prevnet.ca/resources/ assessment-tool

(continues)

Table 1.1: Commonly Used Measures of Bullying (*Continued*)

Resource	Grade or Age Group	Description and Access
Student School Survey (Williams & Guerra, 2007)	Ages 10–17	**Self-report:** This 70-item instrument assesses school climate. In particular, items 17–38 ask about bullying victimization, perpetrator, and bystander behaviors. Items 53–70 inquire about moral disengagement from aggression and peer victimization. **Availability:** Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pub/measuring_bullying.html
Modified Peer Nomination Inventory (Perry, Kusel, & Perry, 1988)	Ages 10–14	**Peer nomination:** Within this instrument, 7 items measure aggression (e.g., "He makes fun of people") and 7 measure victimization (e.g., "He gets picked on"). Students identify classmates fitting each behavior. This source has been widely cited. **Availability:** Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pub/measuring_bullying.html
Child Social Behavior Questionnaire (Warden, Cheyne, Christie, Fitzpatrick, & Reid, 2003)	Ages 9–10	**Peer nomination:** An interview style presents 24 items to students, asking them to indicate whether they have observed any of 8 randomly selected classmates engaging in behavior (e.g., "Pushing or tripping"). Parallel self-report and teacher report forms are available. **Availability:** Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pub/measuring_bullying.html
Negative Acts Questionnaire—Revised (Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009)	Ages 18+	**Self-report:** This 22-item instrument asks employees to indicate exposure to work-related bullying (e.g., "Having your opinions ignored"), person-related bullying (e.g., "Persistent criticism of your errors"), and physically intimidating bullying (e.g., "Intimidating behaviours such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space"). **Availability:** Bergen Bullying Research Group. http://www.uib.no/en/rg/bbrg/44045/naq

4. Advances in bullying assessment are ongoing. New assessment resources are available (for example, Morrow, Hubbard, Barhight, & Thomson, 2014), including innovative computer-aided assessments (for example, Verlinden et al., 2014). Finally, there is a range of measurement strategies used in bully instruments; however, the dominant methods are self-report (used in 85 percent of research) followed by peer nominations (12 percent; Vivolo-Kantor et al., 2014). Table 1.1 lists some of the best developed and most widely used self-report and peer nomination instruments.

Practitioners using surveys to evaluate the need for or success of bullying interventions should consider the advice of Olweus, the pioneer of bullying research and prevention:

> There currently exist several questionnaires that purport to measure bullying and may even be named "bullying questionnaires" but do not involve the three key criteria through a definition or by other means. . . . Such instruments are likely to measure aggression in general rather than the special subcategory of bullying. (Breivik & Olweus, 2015, p. 9)

Survey selection should be based on a match between item content and practical need, not the title of the instrument.

REFERENCES

Bradshaw, C. P., Waasdorp, T. E., & Lindstrom Johnson, S. (2015). Overlapping verbal, relational, physical, and electronic forms of bullying in adolescence: Influence of school context. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 44*, 494–508. doi:10.1080/15374416.2014.893516

Branson, C., & Cornell, D. (2009). A comparison of self and peer reports in the assessment of middle school bullying. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 25*, 5–27.

Breivik, K., & Olweus, D. (2015). An item response theory analysis of the Olweus Bullying Scale. *Aggressive Behavior, 41*(1), 1–13. doi:10.1002/AB.21571

Chapell, M. S., Hasselman, S. L., Kitchin, T., Lomon, S. N., MacIver, K. W., & Sarullo, P. L. (2005). Bullying in elementary school, high school, and college. *Adolescence, 41*(164), 633–648.

Copeland, W. E., Wolke, D., Angold, A., & Costello, E. J. (2013). Adult psychiatric outcomes of bullying and being bullied by peers in childhood and adolescence. *JAMA Psychiatry, 70*, 419–426. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2013.504

Cornell, D. G. (2014). *The Authoritative School Climate Survey and School Climate Bullying Survey: Description and research summary.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia, Virginia Youth Violence Project.

Cornell, D. G., & Bandyopadhyay, S. (2010). The assessment of bullying. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 265–276). New York: Routledge.

Cornell, D., & Mehta, S. B. (2011). Counselor confirmation of middle school student self-reports of bullying victimization. *Professional School Counseling, 14*, 261–270. doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2011-14.261

Cowie, H., Naylor, P., Rivers, I., Smith, P. K., & Pereira, B. (2002). Measuring workplace bullying. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 7*, 33–51. doi:10.1080/09585192.2012.725084

Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development, 66*, 710–722. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.1995.tb00900.x

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Noetelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work & Stress, 23*, 24–44. doi:10.1080/02678370902815673

Espelage, D. L., & Swearer, S. M. (2003). Research on school bullying and victimization: What have we learned and where do we go from here? *School Psychology Review, 32*, 365–383.

Felix, E. D., Sharkey, J. D., Green, J. G., Furlong, M. J., & Tanigawa, D. (2011). Getting precise and pragmatic about the assessment of bullying: The development of the California Bullying Victimization Scale. *Aggressive Behavior, 37*, 234–247. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.281

Fink, E., Deighton, J., Humphrey, N., & Wolpert, M. (2015). Assessing the bullying and victimisation experiences of children with special educational needs in mainstream schools: Development and validation of the Bullying Behaviour and Experience Scale. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 36*, 611–619. doi:10.1016/j.ridd.2014.10.048

Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R. K., Turner, H. A., Avery-Leaf, S., Cascardi, M., O'Leary, K. D., et al. (2007). Polyvictimization and trauma in a national longitudinal cohort. *Development and Psychopathology, 19*, 149–166. doi:10.1017/S0954579407070083

Finkelhor, D., Turner, H. A., & Hamby, S. (2012). Let's prevent peer victimization, not just bullying. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 36*, 271–274. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2012.10.006

Furlong, M. J., Felix, E. D., Sharkey, J. D., Green, J. G., & Tanigawa, D. (2006). *Development of a multi-gating bullying victimization assessment: Final report to the Hamilton Fish Institute.* Center for School-Based Youth Development, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Furlong, M. J., Sharkey, J. D., Felix, E., Tanigawa, D., & Green, J. (2010). Bullying assessment: A call for increased precision of self-reporting procedures. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 329–346). New York: Routledge.

Galanaki, E., & Papalexandris, N. (2013). Measuring workplace bullying in organisations. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24*, 2107–2130. doi:10.1080/09585192.2012.725084

Gladden, R. M., Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., Hamburger, M. E., & Lumpkin, C. D. (2014). *Bullying surveillance among youths: Uniform definitions for public health and recommended data elements, version 1.0.* Atlanta: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; U.S. Department of Education.

Godleski, S. A., Kamper, K. E., Ostrov, J. M., Hart, E. J., & Blakely-McClure, S. J. (2015). Peer victimization and peer rejection during early childhood. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 44*, 380–392. doi:10.1080/15374416.2014.940622

Green, J. G., Felix, E. D., Sharkey, J. D., Furlong, M. J., & Kras, J. E. (2013). Identifying bully victims: Definitional versus behavioral approaches. *Psychological Assessment, 25*, 651–657. doi:10.1037/a0031248

Hamburger, M. E., Basile, K. C., & Vivolo, A. M. (Eds.). (2011). *Measuring bullying victimization, perpetration, and bystander experiences: A compendium of assessment tools*. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Division of Violence Prevention.

Hanish, L. D., Kochenderfer-Ladd, B., Fabes, R. A., Martin, C. L., & Denning, D. (2004). Bullying among young children: The influence of peers and teachers. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention* (pp. 141–159). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hershcovis, M. S. (2011). "Incivility, social undermining, bullying . . . oh my!": A call to reconcile constructs within workplace aggression research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32*, 499–519. doi:10.1002/job.689

Holt, M. K., Finkelhor, D., & Kantor, G. K. (2007). Multiple victimization experiences of urban elementary school students: Associations with psychosocial functioning and academic performance. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 31*, 503–515. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2006.12.006

Holt, M. K., Green, J. G., Reid, G., Dimeo, A., Espelage, D. L., Felix, E., et al. (2014). Associations between past bullying experiences and initial adjustment to college. *Journal of American College Health, 62*, 552–560. doi:10.1080/07448481.2014.947990

Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Palmer, N. A., & Boesen, M. J. (2014). *The 2013 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools*. New York: GLSEN. Retrieved from http://glsen.org/nscs

Menesini, E., Camodeca, M., & Nocentini, A. (2010). Bullying among siblings: The role of personality and relational variables. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 28*, 921–939. doi:10.1348/026151009X479402

Menesini, E., & Nocentini, A. (2009). Cyberbullying definition and measurement: Some critical considerations. *Journal of Psychology, 217*, 230–232. doi:10.1027/0044-3409.217.4.230

Monks, C. P., & Smith, P. K. (2010). Definitions of bullying: Age differences in understanding of the term, and the role of experience. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 24*, 801–821. doi:10.1348/026151009X479402

Monks, C. P., Smith, P. K., & Swettenham, J. (2003). Aggressors, victims, and defenders in preschool: Peer, self-, and teacher reports. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 49*, 453–469. doi:10.1353/mpq.2003.0024

Morrow, M. T., Hubbard, J. A., Barhight, L. J., & Thomson, A. K. (2014). Fifth-grade children's daily experiences of peer victimization and negative emotions: Moderating effects of sex and peer rejection. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 42*, 1089–1102. doi:10.1007/s10802-014-9870-0

Nielsen, M. B., Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2010). The impact of methodological moderators on prevalence rates of workplace bullying. A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83*, 955–979. doi:10.1348/096317909X481256

Nielsen, M. B., Skogstad, A., Matthiesen, S. B., Glasø, L., Aasland, M. S., Notelaers, G., & Einarsen, S. (2009). Prevalence of workplace bullying in Norway: Comparisons across time and estimation methods. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 18*, 81–101. doi:10.1080/13594320801969707

Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere (Wiley).

Pellegrini, A. D., & Long, J. D. (2002). A longitudinal study of bullying, dominance, and victimization during the transition from primary school through secondary school. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 20*(2), 259–280. doi:10.1348/026151002166442

Pepler, D., & Craig, W. (n.d.). PREVNet's BEST (Bullying Evaluation and Strategies Tool) [Unpublished measure]. Retrieved from https://www.safeacceptingschools.ca/en/resources/prevnets-best-bullying-evaluation-and-strategies-tool

Perry, D. G., Kusel, S. J., & Perry, L. C. (1988). Victims of peer aggression. *Developmental Psychology, 24*, 807–814. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.24.6.807

Sharkey, J. D., Ruderman, M. A., Mayworm, A., Green, J. G., Furlong, M. J., Rivera, N., & Purisch, L. (2015). Behavioral strengths and risks of bullied youth who accept versus deny the bullied victim label. *School Psychology Quarterly, 30*(1), 91–104. doi:10.1037/spq0000077

Smith, P. K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., & Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 49*, 376–385. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01846.x

Solberg, M. E., & Olweus, D. (2003). Prevalence estimation of school bullying with the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior, 29*, 239–268. doi:10.1002/ab.10047

Sourander, A., Helstelä, L., Helenius, H., & Piha, J. (2000). Persistence of bullying from childhood to adolescence: A longitudinal 8-year follow-up study. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 24*, 873–881. doi:10.1016/S0145-2134(00)00146-0

Stuart-Cassel, V., Bell, A., & Springer, J. F. (2011). *Analysis of state bullying laws and policies.* Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, U.S. Department of Education.

Swearer, S. M., & Cary, P. T. (2003). Perceptions and attitudes toward bullying in middle school youth: A developmental examination across the bully/victim continuum. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 19*, 63–79. doi:10.1300/J008v19n02_05

Totten, M., Quigley, P., & Morgan, M. (2004). *Assessment toolkit for bullying, harassment and peer relations at school*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Public Health Association.

Ttofi, M. M., Farrington, D. P., & Lösel, F. (2012). School bullying as a predictor of violence later in life: A systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective longitudinal studies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 17*, 405–418. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2012.05.002

Twemlow, S. W., Fonagy, P., Sacco, F. C., & Brethour, J. R. (2006). Teachers who bully students: A hidden trauma. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 52*, 187–198. doi:10.1177/0020764006067234

Van der Wal, M. F., De Wit, C. A., & Hirasing, R. A. (2003). Psychosocial health among young victims and offenders of direct and indirect bullying. *Pediatrics, 111*, 1312–1317. doi:10.1542/peds.111.6.1312

Verlinden, M., Veenstra, R., Ringoot, A. P., Jansen, P. W., Raat, H., Hofman, A., et al. (2014). Detecting bullying in early elementary school with a computerized peer-nomination instrument. *Psychological Assessment, 26*, 628–641. doi:10.1037/a0035571

Vessey, J., Strout, T. D., DiFazio, R. L., & Walker, A. (2014). Measuring the youth bullying experience: A systematic review of the psychometric properties of available instruments. *Journal of School Health, 84*, 819–843. doi:10.1111/josh.12210

Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., Martell, B. N., Holland, K. M., & Westby, R. (2014). A systematic review and content analysis of bullying and cyber-bullying measurement strategies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 19*, 423–434. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2014.06.008

Warden, D., Cheyne, B., Christie, D., Fitzpatrick, H., & Reid, K. (2003). Assessing children's perceptions of prosocial and antisocial peer behaviour. *Educational Psychology, 23*, 547–567. doi:10.1080/0144341032000123796

Williams, K. R., & Guerra, N. G. (2007). Prevalence and predictors of Internet bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41*, s14–s21. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.08.018

Definition of Bullying. Bullying must meet certain requirements to be considered bullying. Â School climate is the overall quality and character of school life. A positive school climate goes a long way in preventing bullying in schools. Teachers and administrators can encourage a positive school climate by implementing the followingÂ Measuring Your Effectiveness. 1. Both before and after implementing anti-bullying measures, it is advisable to take surveys to measure the effectiveness of a program. Examples of surveys include: 2. Percentage of victims by bullying type. A conceptual definition of school-based bullying for the Australian research and academic community. Canberra: Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth. Contact us.Â Existing approaches to measuring school-based bullying in Australian and international school communities1. The different types or forms of school-based bullying (for example, verbal, physical and psychological / social).Â Contemporary definitions of bullying have incorporated (with different levels of consistency) a number of key concepts. Bullying is generally considered to be a subset of aggressive behaviour (Koo, 2007; Spears, 2005), with the latter defined as behaviour that intends to cause harm or injury to another (Baron, 1977) and usually results in personal injury or destruction of property (Bandura, 1973). Workplace bullying is a persistent pattern of mistreatment from others in the workplace that causes either physical or emotional harm. It can include such tactics as verbal, nonverbal, psychological, and physical abuse, as well as humiliation. This type of workplace aggression is particularly difficult because, unlike the typical school bully, workplace bullies often operate within the established rules and policies of their organization and their society. In the majority of cases, bullying in the...