

Parental Characteristics Associated With Bullying Perpetration in US Children Aged 10 to 17 Years

Rashmi Shetgiri, MD, Hua Lin, PhD, Rosa M. Avila, MSPH, and Glenn Flores, MD

Bullying is defined as intentional, repeated aggression perpetrated by a more powerful person or group on a less powerful victim.¹ Almost 30% of US middle and high school students are involved in bullying, including 13% as perpetrators of bullying (bullies), 11% as victims of bullying (victims), and 6% as both perpetrators and victims of bullying (bully victims).¹ Internationally, involvement in bullying ranges from 9% to 54%, with 3% to 20% as bullies, 5% to 20% as victims, and 1% to 20% as bully victims,² and measures of bullying vary across different studies. Bullies are more likely to experience depression, delinquency, and criminality as adults.³⁻⁶ Victims have higher levels of chronic anxiety, depression, and psychosomatic complaints; lower self-esteem and poor psychosocial adjustment as adults; and greater likelihood of perpetrating school shootings.³⁻⁶

Much of the research on bullying has been conducted internationally,⁷⁻¹⁶ with a customary focus on sociodemographic and child characteristics associated with bullying.^{12,7-12,14-24} US studies have primarily relied on school-based self-reports from children, and few have used nationally representative data sets.^{12,17-20} A recent meta-analysis of school-based bullying prevention interventions concluded that parent training and education are essential components of effective interventions to reduce bullying,²⁵ which suggests that parental characteristics and behaviors may influence child bullying. However, little information is available on parental characteristics associated with child bullying in the United States and whether these characteristics influence bullying independent of child or community characteristics. Research on children in the United Kingdom has shown that higher parental involvement with the child and increased maternal warmth are associated with decreased bullying.^{8,9} Studies in local US communities have suggested an association of low parental monitoring and high family conflict with bullying.^{18,21}

Objectives. We identified factors associated with child bullying in the United States.

Methods. We used the 2007 National Survey of Children's Health to examine associations among child, parent, and community factors and bullying perpetration among children aged 10 to 17 years, using bivariate and stepwise multivariable analyses.

Results. African American and Latino children and children living in poverty and who had emotional, developmental, or behavioral (EDB) problems had higher odds of bullying, as did children of parents who felt angry with their child or who felt their child bothered them a lot or was hard to care for; suboptimal maternal mental health was associated with higher bullying odds. Children who always or usually completed homework and had parents who talked with them and met all or most of their friends had lower bullying odds.

Conclusions. Assessing children's EDB problems, maternal mental health, and parental perceptions may identify children at risk for bullying. Parent-child communication, meeting children's friends, and encouraging children academically were associated with lower bullying odds; these protective factors may be useful in designing preventive interventions. (*Am J Public Health.* 2012;102:2280-2286. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2012.300725)

One US study using nationally representative data found that parent-child communication was associated with bullying, but it did not adjust for other child, parental, or community characteristics.¹⁷ Previous studies of US children have not concurrently examined the associations of multiple factors, including child, family, and community characteristics, with bullying. In this study, we identified factors associated with child bullying perpetration using a national US data set and focusing on parental characteristics.

METHODS

The 2007 National Survey of Children's Health (NSCH) was a population-based, random-digit-dial telephone survey conducted from April 2007 to July 2008 by the National Center for Health Statistics, sponsored by the Maternal and Child Health Bureau, using the state and local area integrated telephone survey mechanism.²⁶ The respondent in each household was the parent or guardian of 1 randomly selected child aged 0 to 17 years who was knowledgeable about the child's

health and health care. The survey was designed to provide national and state-specific estimates of children's physical, emotional, and behavioral health and family and neighborhood characteristics. Estimates based on the sampling weights generalize to the noninstitutionalized population of US children.

Trained interviewers conducted 91 642 interviews. Interviews were completed for 66% of identified households, and the weighted overall response rate was 46.7%. The questionnaire was translated into Spanish and reviewed for accuracy and cultural appropriateness by an independent translator and Spanish-speaking phone interviewers. Similar procedures were used for Mandarin, Cantonese, Vietnamese, and Korean translations. Households were initially contacted by English-speaking interviewers, and respondents with limited English proficiency were called back by specially trained interviewers fluent in the appropriate language. More details on the survey design are available elsewhere.²⁶

We restricted the study sample to children aged 10 to 17 years ($n = 44\ 848$) to examine bullying among adolescents. Variables chosen

for this study were factors in the literature associated with bully perpetration, youth violence, or delinquent behavior. The conceptual framework we used was that of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Center for Injury Prevention, Division of Violence Prevention. This framework includes multiple levels of factors that increase the likelihood of violence, including individual, household, parental, and community characteristics that influence child and adolescent violence participation.^{27,28}

Measures

Outcome variable. We assessed bullying perpetration with the question "How often was this true for [child] during the past month: [He/she] bullies or is cruel or mean to others." Respondents chose from the following options: *never, rarely, sometimes, usually, or always*. The child was classified as a bully if the respondent chose *sometimes, usually, or always*. This question has been used to evaluate bullying in previous studies using this response classification.^{20,29,30}

Child characteristics. We selected independent variables (in part) on the basis of previous studies on bullying.^{1,2,7-12,14-24} Age in years was analyzed as a continuous and categorical variable, and child's place of birth was analyzed as a dichotomous variable. We categorized the child's race/ethnicity on the basis of US Census Bureau categories: Latino (or Hispanic/Spanish), non-Latino African American (or Black), non-Latino American Indian/Alaska Native, non-Latino Asian/Pacific Islander, non-Latino White, and non-Latino multiracial. The presence in the child of an emotional, developmental, or behavioral (EDB) problem needing treatment or counseling has been shown to be associated with bullying,^{12,16} and we examined it in this study as a dichotomous variable. School involvement and performance have also been associated with bullying,¹⁷ so we also examined whether the child participated in clubs, organizations, or sports teams; completed required homework; and had ever repeated a grade.

Family characteristics. We categorized the highest educational attainment of a parent or guardian living in the household as not a high school graduate, high school graduate or equivalent, or at least some college. Dichotomous

variables were created for primary language spoken at home (English vs non-English primary language) and parental composition (2-parent married or cohabitating household vs other). The annual combined family income was classified as the percentage of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) as determined by the US Department of Health and Human Services in 2007, using the following categories: 100% FPL or less, more than 100% to 200% FPL, more than 200% to 300% FPL, more than 300% to 400% FPL, and more than 400% FPL.²⁶

We examined several parental characteristics associated with child bullying and externalizing problems.^{8,9,17,18,20,21} Parental involvement with the child was examined using 2 dichotomous variables: whether the parent always or usually attends the child's events and whether the parent has met all or most of the child's friends. We assessed parental supervision with the dichotomous variable of whether the child had been alone without an adult in the past week. Parent-child communication was assessed by determining whether the parent and child share ideas or talk very well or somewhat well. We examined suboptimal maternal mental health by determining whether the mother's mental health status was reported by the respondent as poor, fair, or good (vs very good or excellent). Additional independent variables included whether the child was always or usually harder to care for than other children, the child always or usually did things that bothered the parent a lot, parent always or usually felt angry with the child, parent coped with the demands of parenthood very or somewhat well, parent had someone to provide emotional help with parenthood, and the relationship between parents is completely happy or very happy.

Community characteristics. Community characteristics associated with bullying in the literature^{17,21} included school and neighborhood qualities. School and neighborhood safety were categorized dichotomously (unsafe vs safe). We also examined neighborhood vandalism and supportiveness (people help each other, watch out for each other's children, and can be counted on in the neighborhood) as dichotomous variables.

Statistical Methods

We calculated national estimates using sample weights. We used SAS 9.2³¹ and SUDAAN

10³² in all analyses to account for the complex sample design. We removed unknown values from denominators when calculating estimates, except for family income, which was multiply imputed. We performed bivariate analyses of associations between the independent variables and bullying using the *t* test for continuous variables and the χ^2 test for categorical variables. Correlations between independent variables were low, with most less than 0.4; therefore, multicollinearity was not a major concern.

We used stepwise multivariate regression to produce a final parsimonious model of variables associated with bullying, without overfitting the data.³¹ We included all variables associated with bullying in the bivariate analyses as initial candidate variables in the procedure.³¹ The initial α -to-enter was set at .15, 2-tailed *P* values were reported, and $P < .05$ was considered to be statistically significant for inclusion or withdrawal from the model. We did not assess variables for their influence on other variables in the model during the stepwise procedure. We removed less than 8% of the sample from the multivariate analysis because of unknown values. Multiple logistic regression was used to obtain adjusted odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals for factors associated with bullying perpetration.

RESULTS

Among children aged 10 to 17 years, the prevalence of bullying was 14.9%. Approximately 73% of the respondents were mothers and 21% were fathers. Almost 4 of 5 children always or usually did all required homework, and fewer than 10% had an EDB problem needing treatment. Most parents shared ideas or talked very or somewhat well with their child (96%) and had met all or most of their child's friends (81%). Fewer than 30% of mothers had suboptimal mental health. Among all parents, 7% felt their child was always or usually much harder to care for than other children, 6% felt their child always or usually did things that bother them a lot, and 3% always or usually felt angry with their child.

Child, Parent, and Community Factors and Bullying

Child's race/ethnicity was associated with being a bully, whereas age, gender, and

TABLE 1—Bivariate Analysis of Factors Associated With Bullying Perpetration Among US Children Aged 10–17 Years: 2007 National Survey of Children’s Health, April 2007–July 2008

Characteristic	Bully (n = 5 031), % (SE)	Not Bully (n = 39 817), % (SE)	<i>P</i> ^a
Child			
Male	51.9 (1.80)	50.3 (0.65)	.38
Race/ethnicity			< .001
Non-Latino White	47.4 (1.77)	60.3 (0.68)	
Latino or Hispanic	24.0 (1.94)	18.1 (0.65)	
Non-Latino African American	22.4 (1.36)	13.9 (0.44)	
Non-Latino Asian/Pacific Islander	1.2 (0.25)	3.5 (0.33)	
Non-Latino American Indian/Alaska Native	1.2 (0.24)	0.7 (0.26)	
Non-Latino multiracial	3.9 (0.46)	3.4 (0.20)	
Child born in United States	92.9 (1.17)	93.2 (0.39)	.8
Always or usually does all required homework	65.8 (1.73)	85.9 (0.49)	< .001
Has a personal doctor or nurse	88.5 (1.23)	91.6 (0.40)	.02
Participates in a sport team	50.4 (1.80)	61.1 (0.66)	< .001
Participates in clubs or organizations	48.7 (1.79)	61.6 (0.67)	< .001
Has emotional, developmental, or behavioral problems needing treatment or counseling	24.3 (1.36)	6.6 (0.31)	< .001
Has repeated any grade	19.6 (1.31)	11.0 (0.46)	< .001
Household			
Highest educational attainment in household			< .001
Not a high school graduate	14.3 (1.35)	7.6 (0.40)	
High school graduate	29.9 (1.66)	23.5 (0.56)	
≥ some college	55.8 (1.81)	68.9 (0.65)	
Primary language spoken at home not English	11.5 (1.49)	10.9 (0.54)	.69
Annual family income, % Federal Poverty Level ^b			< .001
≤ 100	25.7 (1.45)	14.5 (0.50)	
> 100–200	25.6 (1.79)	19.8 (0.57)	
> 200–300	18.6 (1.59)	18.6 (0.52)	
> 300–400	12.5 (1.47)	14.3 (0.47)	
> 400	17.6 (1.25)	32.7 (0.58)	
2-parent household	67.4 (1.63)	77.6 (0.54)	< .001
Parent-child interaction			
Parent copes with demands of parenthood very or somewhat well	93.1 (1.00)	98.3 (0.18)	< .001
Parent and child share ideas, talk very well or somewhat well	88.9 (1.18)	97.7 (0.25)	< .001
Parent has someone to provide emotional help with parenthood	79.4 (1.62)	87.8 (0.48)	< .001
Parent always or usually attends child’s events	74.7 (1.60)	85.4 (0.50)	< .001
Parents’ relationship is completely happy or very happy	69.1 (2.01)	81.9 (0.59)	< .001
Parent			
Parent has met all or most of child’s friends	66.7 (1.71)	83.4 (0.53)	< .001
Mother’s mental or emotional health < very good or excellent	48.7 (1.92)	26.7 (0.62)	< .001
Child always or usually does things that bother parent a lot	20.7 (1.45)	3.6 (0.28)	< .001
Parent always or usually feels child is much harder to care for than most other children	18.5 (1.39)	5.4 (0.37)	< .001
Parent always or usually feels angry with child	12.9 (1.21)	1.6 (0.14)	< .001
Child alone without an adult in past week	19.1 (2.32)	20.3 (0.98)	.64

Continued

birthplace were not (Table 1). All other child characteristics were significantly associated with bullying. Of note, compared with nonbullies, bullies were less likely to always or usually complete all their homework. Among bullies, approximately 1 in 4 had an EDB problem, compared with 1 in 15 nonbullies.

Educational attainment in the household, family income, and family structure were associated with being a bully, whereas the primary language spoken at home was not (Table 1). Compared with nonbullies, a higher proportion of bullies lived in households that were low income, without 2 parents, and without parents who were high school graduates. Parents of nonbullies were more likely than parents of bullies to cope very or somewhat well with the demands of parenthood, share ideas with or talk very or somewhat well with their children, have someone to provide emotional help with parenthood, attend their child’s events, have a happy relationship with the other parent, and meet all or most of their child’s friends. Mothers of bullies were more likely to have suboptimal mental health than mothers of nonbullies. Parents of bullies were more likely than parents of nonbullies to always or usually feel their child did things that bothered them a lot, feel their child was hard to care for, and feel angry with their child. Parental supervision was the only parent characteristic not significantly associated with bullying.

All community characteristics were significantly associated with bullying (Table 1). Nonbullies were more likely to live in neighborhoods in which people were helpful, watched out for each other’s children, and could be counted on. Bullies were more likely to live in unsafe neighborhoods and attend unsafe schools.

Multivariate Analysis

Children aged 10 to 12 years were more likely to be bullies than were children aged 16 to 17 years. African American and Latino children had higher odds than White children of being bullies, whereas Asian/Pacific Islander children had lower odds (Table 2). Children with EDB problems had higher odds of bullying, whereas children who always or usually did required homework had lower odds of bullying. Children living in poverty had almost twice the odds of being bullies, whereas those

TABLE 1—Continued

	Community		
If a child got hurt outside, someone would help	88.8 (1.10)	92.5 (0.36)	< .001
People in the neighborhood watch out for each other's children	85.0 (1.50)	90.9 (0.39)	< .001
There is someone in the neighborhood that can be counted on	83.7 (1.41)	90.4 (0.41)	< .001
People in neighborhood help each other	81.0 (1.57)	89.6 (0.44)	< .001
Unsafe neighborhood	20.9 (1.46)	11.9 (0.46)	< .001
Unsafe school	18.9 (1.27)	11.0 (0.49)	< .001
Vandalism in neighborhood	15.8 (1.32)	10.6 (0.45)	< .001

Note. Children's mean ages were 13.5 years (SD = 0.08) for bullies and 13.5 years (SD = 0.03) for not bullies.

^aP values were determined by the χ^2 test, with $P > .05$ considered statistically significant.

^bAs determined by the US Department of Health and Human Services in 2007.

living in households in which English was not the primary language had lower adjusted odds of bullying.

Parents who always or usually felt angry with their child, felt that the child did things that bothered them a lot, felt that their child was much harder to care for than most other children, and had suboptimal maternal mental health had higher odds of bullying. Parents who had met all or most of their child's friends and communicated very or somewhat well with their child had significantly lower adjusted odds of bullying.

DISCUSSION

This study included the largest US sample, to our knowledge, to be analyzed for sociodemographic, child, family, and community-level risk and protective factors for bullying perpetration. The prevalence of bullying perpetration was 15%, which is comparable with that found in other studies.¹ The findings suggest that parents' perceptions of anger with their child, that their child bothers them a lot, and that their child is harder to care for than other children and suboptimal maternal mental health are associated with higher odds of child bullying perpetration, whereas high parental involvement and communication with children are associated with lower odds of bullying perpetration.

Children of parents who were frequently angry with their child and felt that their child bothered them a lot had more than double the odds of bullying perpetration. These parents' responses may reflect an overall pattern of

negative interactions with their child, in which the child may model aggressive responses learned from the parents, which may translate into bullying. Alternatively, parents' anger and feelings that their child bothers them a lot may reflect frustration with their child's bullying perpetration or other problematic behaviors, which can stem from peer or other nonparental influences. This relationship between parents' negative feelings toward their child and bullying may also be cyclical, whereby parental factors can contribute to the child's behaviors and ability to develop personal relationships, thereby resulting in bullying; these child behaviors could then exacerbate negative parental feelings and interactions with the child. The cross-sectional nature of this study precludes attribution of causality or directionality of these relationships. Parental anger with the child may also be a symptom of an unmeasured variable, such as family conflict, which has been associated with increased bullying.¹⁸

Children with EDB problems had more than double the odds of bullying. Previous studies have shown that bullies are more likely to have EDB problems and depression.^{5,7,14,16,33} Maternal depression is associated with child delinquency, antisocial behavior, aggression, and externalizing behavior.^{34–36} Suboptimal maternal mental health, however, has not previously been shown to be associated with increased child bullying perpetration. In our study, suboptimal maternal mental health was significantly associated with higher odds of child bullying perpetration, even after controlling for the child's emotional or behavioral problems. It is unclear from this cross-sectional

study whether maternal depression causes bullying or whether maternal mental health is affected by the child's bullying perpetration. The relationship between maternal mental health and child bullying perpetration may be transactional, with the child's behaviors contributing to suboptimal maternal mental health and the mother responding to the child with negative behaviors. Maternal depression is associated with negative parenting behaviors, including irritability toward the child and disengagement from the child.^{36,37} The relationship between suboptimal maternal mental health and bullying perpetration may be mediated by the quality of mother–child interaction or decreased maternal attachment to the child, which are associated with bullying.^{8,20}

This study is, to our knowledge, the first in the United States to document that children with parents who meet their child's friends had significantly lower odds of bullying. The study findings also revealed that children who complete their homework and whose parents share ideas and talk with them are less likely to be bullies. These associations could reflect parent–child communication and involvement with the child. This finding is consistent with research from the United Kingdom showing that children with higher levels of parental involvement have a lower likelihood of being bullies.⁹ Parents who are more involved with their children may be more likely to monitor the completion of their children's homework and to help as needed. The findings may also reflect that bullying behavior itself affects whether parents meet their child's friends and communicate well with their child.

Children living in households in which English was not the primary language had lower odds of bullying. Studies have shown that these children are more likely to be victims of bullying³³ and less likely to have behavioral problems and depression or anxiety.³⁸ This status may reflect lower levels of acculturation, which has been associated with lower rates of adolescent behavior problems, such as alcohol use, drug use, and risky sexual behavior (“healthy immigrant effect”).³⁹ Acculturation appears to play a role in bullying, but it may affect victimization and perpetration differently.

The literature contains conflicting evidence regarding the associations of parental education attainment, family household composition,

TABLE 2—Multivariate Logistic Regression Analyses of Factors Associated With Bullying Perpetration Among US Children Aged 10–17 Years: 2007 National Survey of Children’s Health, April 2007–July 2008.

Independent Variable	Bullying Perpetration, AOR (95% CI)
Child	
Age, y	
10–12	1.36 (1.07, 1.72)
13–15	1.27 (1.00, 1.61)
16–17 (Ref)	1.00
Race/ethnicity	
Non-Latino African American	1.42 (1.01, 2.00)
Latino or Hispanic	1.33 (1.06, 1.66)
Non-Latino American Indian/Alaska Native	1.18 (0.78, 1.79)
Non-Latino multiracial	1.16 (0.83, 1.62)
Non-Latino Asian/Pacific Islander	0.59 (0.35, 0.99)
Non-Latino White (Ref)	1.00
Child has emotional, developmental, or behavioral problem needing treatment or counseling	2.20 (1.77, 2.73)
Child always or usually does all required homework	0.55 (0.44, 0.68)
Household	
Annual family income, % of Federal Poverty Level ^a	
≤ 100	1.83 (1.37, 2.44)
> 100–200	1.70 (1.29, 2.24)
> 200–300	1.55 (1.15, 2.10)
> 300–400	1.41 (1.04, 1.90)
> 400 (Ref)	1.00
Primary language spoken in home not English	0.55 (0.34, 0.89)
Parent	
Parent always or usually feels angry with child	2.99 (2.06, 4.35)
Child always or usually does things that bother parent a lot	2.11 (1.48, 3.00)
Mother’s mental or emotional health less than excellent or very good	1.57 (1.30, 1.90)
Parent always or usually feels child is much harder to care for than most other children	1.42 (1.02, 1.98)
Parent has met all or most of child’s friends	0.60 (0.48, 0.75)
Parent and child can share ideas or talk very or somewhat well	0.59 (0.37, 0.93)

Note. AOR = adjusted odds ratio; CI = confidence interval.

^aAs determined by the US Department of Health and Human Services in 2007.

and community factors with bullying.^{7,10,16,17} These variables were not associated with bullying perpetration in our stepwise analysis, which also examined parental and community characteristics. This lack of association may be because some characteristics were measured differently, such as family composition (other studies compared single-parent households with 2-parent households). Some studies showed that higher socioeconomic status is associated with bullying in bivariate analyses.^{7,10} Our study finding that children living in

poverty have higher odds of being bullies, after adjusting for parental characteristics, is also supported by the literature.^{17,23} Contrary to previous studies,^{9,11,12,15–17,19,22,23} male gender was not associated with bullying in our study, which may be because our study sample did not contain boys aged 10 years and younger, and bullying among boys decreases with increasing age.¹⁶ Consistent with previous work, however, older children^{11,19,24} were less likely to be bullies. The findings regarding increased bullying perpetration among African Americans

and Latinos is also consistent with the literature.^{2,8,12,16,19} In contrast to our initial theory, community-level characteristics were not retained in the final model obtained from the stepwise regression, perhaps because we accounted for family characteristics as well rather than limiting the focus to the child level.

Despite the strengths of the NSCH, which include the large sample size and breadth of question topics, certain study limitations should be considered. A limitation of the study is the cross-sectional survey design, which prevents inferences about causation and the direction of influence of the relational factors and bullying perpetration. Determining whether some of the child and family variables, such as child’s EDB problems, suboptimal maternal mental health, and parental perceptions of the child, predate the bullying or arise after the bullying is not possible. Further examination of these relationships should be conducted using a longitudinal study design.

NSCH data are based on parental report of child behaviors rather than child self-report or observed behavior. Methods of data collection about bullying differ across various studies and include assessment of bullying from child self-report,^{2,17–21} parental report,¹⁸ teacher report,²² direct observation,²² and peer nomination.¹¹ Parental report may be subject to bias by underestimating rates of child bullying; parental perceptions of communication and involvement with their child may also differ from child perceptions. The NSCH parent-reported bullying question has, however, been used to evaluate bullying in previous studies using the same response classification of bullying (*sometimes, usually, or always*).^{20,29,30} The finding in this study that parent–child communication is associated with bullying perpetration supports similar findings in a cross-sectional study based on child and adolescent self-reports, which showed that poor parent–child communication is associated with increased bullying perpetration,¹⁷ which suggests that the associations between parental characteristics and child bullying perpetration may persist across multiple reporters. These relationships should be further examined using self-report by children and adolescents, ideally in combination with peer and teacher reporting.

Another potential source of bias is social desirability, which may result in parental underreporting of child bullying perpetration and negative parental behaviors and overreporting of positive parental and child behaviors. Parental underreporting of bullying or negative behaviors may result in underestimation of the strength of associations between these factors and bullying, whereas overreporting of positive behaviors may result in overestimation of the strength of association between these factors and bullying. Other factors associated with bullying, such as peer influences,^{19,21} self-esteem,^{7,14} smoking,¹ alcohol use,^{1,2} substance use,²⁴ parental use of physical discipline and harsh punishment,^{18,21} child maltreatment,^{8,22} and domestic violence exposure,⁸ were not available in NSCH. Of NSCH respondents, 21% were fathers. We did not examine the possible association of paternal mental health with bullying because paternal depression and involvement have not, to our knowledge, been shown to be associated with child bullying. Further research on this relationship may prove useful. The survey also did not include questions about parental experiences with bullying and child exposure to bullying in the home. The measures used were primarily single-item variables rather than scales, and some may be proxies for the underlying constructs. Mental health, for example, was measured with a single question rather than with a depression scale. The survey also did not include questions about victimization and whether perpetrators of bullying were also bullying victims.

In this study, several parental characteristics were associated with child bullying perpetration, even after controlling for sociodemographic and child characteristics. Negative parental perceptions of the child (the child bothers them, frequently makes them angry, is hard to care for) and suboptimal maternal mental health were associated with higher odds of child bullying perpetration, whereas positive parental involvement (parents communicate well with their child and meet the child's friends) was associated with lower odds of bullying. Although we could not determine whether these associations were causal, results from the nationally representative data used in this study lend support to findings from previous international and community-based US

studies on the potentially important role of parental factors in bullying perpetration.^{8,9,17–21} Most current antibullying efforts, however, focus on school-based interventions with children.^{40,41} These interventions primarily target children or school personnel, with minimal involvement of parents of bullies.⁴² Evaluations of school-based programs that engage parents have suggested that parental involvement may be an essential component of effective interventions but that it is often difficult to implement.²⁵ Programs that focus on the individual child, such as mentoring programs, and international studies of interventions that change the school environment have shown variable levels of success.^{40,41} Continued efforts are needed to evaluate whether screening for childhood EDB problems, negative parental perceptions of children, and maternal mental health can be used to identify children at risk for being bullies. Parenting skills and parental interactions with the child could also be useful to consider when addressing bullying perpetration among children. ■

About the Authors

Rashmi Shetgiri, Hua Lin, and Glenn Flores are with the Division of General Pediatrics, Department of Pediatrics, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas. Rashmi Shetgiri and Glenn Flores are also with Children's Medical Center, Dallas, TX. Rosa M. Avila is with the National Center for Health Statistics, Hyattsville, MD.

Correspondence should be sent to Rashmi Shetgiri, MD, Division of General Pediatrics, Department of Pediatrics, UT Southwestern Medical Center, 5323 Harry Hines Boulevard, Dallas, TX 75390-9063 (e-mail: rashmi.shetgiri@utsouthwestern.edu). Reprints can be ordered at <http://www.ajph.org> by clicking the "Reprints" link.

This article was accepted January 31, 2012.

Contributors

R. Shetgiri, H. Lin, G. Flores, and R.M. Avila made substantial contributions to the conception and design of the study, data acquisition and analysis, and data interpretation. R. Shetgiri wrote the first draft of the article, and all authors made substantial contributions to the critical review and editing of the article.

Acknowledgments

R. Shetgiri was supported by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD; grant K23HD068401) and the North and Central Texas Clinical and Translational Science Initiative (Principal Investigator, Robert Toto, MD) from the National Center for Research Resources (NCR; grant KL2RR024983), a component of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), and the NIH Roadmap for Medical Research. Information on NCR is available at <http://www.ncrr.nih.gov>. Information on Re-engineering the Clinical Research Enterprise can be obtained from [\[nihroadmap.nih.gov/clinicalresearch/overview-translational.asp\]\(http://nihroadmap.nih.gov/clinicalresearch/overview-translational.asp\).](http://</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

This study was presented in part as a platform presentation at the 2010 annual meeting of the Pediatric Academic Societies.

Note. The article's contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the NICHD, NCR, or NIH. The findings and conclusions in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the National Center for Health Statistics, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Human Participant Protection

This study was approved by the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center Institutional Review Board.

References

- Nansel TR, Overpeck M, Pilla RS, et al. Bullying behaviors among US youth: prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *JAMA*. 2001;285(16):2094–2100.
- Nansel TR, Craig W, Overpeck MD, et al. Cross-national consistency in the relationship between bullying behaviors and psychosocial adjustment. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2004;158(8):730–736.
- Anderson M, Kaufman J, Simon TR, et al. School-associated violent deaths in the United States, 1994–1999. *JAMA*. 2001;286(21):2695–2702.
- Rigby K. Consequences of bullying in schools. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2003;48(9):583–590.
- Salmon G, West A. Physical and mental health issues related to bullying in schools. *Curr Opin Psychiatry*. 2000;13(4):375–380.
- Spector ND, Kelly SF. Pediatrician's role in screening and treatment: bullying, prediabetes, oral health. *Curr Opin Pediatr*. 2006;18(6):661–670.
- Yang SJ, Kim JM, Kim SW, Shin IS, Yoon JS. Bullying and victimization behaviors in boys and girls at South Korean primary schools. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2006;45(1):69–77.
- Bowes L, Arseneault L, Maughan B, et al. School, neighborhood, and family factors are associated with children's bullying involvement: a nationally representative longitudinal study. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2009;48(5):545–553.
- Flouri E, Buchanan A. The role of mother involvement and father involvement in adolescent bullying behavior. *J Interpers Violence*. 2003;18(6):634–644.
- Kim YS, Koh Y, Leventhal BL. Prevalence of school bullying in Korean middle school students. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2004;158(8):737–741.
- Kumpulainen K, Rasanen E, Henttonen I. Children involved in bullying: psychological disturbance and the persistence of the involvement. *Child Abuse Negl*. 1999;23(12):1253–1262.
- Kumpulainen K, Rasanen E, Henttonen I, et al. Bullying and psychiatric symptoms among elementary school-age children. *Child Abuse Negl*. 1998;22(7):705–717.
- Olweus D. Familial and temperamental determinants of aggressive behavior in adolescent boys: a causal analysis. *Dev Psychol*. 1980;16(6):644–660.
- Rigby K, Slee PT. Dimensions of interpersonal relation among Australian children and implications for psychological well-being. *J Soc Psychol*. 1993;133(1):33–42.

15. Salmon G, James A, Smith DM. Bullying in schools: self reported anxiety, depression, and self esteem in secondary school children. *BMJ*. 1998;317(7163):924-925.
16. Sourander A, Helstela L. Persistence of bullying from childhood to adolescence—a longitudinal 8-year follow-up study. *Child Abuse Negl*. 2000;24(7):873-881.
17. Spriggs AL, Iannotti RJ, Nansel TR, et al. Adolescent bullying involvement and perceived family, peer and school relations: commonalities and differences across race/ethnicity. *J Adolesc Health*. 2007;41(3):283-293.
18. Stevens V, De Bourdeaudhuij I, Van Oost P. Relationship of the family environment to children's involvement in bully/victim problems at school. *J Youth Adolesc*. 2002;31(6):419-428.
19. Wang J, Iannotti RJ, Nansel TR. School bullying among adolescents in the United States: physical, verbal, relational, and cyber. *J Adolesc Health*. 2009;45(4):368-375.
20. Zimmerman FJ, Glew GM, Christakis DA, et al. Early cognitive stimulation, emotional support, and television watching as predictors of subsequent bullying among grade-school children. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2005;159(4):384-388.
21. Espelage DL, Bosworth K, Simon TR. Examining the social context of bullying behaviors in early adolescence. *J Couns Dev*. 2000;78(3):326-333.
22. Shields A, Cicchetti D. Parental maltreatment and emotion dysregulation as risk factors for bullying and victimization in middle childhood. *J Clin Child Psychol*. 2001;30(3):349-363.
23. Wolke D, Woods S, Stanford K, et al. Bullying and victimization of primary school children in England and Germany: prevalence and school factors. *Br J Psychol*. 2001;92(pt 4):673-696.
24. Carlyle KE, Steinman KJ. Demographic differences in the prevalence, co-occurrence, and correlates of adolescent bullying at school. *J Sch Health*. 2007;77(9):623-629.
25. Farrington DP, Ttofi MM. School-based programs to reduce bullying and victimization. *Campbell Syst Rev*. 2009;6:1-148.
26. Blumberg SJ, Foster EB, Frasier AM, et al. Design and operation of the National Survey of Children's Health, 2007. *Vital Health Stat*. 2012;1(55).
27. Krug EG, Dahlberg LL, Mercy JA, et al., eds. *World Report on Violence and Health*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2002.
28. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Division of Violence and Prevention. The social-ecological model: a framework for prevention. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/overview/social-ecologicalmodel.html>. Accessed December 30, 2009.
29. Montes G, Halterman J. Bullying among children with autism and the influence of comorbidity with ADHD: a population-based study. *Ambul Pediatr*. 2007;7(3):253-257.
30. Van Cleave J, Davis MM. Bullying and peer victimization among children with special health care needs. *Pediatrics*. 2006;118(4):e1212-e1219.
31. SAS Institute Inc. SAS/STAT® 9.1 user's guide. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.; 2004. Available at: http://support.sas.com/documentation/onlinedoc/91pdf/index_913.html. Accessed December 30, 2009.
32. SUDAAN [computer software]. Release 10.0. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute; 2008.
33. Yu SM, Huang ZJ, Schwalberg RH, Overpeck M, Kogan MD. Acculturation and the health and well-being of US immigrant adolescents. *J Adolesc Health*. 2003;33(6):479-488.
34. Kim-Cohen J, Moffitt TE, Taylor A, Pawlby SJ, Caspi A. Maternal depression and children's antisocial behavior: nature and nurture effects. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2005;62(2):173-181.
35. Gross HE, Shaw DS, Burwell RA, Nagin DS. Transactional processes in child disruptive behavior and maternal depression: a longitudinal study from early childhood to adolescence. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2009;21(1):139-156.
36. Marchand JF, Hock E, Widaman K. Mutual relations between mothers' depressive symptoms and hostile-controlling behavior and young children's externalizing and internalizing behavior problems. *Parent Sci Pract*. 2002;2(4):335-353.
37. Lovejoy MC, Graczyk PA, O'Hare E, Neuman G. Maternal depression and parenting behavior: a meta-analytic review. *Clin Psychol Rev*. 2000;20(5):561-592.
38. Flores G, Tomany-Korman SC. The language spoken at home and disparities in medical and dental health, access to care, and use of services in US children. *Pediatrics*. 2008;121(6):e1703-e1714.
39. Flores G, Brotanek J. The healthy immigrant effect: a greater understanding might help us improve the health of all children. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2005;159(3):295-297.
40. Vreeman RC, Carroll AE. A systematic review of school-based interventions to prevent bullying. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2007;161(1):78-88.
41. Smith PK, Ananiadou K, Cowie H. Interventions to reduce school bullying. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2003;48(9):591-599.
42. Stevens V, De Bourdeaudhuij I, Van Oost P. Anti-bullying interventions at school: aspects of programme adaptation and critical issues for further programme development. *Health Promot Int*. 2001;16(2):155-167.



BULLYING SURVEILLANCE AMONG YOUTHS

UNIFORM DEFINITIONS FOR PUBLIC HEALTH
AND RECOMMENDED DATA ELEMENTS

Version 1.0



Bullying Surveillance Among Youths: Uniform Definitions for Public Health and Recommended Data Elements, Version 1.0 is a publication of the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the United States Department of Education.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Thomas R. Frieden, MD, MPH, Director

National Center for Injury Prevention and Control
Daniel M. Sosin, MD, MPH, FACP, Acting Director

Division of Violence Prevention
Howard R. Spivak, MD, Director

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Deborah S. Delisle, Assistant Secretary

Office of Safe and Healthy Students
David G. Esquith, Director

Suggested citation: Gladden, R.M., Vivolo-Kantor, A.M., Hamburger, M.E., & Lumpkin, C.D. *Bullying Surveillance Among Youths: Uniform Definitions for Public Health and Recommended Data Elements, Version 1.0*. Atlanta, GA; National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and U.S. Department of Education; 2014.

**BULLYING SURVEILLANCE AMONG YOUTHS:
UNIFORM DEFINITIONS FOR PUBLIC HEALTH AND
RECOMMENDED DATA ELEMENTS**

Version 1.0

Compiled by

R. Matthew Gladden, PhD

Alana M. Vivolo-Kantor, MPH, CHES

Merle E. Hamburger, PhD

Corey D. Lumpkin, MPH

2014

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Atlanta, Georgia

United States Department of Education
Washington, D.C.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	iv
Dedication	v
Panel Members and Reviewers	vi
Introduction	1
Section 1: Background	4
Section 2: The Uniform Definition	7
Section 3: Considerations When Gathering Data on Bullying Using the Uniform Definition	9
Section 4: Recommended Data Elements for Bullying	10
4.1 Purpose of the Data Elements	10
4.2 Explanation of a Data Element and its Description	10
4.3 Core Data Elements	12
4.4 Expanded Data Elements	41
Section 5: Federal Government Resources on Bullying	94
References	95
Appendix A: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment (PPRA)	101

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to extend our sincere gratitude to Kevin Jennings, Deborah Temkin, Kristen Harper, and Sharon Burton from the United States Department of Education for the financial and technical support provided to develop this document.

We also wish to thank the following staff members from the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control for their contribution to this process: Linda L. Dahlberg, Kathleen Basile, Debra Karch, Alida Knuth, Lynn Jenkins, Greta Massetti, Alexander Crosby, Beth Reimels and Kristen Bell.

Finally, we would like to give warm thanks to all of the panel members and external reviewers for their expertise, thoughtful reviews, and contributions to this document.



DEDICATION

We dedicate this document to the memory of our co-author, Merle E. Hamburger, PhD, who passed away during the development of this publication. He, with humor and compassion, has empowered and positively changed the lives of all those who knew him. His tireless efforts toward making bullying a priority at the CDC and across the U.S. are part of his legacy.

PANEL MEMBERS AND REVIEWERS

EXPERT PANEL MEMBERS*

Catherine Bradshaw
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, MD

Clayton Cook
University of Washington
Seattle, WA

Wendy Craig
Queens University
Kingston, ON

Dorothy Espelage
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Champaign, IL

David Finklehor
University of New Hampshire
Durham, NH

Jaana Juvonen
University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA

Susan Limber
Clemson University
Clemson, SC

Jamie Ostrov
University at Buffalo,
The State University of New York
Buffalo, NY

Barbara-Jane Paris
Canyon Vista Middle School
Austin, TX

Fred Poteete
Tahlequah Middle School
Tahlequah, OK

Ian Rivers
Brunel University
Uxbridge UK

Brian Weaver
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Madison, WI

* These affiliations are accurate
as of November 1, 2012

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS*

Mo Canady

National Association of School Resource Officers
(NASRO)
Hoover, AL

Erima Fobbs

Division of Prevention and Health Promotion
Virginia Department of Health
Richmond, VA

Sally Fogerty

Center for Study & Prevention of Injury,
Violence & Suicide
Children's Safety Network
Education Development Center
Waltham, MA/ Washington, D.C.

Julie Hertzog

PACER's National Bullying Prevention Center
Bloomington, MN

Melissa Holt

Boston University
Boston, MA

Mary Pat King

National PTA
Washington, D.C.

Joseph G Kosciw

Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network
(GLSEN)
New York, NY

Leigh Anne Kraemer-Naser

The Ophelia Project
Erie, PA

Debbie Lee

Futures Without Violence
San Francisco, CA

Elizabeth Miller

Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA

Daniel Olweus

University of Bergen
Bergen, Norway

Philip Rodkin

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Champaign, IL

Sandy Spavone

National Organizations for Youth Safety
Gainesville, VA

Lisa Thomas

American Federation of Teachers
Washington, D.C.

Michele Ybarra

Internet Solutions for Kids, Inc.
Santa Ana, CA

* These affiliations are accurate
as of November 1, 2012

FEDERAL PARTNERS COLLABORATORS*

Leroy Frazier

Division of Violence Prevention
National Center for Injury Prevention and Control
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Atlanta, GA

Marci Hertz

Division of Violence Prevention
National Center for Injury Prevention and Control
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Atlanta, GA

Deb Temkin

Office of Safe and Healthy Students
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C.

Kathryn Chandler

National Center for Education Statistics
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C.

Monica Hill

National Center for Education Statistics
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C.

Erin Reiney

Division of Child, Adolescent and Family Health
Maternal and Child Health Bureau
Health Resources and Services Administration
Rockville, MD

Elizabeth Edgerton

Division of Child, Adolescent and Family Health
Maternal and Child Health Bureau
Health Resources and Services Administration
Rockville, MD

Capt. Stephanie Bryn

Division of Child, Adolescent and Family Health
Maternal and Child Health Bureau
Health Resources and Services Administration
Rockville, MD

Joseph Wheeler

Office for Civil Rights
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C.

* These affiliations are accurate
as of November 1, 2012.

INTRODUCTION*

Bullying is one type of violence that threatens a youth's well-being in schools and neighborhoods. The impacts of bullying are felt by individuals, families, schools, and society and may result in youths¹ feeling powerless, intimidated, and humiliated by the aggressive acts of other youth(s). Bullying occurs in many settings, such as schools, after-school programs, or in a youth's neighborhood. It emerges from an interaction of complex factors related to individual characteristics of a youth, relationships with their peers and adults, and school or community norms.

Purpose and Scope:

Bullying Surveillance Among Youths: Uniform Definitions for Public Health and Recommended Data Elements, Version 1.0 is designed as a tool to help organizations, researchers, evaluators, community groups, educators, and public health officials define and gather systematic data on bullying to better inform research and prevention efforts. It is intended to improve the consistency and comparability of data collected on bullying. Current efforts to characterize bullying vary considerably. The lack of a uniform definition hinders our ability to understand the true magnitude, scope, and impact of bullying and track trends over time. Consistent terminology with standardized definitions is necessary to improve public health surveillance of bullying and inform efforts to address bullying.

The current definition applies to bullying that occurs between peers and excludes abuse perpetrated by adults against children or youths. It also excludes family violence and violence that occurs within the context of an intimate or dating relationship. These different forms of violence (e.g., child maltreatment, sibling violence, teen dating violence, intimate partner violence, elder maltreatment) can include aggression that is physical, sexual, or psychological (e.g., verbal, belittling, isolating, coercive). However, the context and uniquely dynamic nature of the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator in which these acts occur is different from that of peer violence.

It is important to keep in mind that youths who are experiencing or involved in bullying may be exposed to other forms of violence such as child maltreatment, dating violence, gang violence, other peer violence and delinquent behavior, suicidal behavior, and abuse by adults. Youths who report bullying victimization are often victims of other types of violence such as child maltreatment, being injured in a fight, sexual assault, simple or aggravated assault, and robbery (DeVoe & Bauer, 2011; Duke, Pettingell, McMorris, & Borowsky, 2010; Finkelhor, Ormrod, & Turner, 2007; Nansel, Overpeck, Haynie, Ruan, & Scheidt, 2003; Turner, Finkelhor, & Ormrod, 2010). Also, youths engaging in bullying are more likely to engage in frequent fights and perpetrate sexual violence (Espelage, Basile, & Hamburger, 2012; Nansel et al., 2003). Thus, it is strongly recommended that those concerned about youths' safety not limit their data collection efforts to bullying alone, but rather gather information on the broad threats to youths' safety. Uniform definitions and recommended data elements for some of these different types of violence is available at www.cdc.gov/injury.

This document is divided into four sections, the first of which provides background on the problem, including what is presently known about the public health burden of bullying and the need for a uniform definition of bullying. The uniform definition and description of key terms is presented next followed by considerations to keep in mind when gathering data on bullying. The last section provides a list of recommended data elements designed to assist individuals collecting information on bullying and to serve as a technical reference for the collection of surveillance data. The data elements are grouped into "core" and "expanded" data elements. Core elements are those which are recommended for inclusion in data collection systems in order to track the magnitude, scope, and characteristics of the bullying problem and to identify groups at high risk for being bullied. Expanded data elements are included to support users who may wish to collect other important contextual information about bullying (i.e., witnesses' responses to bullying) depending on community needs, interests, and the feasibility of gathering additional data. A large number of expanded data elements are provided with the expectation that the vast majority of users will only use a subset of them.

* The introduction is updated through November 2012.

1. The term youth(s) described in this document refers to school-aged individuals 5 to 18 years of age.

The Development Process:

This document was developed with funding from the U.S. Department of Education (ED) and represents a collaborative effort between the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the Department of Education, and the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) with extensive feedback and assistance from external researchers and practitioners working to prevent bullying in schools and communities. It was developed using a process and format similar to other CDC definitional efforts. The CDC has developed uniform definitions and recommended data elements for several types of violence, including:

- *Intimate Partner Violence Surveillance: Uniform Definitions and Recommended Data Elements, Version 1.0, 2002;*
- *Sexual Violence Surveillance: Uniform Definitions and Recommended Data Elements, Version 1.0, 2002;*
- *Child Maltreatment Surveillance: Uniform Definitions for Public Health and Recommended Data Elements, Version 1.0., 2008;*
- *Self-Directed Violence Surveillance, Uniform Definitions and Recommended Data Elements, 2011;*
- *Pediatric Abusive Head Trauma: Recommended Definitions for Public Health Surveillance and Research, 2012; and*
- *Elder Maltreatment Surveillance: Uniform Definition and Recommended Data Elements (in progress)*

Much like the above definitional efforts, this initial release of *Bullying Surveillance Among Youth: Uniform Definitions for Public Health and Recommended Data Elements, Version 1.0* is intended to serve as a starting point to guide public health surveillance of bullying.

History of the Uniform Bullying Definition Project

In 2008, the Federal Partners in Bullying Prevention Steering Committee was founded in order to provide effective and consistent federal guidance on bullying. This Steering Committee was tasked with combining and coordinating the efforts of six federal agencies (Departments of Education (ED), Health and Human Services, Justice, Defense, Agriculture, and Interior).² In 2010, the Steering Committee convened the first Federal Partners in Bullying Prevention Summit, which brought together over 150 non-profit and corporate leaders, researchers, practitioners, parents, and youths to identify challenges to bullying prevention efforts. Discussions at the Summit revealed inconsistencies regarding the definition of bullying behaviors and the need to create a uniform definition of bullying. In addition, a review of the 2011 CDC publication of assessment tools used to measure bullying among youths (Hamburger, Basile, & Vivolo, 2011) revealed inconsistent definitions of bullying and diverse measurement strategies that make it difficult to compare the prevalence of bullying with other findings across studies (Vivolo, Holt, & Massetti, 2011). The uniform definition was developed in response to this feedback.

2. Since 2008, federal participation in this effort has expanded to nine agencies: Departments of Education (ED), Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Justice, Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, National Council on Disability, Department of Interior, the White House Initiative on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and the Federal Trade Commission.

The Consultative Process

In January 2011, ED provided funding for the CDC to develop a uniform definition of bullying through a process of consulting with bullying experts and practitioners. Staff from multiple federal government agencies including the CDC, ED, and the HRSA selected an expert panel of 12 researchers and practitioners representing multiple disciplines (e.g., education, public health, and psychology), various organizations (e.g., academic institutions, schools, state public health departments), and diverse areas of expertise. The expert panel provided advice and feedback on this document during two in-person meetings held in May and September 2011 as well as multiple conference calls throughout 2011. Additional feedback on a draft bullying definition was solicited from attendees from the Second Annual Federal Partners in Bullying Prevention Summit held in September 2011.

A draft of the document was completed and reviewed by a separate group of external bullying experts and other federal partners in May 2012. After integrating feedback from external experts and federal partners, the CDC finalized the document. Although feedback from researchers and practitioners was essential in the formulation of this document, this document was not constructed through a consensus process, and the CDC is responsible for the final content.



SECTION 1: BACKGROUND

The Public Health Approach to Bullying

This document is guided by a four-step public health model (Institute of Medicine, 1988) that works to reduce bullying among youths by focusing on preventing bullying before it happens and using scientific evidence to identify and address factors that increase or decrease the risk of bullying at the individual, relational (e.g., a child's relationship with a friend or parent), organizational/community, and societal level (e.g., policies that impact factors contributing to or reducing bullying). The first step of the model involves uncovering the “who”, “what”, “when”, “where”, and “how” associated with bullying. Data on the magnitude, scope, characteristics, and consequences of the problem at local, state, and national levels are systematically gathered to demonstrate how frequently bullying behavior occurs, where it occurs most often, who the victims and perpetrators are, and its impact on victims, families, and communities. This step in the public health model is referred to as “problem definition and surveillance.” Surveillance is defined as the ongoing, systematic collection, analysis, and interpretation of data for use in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of public health practice (Thacker & Berkelman 1988). Surveillance systems that capture information on bullying are mostly implemented in school settings, such as the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS) and the Health Behaviors in School-age Children (HBSC) survey.

It is not enough to know the magnitude and characteristics of a public health problem. It is also important to understand “why” it occurs and which factors protect people or put them at risk for experiencing or perpetrating violence. These factors help identify where prevention efforts need to be focused. Thus, identifying risk and protective factors is the second step in the public health model. With a better understanding of the factors that place youth at risk for bullying, we can begin to develop and test prevention strategies that seek to change the relevant factors that increase a youth's risk in experiencing bullying. In this third step of the public health model, programs and policies are implemented and rigorously evaluated to determine “what works” to prevent bullying among youth. The final step of the public health model is to ensure widespread dissemination and adoption of the programs that prevent bullying.

It is important to define public health problems in a way that allows for consistent measurement so that variation in the level of the problem detected in a community can more likely be attributed to the underlying problem and not to differing definitions of the problem. Thus, consistent with the first step of the public health model, this document provides a uniform definition of bullying among youth.

The Need for a Uniform Definition of Bullying

Bullying is an important public health issue that has garnered significant attention in the United States over the past decade. Presently, researchers and schools have been collecting data on bullying behaviors; however, there are inconsistencies with and confusion about how to define this phenomenon (Swearer, Siebecker, Johnsen-Frerichs, & Wang, 2010). The most commonly used definition of bullying was developed by Dr. Daniel Olweus and stresses three components: 1) aggressive behaviors that are 2) repeated and 3) involve a power imbalance favoring the perpetrator. According to this definition, an individual is a victim of bullying when he or she is exposed repeatedly over time to negative actions by one or more individuals and is unable to defend him or herself, excluding cases where two children of similar physical and psychological strength are fighting (Olweus, 1993; 1994).

Distinguishing bullying from other types of aggression between youths is seen as critical because the unique characteristics of bullying included in many definitions, such as repeated aggression and a power imbalance favoring the aggressor, may make bullying more harmful to experience than similar forms of aggression without these characteristics (Hunter, Boyle, & Warden, 2007; Solberg & Olweus, 2003). Also, there is evidence that some prevention programs that target physical fighting and other forms of youth aggression are unsuccessful in preventing bullying behaviors (Taub, 2001; Van Schoiack-Edstrom, Frey, & Beland, 2002) and certain bullying prevention programs are not effective at preventing violence and aggression (Ferguson, San Miguel, Kilburn, & Sanchez, 2007). Thus, different prevention programs may be required to prevent bullying separate from other types of aggression that are not repeated and do not involve a power imbalance. Moreover, bullying is

sometimes equated with harassment. Even though there may be overlap in some of the concepts, distinguishing bullying from discriminatory harassment is critical due to the need to respond effectively and appropriately to the unique characteristics and legal requirements associated with harassment (U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, 2010).³

The inconsistent definitions used to measure bullying coupled with evidence indicating the importance of distinguishing bullying from other types of aggression between youths highlight the need for a uniform definition. A uniform definition supports the consistent tracking of bullying overtime, facilitates the comparison of bullying prevalence rates and associated risk and protective factors across different data collection systems, and enables the collection of comparable information on the performance of bullying intervention and prevention programs across contexts.

Although the definition focuses on identifying bullying behavior that occurs between youths, it is critical to recognize that bullying behavior emerges not only from the characteristics of youths themselves, but is affected by the responses of youths and adults who witness bullying, community and school norms, and larger social factors (Bradshaw, Sawyer, & O’Brennan, 2007). The most effective prevention programs will respond to the range of contributing factors instead of solely focusing on the individuals engaging in or experiencing bullying behaviors (Dahlberg & Krug, 2002; Espelage & Swearer, 2010; Green, 2001; Swearer & Doll, 2011; Vivolo et al., 2011).

The Public Health Burden of Bullying among Youth

Prevalence

Differences in the measurement and definition of bullying have contributed to varying estimates of its prevalence among youth. Estimates range from 13% to 75% (Swearer et al., 2010). Although national estimates of bullying in the U.S. use different definitions of bullying and produce varying estimates, these estimates consistently indicate that a considerable amount of youth are bullied.

National estimates of the prevalence of bullying are typically drawn from three national surveys: the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), the School Crime Supplement (SCS), and the Health Behaviors in School-age Children (HBSC). The 2011 YRBS, a national survey of high school students, found that approximately 20% of students reported being bullied at school during the past 12 months (Eaton et al., 2012). In the 2011 SCS, 28% of 12 to 18 year olds reported being bullied at school (Robers, Kemp, & Truman, 2013). Finally, the 2005-2006 HBSC, found that 11% of sixth through tenth graders in the U.S. reported being bullied two or more times in the last two months at school (Iannotti, 2012).

Each of these three surveys used different definitions of bullying; thus, making comparisons and integrating their findings very difficult. For instance, the lower estimate of bullying found in the YRBS, as compared to SCS, may partially be explained by its use of a more restrictive definition of bullying than the SCS or alternatively by the different ages of youth surveyed.⁴ In addition, youth bully others and are bullied in many different ways, including physically, verbally, and relationally (i.e., efforts to harm youth through attacking their relationships with other people). In the 2011 SCS, 18% of students were verbally bullied (e.g., made fun of, called names, or insulted), 8% experienced physical bullying (e.g., pushed, shoved, tripped, or spit on), and 5% were physically threatened by another student during the school year (Robers et al., 2013). The SCS found that 18% of students were the subject of rumors and 6% were excluded from activities on purpose during the school year (Robers et al., 2013).

3. For a full understanding and more specific guidance on school districts’ obligations to address discriminatory harassment, including bullying and violence, please visit the Office for Civil Rights’ Reading Room at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/publications.html>

4. The YRBS defines bullying as repeated aggression (teasing, threatening, spreading rumors, hitting, shoving, or hurting) among youth where the targeted youth has less strength or power than the perpetrator. This is more restrictive than the bullying variable used in the SCS that is based on compiling affirmative responses to a series of questions assessing aggressive acts such as calling a youth hurtful names.

Increasingly, use of technology, such as the Internet and electronic devices, has provided a new context in which bullying can occur. A 2011 study found that 95% of 12 to 17 year olds use the Internet and 80% use social media sites such as Facebook, MySpace, or Twitter. Nine percent of these 12 to 17 year olds reported being bullied via text messaging and 8% experienced electronic bullying⁵ through email, a social network site, or instant messaging in the last 12 months (Lenhart et al., 2011).

In general, studies have found that fewer students are bullied electronically than in-person (DeVoe & Bauer, 2011; Li, 2007; Robers et al., 2013; Williams & Guerra, 2007; Ybarra, Mitchell, & Espelage, 2012). Both the YRBS and SCS found a higher percentage of students reporting in-person bullying than electronic bullying. Specifically, the 2011 SCS found that 28% of 12 to 18 year olds reported being bullied at school compared to 9% who reported experiencing electronic bullying during the school year (Robers et al., 2013). The 2011 YRBS found a smaller difference with 20.1% of high schools students reporting being bullied at school in the past 12 months compared to 16.2% of students who reported ever being electronic bullied anywhere (Eaton et al., 2012).

Impact of Bullying on Youth

Victims of bullying are more likely than those who are not bullied to report feelings of low self-esteem and isolation, to perform poorly in school, not to have a lot friends at school, have a negative view of school, experience psychosomatic problems (e.g., headache, stomachache, or sleeping problems), and to report mental health problems (depression, suicidal thoughts, and anxiety) (Bond, Carlin, Thomas, Rubin, & Patton, 2001; Eisenberg, Neumark-Sztainer, & Perry, 2003; Gini & Pozzoli, 2009; Gladstone, Parker, & Malhi, 2006; Hawker & Boulton, 2000; Klomek, Marrocco, Kleinman, Schonfeld, & Gould, 2007; Nansel, Craig, & Overpeck, 2004; O'Brennen & Bradshaw, 2009; Sourander, Helstelä, Heleinus, & Piha, 2000). For instance, a national survey of 10 to 15 year olds in the U.S. found that 38% of youths who were bullied reporting being very or extremely upset about the most serious incident of bullying they had recently experienced at school (Ybarra et al., 2012). Evidence further suggests that people who both experience and perpetrate bullying (i.e., bully-victims) may exhibit the poorest functioning (e.g., depression, health problems, and externalizing disorders), in comparison with youths who just report being bullied or perpetrating bullying (Haynie et al, 2001; Nansel et al., 2004; Veenstra et al., 2005). Finally, experiencing bullying during childhood predicts being depressed as an adult (Farrington, Loeber, Stallings, & Ttofi, 2011; Ttofi, Farrington, Losel, & Loeber, 2011).

Some recent, yet limited, research suggests that the unique characteristics of bullying included in many definitions, such as repeated aggression and a power imbalance favoring the perpetrator, identify a distinct form of aggression that may be more harmful to experience than similar forms of general aggression without these characteristics. Recent research from Ybarra, Boyd, and colleagues (2012) found that adding a follow-up question about differential power yielded a more accurate classification of bullying. There is also some evidence that these unique characteristics may make bullying more harmful to experience than similar forms of general aggression without these characteristics. For instance, depressive tendencies, social disintegration, and negative self-evaluations of youths who were bullied became increasingly more severe as the repetition of aggression increased from once or twice in the past two to three months to once a week or more (Solberg & Olweus, 2003). Another study found that youth who experienced repeated aggression that was purposeful and involved a power imbalance, felt more threatened, less in control, and more depressed than those who experienced repeated aggression that did not involve a power imbalance favoring the perpetrator (Hunter et al., 2007).

5. Bullying behaviors perpetrated through the use of technology are referred to as both cyberbullying and electronic bullying in the literature. In this document, bullying involving technology is referred to as electronic bullying.

SECTION 2: THE UNIFORM DEFINITION

The uniform definition of bullying presented below conceptually builds from the extensive work on bullying and is similar to the widely used definition of bullying developed by Olweus (Olweus, 1993; 1994). The definition, however, also attempts to address some of the current critiques, especially those arguing that a single act of aggression can be bullying (Arora, 1996; Finkelhor, Turner, & Hamby, 2012; Olweus, 1993).

In order to support the use of the uniform definition, the context, modes, and types of bullying are defined along with the key terms in the definition such as aggression, power imbalance, and harm. As with the other CDC uniform definition documents, (Basile & Saltzman, 2002; Crosby, Ortega, & Melanson, 2011; Leeb, Paulozzi, Melanson, Simon, & Arias, 2008; Parks, Annest, Hill, & Karch, 2012; Saltzman, Fanslow, McMahon, & Shelley, 1999) this initial release of *Bullying Surveillance Among Youths: Uniform Definitions for Public Health and Recommended Data Elements, Version 1.0* is a starting point that will need to be revised periodically as more becomes known about bullying.

Definition of Bullying Among Youths

Bullying is any **unwanted aggressive behavior(s)** by another youth or group of youths who are not siblings or current dating partners⁶ 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**.

Modes and Types of Bullying

Modes of Bullying

1) Direct: aggressive behavior(s) that occur in the presence of the targeted youth. Examples of direct aggression include but are not limited to face-to-face interaction, such as pushing the targeted youth or directing harmful written or verbal communication at a youth.

2) Indirect: aggressive behavior(s) that are not directly communicated to the targeted youth. Examples of indirect aggression include but are not limited to spreading false and/or harmful rumors or communicating harmful rumors electronically.

Types of Bullying

1) Physical: the use of physical force by the perpetrator against the targeted youth. Examples include but are not limited to behaviors such as hitting, kicking, punching, spitting, tripping, and pushing.

2) Verbal: oral or written communication by the perpetrator against the targeted youth that causes him or her harm. Examples include but are not limited to mean taunting, calling the youth names, threatening or offensive written notes or hand gestures, inappropriate sexual comments, or threatening the youth verbally.

3) Relational: behaviors by a perpetrator designed to harm the reputation and relationships of the targeted youth. Direct relational bullying includes but is not limited to efforts to isolate the targeted youth by keeping him or her from interacting with their peers or ignoring them. Indirect relational bullying includes but is not limited to spreading false and/or harmful rumors, publicly writing derogatory comments, or posting embarrassing images in a physical or electronic space without the target youth's permission or knowledge.

6. The current uniform definition of bullying excludes sibling violence and violence that occurs within the context of an intimate or dating relationship. The different forms of violence (e.g., sibling violence, teen dating violence, intimate partner violence) can include aggression that is physical, sexual, or psychological (e.g., verbal, belittling, isolating, coercive). However, the context and uniquely dynamic nature of the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator in which these acts occur is different from that of peer violence (Heise & Garcia-Moreno, 2002). Consequently, it is important to assess teen dating violence and sibling violence separately from bullying in order to establish separate prevalence estimates and to understand the patterns and dynamics involved. The CDC defines teen dating violence as “the physical, sexual, or psychological/emotional violence within a dating relationship, as well as stalking” (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2012).

4) Damage to Property: theft, alteration or damaging of the target youth's property by the perpetrator to cause harm. These behaviors can include but are not limited to taking a youth's personal property and refusing to give it back, destroying a youth's property in their presence, or deleting personal electronic information.

Context of Bullying

Bullying may occur within multiple contexts such as at school and school events, travelling to and from school, a youth's neighborhood, or on the Internet. Within these contexts bullying can include a range of behaviors such as physical aggression, verbal aggression, efforts to isolate or harm a youth by attacking his or her relationships with others, or damaging property.

Bullying that occurs using technology is considered electronic bullying and is viewed as a context or location, such as a school, where verbal, relational, and property (e.g., deleting personal data) bullying occurs through electronic means. Electronic bullying can be identified using the general definition of bullying.⁷

Bullying is often witnessed or known about by other youth who may also be harmed as a result. Because bullying is often witnessed, the response to bullying by adults and youth (e.g., supporting the targeted youth, watching and not intervening, or supporting the perpetrator) may encourage or discourage bullying behaviors.

Key Terms

Youth are school-aged individuals 5 to 18 years of age.

Unwanted means that the targeted youth wants the aggressive behaviors by the perpetrator to stop. For instance, two youths may enjoy taunting or making fun of each other in a playful manner. This should not be considered bullying.

Aggressive behavior is the intentional use of harmful behavior(s), threatened or actual, against another youth. Instead of attempting to assess whether the perpetrator intended for the victim to experience an injury as a result of the bullying behavior, intentionality can be captured by assessing the perpetrator's intent to use harmful behaviors against the targeted youth. For instance, telling damaging rumors about a youth, threatening another youth, or shoving another youth would be considered intentional because the perpetrator is using harmful behaviors against another youth. This approach to measuring intentionality is consistent with how the CDC and the World Health Organization measure other types of violence (Dahlberg & Krug, 2002).

Has occurred multiple times or is highly likely to be repeated means that the youth experiences multiple incidents of aggression perpetrated by a single youth or group of youths over a specified time period or there is strong concern a single aggressive behavior by a youth or group of youths has a high likelihood of being followed by more incidents of aggression. Repeated aggression that involves different perpetrators and is perceived as unrelated by the youth should not be considered repeated. If the youth, however, experiences multiple separate incidents of aggression over time, this is considered repeated if the targeted youth perceives the aggression as related even if the perpetrator(s) changes across the incidents and no single perpetrator is involved in multiple incidents.

A power imbalance is the attempt by the perpetrator(s) to use observed or perceived personal or situational characteristics to exert control over the targeted youth's behavior or limit the victim's ability to respond or stop their aggression. The power imbalance should not be used to label certain children "powerless" or "powerful," but instead is designed to capture power differences that exist in a certain relationship at a specific time. Power imbalances can change over time and across situations even when they involve the same people. The use of violence or threats of violence may create or enhance an existing power imbalance.

Harm is a range of negative experiences or injuries and can include a) physical cuts, bruises or pain, b) psychological consequences such as feelings of distress, depression or anxiety, c) social damage to reputation or relationship, and/or d) limits to educational opportunities through increased absenteeism, dropping out of school, having difficulty concentrating in class, and poor academic performance.

7. See the Discussion section in Core Data Element 1.12 for information on key considerations to address when measuring electronic bullying.

SECTION 3: CONSIDERATIONS WHEN GATHERING DATA ON BULLYING USING THE UNIFORM DEFINITION

Systematically gathering data on bullying to determine the magnitude, scope, and characteristics of bullying and tracking trends over time with a uniform definition is important to support research, prevention, and response efforts. A few key considerations when gathering data on bullying in your community or school are highlighted below.

An important first step in gathering data on bullying using the uniform bullying definition and recommended data elements is documenting the extent to which the definition can be applied to the real world and captures the behaviors it is meant to assess. The uniform definition is a technical definition and cannot be used verbatim in questionnaires or other data collection tools. However, the concepts described in the definition and data elements can be converted into survey items or data collection protocols. The data elements section provides information to assist with this process. Users, however, will need to select the most appropriate strategies for translating the definition to use in their data collection systems.

It is important that the uniform definition and recommended data elements be tested with diverse populations and that the design, implementation, and interpretation of data on bullying be informed by emerging findings in the field. Thus, field studies or pilot tests are needed to gauge the usefulness of the uniform bullying definition and recommended data elements, ensure their validity, assess feasibility and cost, and identify adaptations needed to work in various settings.

Many existing surveillance systems that capture information on bullying rely on self-reports of youths because this method is feasible, often cost-effective, and collects information on youths' direct experience of bullying. When resources are available, multiple methods such as peer or adult reports may provide additional insights into the prevalence of bullying and address criticisms of self-report assessments of bullying (Furlong, Sharkey, Felix, Tanigawa, & Green, 2010).

Also, ethical, privacy, legal, and safety issues are important to consider when gathering data on bullying. No data should be collected or stored in a manner that could jeopardize an individual's safety or privacy. If data from one system is to be linked with other data sources, consideration should be given to the creation and use of mechanisms such as encryption of unique identifiers to further ensure an individual's safety. Educational agencies or institutions must take special care to comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment (PPRA) when collecting, storing, maintaining, and sharing data that involves the use of students' education records. These requirements are described in Appendix A.

Finally, assessment of bullying should be integrated into broader routine monitoring systems (e.g., surveillance of health or multiple types of youth violence) when possible. This helps make bullying surveillance routine, takes advantage of existing resources, and assists in understanding the linkage of bullying with other issues. In some cases, monitoring systems for gathering information on bullying will need to be established.

SECTION 4: RECOMMENDED DATA ELEMENTS FOR BULLYING

4.1 Purpose of the Data Elements

This section lists and describes information, or data elements, that are useful to collect when monitoring bullying for prevention purposes. The data elements are classified as core and expanded. The core data elements include information that is critical to assess in order to determine the magnitude, scope, and characteristics of the bullying problem. Many of these core data elements, especially demographic information such as sex, race, and ethnicity, are routinely collected in most surveillance systems. However, resources may not be available to collect all the core data elements (e.g., limited number of questions available on a survey) or some data elements may be inappropriate to collect from certain youth, data sources, or contexts. In these instances, emphasis should be placed on collecting high quality information to capture the prevalence of bullying.

If resources allow, collection of the expanded data elements—which includes the core data elements—will yield additional information about the context and perpetration of bullying. For instance, these elements collect information about where and when bullying occurs and whether peers and adults witnessing bullying respond by intervening to stop it, watching it, encouraging it, or ignoring it. The context of why and how the monitoring data is being collected and used should drive the selection of expanded data elements. For instance, a school that is implementing an intervention that encourages peers and adults to intervene when they witness bullying may want to collect expanded data elements related to witnesses' responses to bullying. A large number of expanded data elements are provided so users of this manual can select the subset of elements that are most relevant to their initiatives. No surveillance system is expected to collect information on all of the expanded data elements.

The order in which the data elements are listed within the core and expanded section is not intended to suggest a hierarchy; users should prioritize inclusion based on the data element descriptions and their needs and context.

4.2 Explanation of a Data Element and its Description

Each data element is accompanied by a description that includes nine categories such as its definition and suggested response categories to assist in their use. Data elements are not variables and information on the data elements may be collected by using single or multiple questions on a survey or may be created by using a single field or combining multiple fields in an administrative database. Data elements, however, may inform the design of instruments or protocols to collect information on bullying.

Definition/Description: This provides a definition of the data element.

Uses: This describes why it is important to collect the data element.

Type of Data Element: This classifies the data element as either core or expanded. A core data element is viewed as critical information that all data collections systems should try to collect in order to track the magnitude, scope, and characteristics of bullying. Expanded data elements refer to information that would be useful to collect if resources are available and relevant to the purpose of the monitoring system.

Discussion: This provides a brief discussion of the data element that may include key considerations such as guidelines, advice, or challenges when assessing the data element, more information on why the data element is important, or other background information on the usage of the data element.

Data Type: This lists whether the data element is usually collected and stored as a text or numeric variable. Text means that the information associated with this data element is grouped into distinct categories such as the location where bullying occurred (e.g., hallway, cafeteria,) and numbers associated with a category have no mathematical meaning (e.g., 2 is not twice as big as 1). In contrast, numbers associated with numerical data elements have mathematical meaning. Numeric can refer to continuous and ordinal data.

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: This indicates when a data element should only have one response or may have multiple responses. For instance, the frequency of being bullied should only have a single numeric response. In response to questions assessing the perceived reasons for bullying, a respondent might provide multiple reasons such as physical appearance, demographic characteristics, or personality traits. A “Yes” indicates that there can be multiple responses, and all appropriate response categories should be coded. A “No” indicates that only one response should be provided.

Field Values/Coding Instructions: This provides a list of suggested response categories for each data element to inform data collection as well as facilitate comparisons across data collection systems. These response categories are suggestions and the user will need to consider their own context and goals as well as measurement improvements when finalizing their response categories. In some instances, more detailed explanations may precede the presentation of the response categories. Although the response categories for some data elements can be used directly in survey questions (see *Data Standards or Guidelines*), the response categories are not designed to be directly used in survey instruments. Multiple questions and changes in the wording of the response categories will usually be required to accurately collect the information.

Data Standards or Guidelines: The federal government has developed measurement standards and guidelines for some data elements, especially those measuring the demographic characteristics of youths. This field lists the standard and guideline documents relevant to this data element. Descriptions of the standards or guidelines are provided in the *Discussion* and *Field Values/Code Instructions* fields.

Other References: This lists other references that provided information on the response categories for the data element or guidance on measuring the data element.

4.3 Core Data Elements

A core data element is viewed as critical information that all data collections systems should try to collect in order to track the magnitude, scope, and characteristics of bullying. The core data elements are listed below and are grouped into five categories.

CASE IDENTIFIER: A unique identification number for information collected on each youth or incident of bullying is important to create to prevent collecting duplicate information, to help track data on youth or incidents, and to facilitate linking the data with other sources.

1.01 Case ID

HOW BULLYING WAS MEASURED: All three key components of the uniform bullying definition (unwanted aggressive behavior(s), observed or perceived power imbalance, and repeated multiple times or is highly likely to be repeated) need to be measured to distinguish bullying from other types of aggression. The method(s) used to assess these components influence estimates of the prevalence of bullying (Cook, Williams, Guerra, & Kim, 2010). Therefore, recording the methodology used to assess bullying is important to facilitate comparisons of information across different surveillance systems.

1.02 Data source

1.03 The time period over which bullying occurs

1.04 The method used to assess aggression

1.05 The method used to assess whether aggression was repeated multiple times or was highly likely to be repeated

1.06 The method used to assess an observed or perceived power imbalance

BULLYING OF YOUTH: These data elements capture the extent to which bullying occurs in a specified time frame. Gathering information to determine the prevalence and frequency of bullying is the most essential feature of any data collection system used to monitor bullying. An overall measure of bullying should always assess the three key components of the bullying definition. Bullying can involve a range of aggressive behaviors that vary across youths' age groups, sex, and context. Whenever possible, the different types of bullying should be measured as well as overall bullying.

1.07 Frequency of being bullied during a specified time period

1.08 Frequency of being physically bullied during a specified time period

1.09 Frequency of being verbally bullied during a specified time period

1.10 Frequency of experiencing relational bullying (efforts to undermine a youth's relationships or reputation) during a specified time period

1.11 Frequency of being bullied by having property damaged during a specified time period

1.12 Frequency of being electronically bullied during a specified time period

DESCRIPTION OF YOUTH WHO WERE BULLIED: Demographic information is routinely collected as an integral part of most monitoring and surveillance systems. This information helps describe the problem and determine whether the prevalence of bullying victimization varies across demographic groups. Although this information can be used to assess the frequency of bullying among and across groups, it cannot be used to determine whether youths have been targeted based on their demographic characteristics (e.g., bullied because of their sex).

- 1.13 Sex of the youth who was bullied
- 1.14 Race of the youth who was bullied
- 1.15 Ethnicity of the youth who was bullied
- 1.16 Age of the youth who was bullied
- 1.17 Current grade level of the youth who was bullied
- 1.18 Disability status of the youth who was bullied
- 1.19 Special education classification of youth who was bullied
- 1.20 English proficiency of the youth who was bullied
- 1.21 Religion of the youth who was bullied
- 1.22 Sexual orientation of the youth who was bullied
- 1.23 Transgender status of youth who was bullied

CASE IDENTIFIER

1.01 CASE ID

Definition/Description: A case ID uniquely identifies each person or bullying incident in a database and is often used instead of confidential identifying information such as a person's name in datasets. In most surveillance systems, the case ID most often represents a youth. The case ID also can be used to track incidents of bullying (e.g., all incidents of bullying occurring in a school) or monitor incidents of bullying experienced by each youth. The case ID may be assigned by the facility/agency responsible for collecting the information (e.g., a school system may attach an ID to disciplinary records) or it may be a generic identifier associated with an anonymous survey.

Uses: A case ID helps prevent double-counting of individuals or incidents of bullying. Also, the case ID assists merging information on individuals or incidents of bullying from multiple sources (e.g., school records to survey information) for administrative tracking, surveillance, or research. A case ID can be especially useful if multiple data collection systems such as a school administrative system tracking attendance and a school survey both use the same ID for each respondent.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: If you are merging information from multiple data sources, each data source should have a unique case ID for the youth or bullying incident before being merged. To protect the confidentiality of people providing information, access to the case ID should be restricted to authorized personnel when the case ID contains confidential information or is easily linked to confidential information.

Most current surveillance systems that capture information on bullying collect information on youth and not incidents of bullying because this simplifies data collection and analysis, provides information to understand how many youths are being bullied, how they are being bullied, and does not require asking youth about multiple incidents of bullying using extensive questionnaires. Organizing information by bullying incidents can also provide unique information such as areas or times where bullying is likely to occur or the context of bullying incidents. However, this will make analysis more complex and should be designed in a manner that allows estimates of key information on youths such as how many respondents are bullied.

Data Type: Numeric or Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Before collecting data make sure a systematic method for assigning each case a unique ID has been established. The ID should include identifying information for every level of data that is being collected when possible. For instance, if a surveillance system was collecting information from 1,000 students across 10 schools, the first part of the ID may represent the school (e.g., 01 to 10) and the second part of the ID may represent the student (e.g., 0150). Thus, the complete ID would read 020099 for a survey of the 99th student in school 02.

Data Standards or Guidelines: Health Level 7 (HL7) (1996).

Other References: None

HOW BULLYING WAS MEASURED

1.02 DATA SOURCE

Definition/Description: This describes the source of information used to measure bullying such as self-report versus observation by a trained observer.

Uses: Identifies how the information is collected and allows more accurate comparisons with other efforts to track bullying. The source of data may impact estimates of bullying.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: Estimates of the prevalence of bullying as well as descriptions of bullying can be impacted by the source of data (Cook et al., 2010). Only modest correlations have been found between bullying data from self-reports (i.e., directly asking a youth if he or she has been bullied or perpetrated bullying) or peer reports (i.e., asking a youth's peers or classmates to identify who has experienced or engaged in bullying) (Cornell & Bandyopadhyay, 2010). Consequently, collecting information from multiple sources when feasible can provide a more complete understanding of bullying. This data element can be used to track how the different data were collected if multiple data sources are used.

Due to cost and feasibility, bullying information is often collected by directly asking youth about bullying victimization and perpetration. Currently, insufficient information exists to uniformly endorse one data source over another.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No, the source of data should be listed for every individual or record collected and not for the overall data collection system.

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
01	Self-report of youths (i.e., youths are asked if they have engaged in bullying or experienced it)
02	Peer nomination by youths (i.e., youths are asked questions about which of their peers engage in bullying or are bullied)
03	Reports by parent or caregiver (i.e., parent or caregiver report if their child has been bullied or engaged in bullying)
04	Teacher reports (i.e., teachers report which students have experienced or engaged in bullying)
05	Reports from adults other than parents or teachers (e.g., a coach reports youths who are perceived as engaging in bullying or bullied)
06	Observation of youths by a trained coder
07	Review of administrative/disciplinary records
08	Other (Specify)

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

1.03 TIME PERIOD OVER WHICH BULLYING OCCURS

Definition/Description: Assessments and measures of bullying behaviors track it over different time periods such as but not limited to a week, a month, two to three months, six months, a year, or ever in the youth's life. This element records the time period used in a monitoring or surveillance system.

Uses: The prevalence of bullying as well as the type of bullying captured can change depending on the time period measured. This is especially true because a component of the bullying definition (aggression is repeated multiple times or is highly likely to be repeated) is impacted by the time period measured.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: The prevalence of bullying is influenced by the time period over which it is measured. Assessing repeated aggression over short time frames will detect bullying that is occurring at a high frequency and is possibly more severe. Moreover, this captures bullying behavior that has occurred recently and may be easier to recall. Very short time periods such as a week should be used cautiously because this may only detect very severe bullying and allow insufficient time to detect repeated aggression. In contrast, longer time periods such as six months or a school year will detect bullying that occurs both frequently and infrequently (e.g., experiencing intimidating behavior by a peer twice over a 6 month period). Distinguishing bullying from multiple incidents of unrelated aggression (e.g., was involved in a playground fight and an unrelated fight with a neighbor's child), however, may be more difficult over longer periods of time. Also, youth may have difficulty recalling incidents of bullying over longer period times, especially if they are younger or being asked about bullying that occurred more than 6 months ago. For instance, some research suggests that the prevalence of bullying may be underestimated if youths are asked about bullying over long periods of time such as "the past year" or more due to the youths having difficulty recalling all incidents that occurred during that time (Cook et al., 2010). Because different time periods will capture different types of bullying and result in different estimates of the prevalence of bullying, surveillance systems when feasible should include multiple time periods with at least one time period assessing bullying that occurred over a shorter time period (e.g., last month) and another time period assessing bullying over a longer time period (e.g., last six months).

Finally, comparing the information you collect to national and state data can provide insight into the scope and context of your bullying problem. If these types of comparisons are a goal of your system, using the time periods consistent with national research is suggested to facilitate comparisons. For instance, the *Youth Risk Behavior Survey* (YRBS) assesses bullying over the last 12 months. The *School Crime Supplement* (SCS) asks about bullying during the school year and the *Health Behavior of School-aged Children* (HSBC) asks about bullying over the last couple of months.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No. The time period should be listed for every individual or record collected and not for the overall data collection system.

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
01	Last week
02	Past 30 days
03	2-3 months
04	A school semester
05	6 months
06	Past 12 months
07	Ever
08	Other time period(s) (Specify)

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

1.04 METHOD USED TO ASSESS AGGRESSION

Definition/Description: This data element assesses the methodology used in the surveillance system to capture aggressive behaviors.

Uses: Bullying is considered a subset of aggressive behaviors. Consequently, understanding the method(s) used to assess aggression in surveillance systems ensures that all three components of the bullying definition are measured, facilitates comparisons across studies, and assists in determining how methodology impacts estimates of the prevalence of bullying.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: Surveillance systems should attempt to capture the range of aggressive behaviors described in the bullying definition (i.e., physical, verbal, relational, and damage to property). Otherwise, the surveillance system will underestimate the prevalence of bullying. For instance, the types of aggression used to bully vary by sex and developmental stage (Card et al., 2011; Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Simons-Morton, & Scheidt, 2001; Rigby, 1999; Solberg & Olweus, 2003). Examples of surveys that have developed questions to assess the range of aggressive behaviors involved in bullying are available at http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pub/measuring_bullying.html (Hamburger et al., 2011).

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No. The method should be listed for every incident or person when multiple methods are used to assess aggression.

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
01	Provide respondents a general definition of bullying that includes examples of aggressive behaviors and ask them to apply the definition to their experiences or observations
02	Ask the respondents to report on whether they have experienced, perpetrated, or observed specific types of aggressive behaviors such as being shoved, being targeted by false rumors, experiencing direct verbal threats, or being threatened via email or notes
03	Provide respondents examples of aggression in written, audio, or video form and ask them to apply it to their experiences or observations of youths. Respondents are not provided a definition of bullying and the word “bullying” is not used
04	Other method(s) (Specify)

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

1.05 METHOD USED TO ASSESS WHETHER AGGRESSION WAS REPEATED MULTIPLE TIMES OR WAS HIGHLY LIKELY TO BE REPEATED

Definition/Description: This data element assesses the methodology used in the surveillance system to measure whether aggressive behaviors have a high likelihood of being repeated or have occurred multiple times.

Uses: In order to be considered bullying, the uniform definition states that an aggressive behavior is repeated multiple times or is highly likely to be repeated. Consequently, differences in how the repetition component is measured may impact what is classified as bullying and affect estimates of how often bullying occurs. Consequently, tracking how the repetition component is measured will facilitate comparisons across studies, ensure a key component of bullying is measured, and help document how methodology impacts estimates of bullying victimization and perpetration.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: One of the main characteristics of bullying that distinguishes it from other types of aggression is that it is repeated multiple times or is highly likely to be repeated. The uniform definition states that a single incident of aggression can be considered bullying if it has a high likelihood of occurring again. This part of the definition is currently not in most measurement definitions of bullying, but is considered an important part of the uniform definition because assessing bullying as it begins is critical for prevention efforts. Possible approaches to measuring this include asking the youth being victimized if they fear or believe aggression will occur again or asking the observers whether aggressive behaviors involve threats of future aggression.

The surveillance system will also need to distinguish repeated aggression by the same youth or group of youths from other types of victimization experienced by youth(s) that may be unrelated.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No. The method should be listed for every incident or person when multiple methods are used to assess aggression.

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
01	Provide respondents a general definition of bullying that includes a high likelihood of repetition and ask them to apply the definition to their experiences or observations
02	Ask the respondents to report how often a youth experienced aggressive behaviors and the extent to which there was a high likelihood the aggression would occur again
03	Provide respondents examples of incidents that were repeated or had a high likelihood of being repeated in written, audio, or video form and ask them to apply it to their experiences or observations of youths. Respondents are not provided a definition of bullying and the word "bullying" was not used
04	Other method(s) (Specify)

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

1.06 METHOD USED TO ASSESS AN OBSERVED OR PERCEIVED POWER IMBALANCE

Definition/Description: This data element assesses the methodology used in the surveillance system to determine whether aggressive behaviors involved an observed or perceived power imbalance favoring the perpetrator.

Uses: In order to be considered bullying, the uniform definition states that aggressive behavior must involve a power imbalance. Differences in how the power imbalance component is assessed may impact estimates of the prevalence of bullying (Cook et al., 2010). Consequently, tracking how the power imbalance component is measured will facilitate comparisons across studies, ensure the power imbalance component is assessed, and help document how different methods impact estimates of bullying victimization and perpetration.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: One of the main characteristics of bullying that distinguishes it from other forms of aggression is an observed or perceived imbalance of power. Due to its subjective nature a power imbalance can be difficult to measure. Two common measurement approaches are: 1) providing respondent's a definition of bullying that describes bullying as typically repeated aggression involving a power imbalance (Nansel et al., 2001; Solberg & Olweus, 2003) or 2) directly asking about certain characteristics of the relationship between the targeted youth and the perpetrator that could create a power imbalance (Felix, Sharkey, Furlong, & Tanigawa, 2011; Hunter et al., 2007). Other approaches could include asking peers, trained observers, or adults such as teachers about whether a power imbalance existed between youth(s) experiencing the aggression and the youth(s) engaging in the aggressive behaviors.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No. The method should be listed for every incident or person when multiple methods are used to assess a power imbalance.

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
01	Provide respondents a general definition of bullying that includes the power imbalance component and ask them to apply the definition to their experiences or observations
02	Ask the respondents to report on characteristics of the relationship between the perpetrator(s) and targeted youth such as physical strength, popularity, or number of aggressors that can create a power imbalance
03	Provide respondents examples of power imbalances in written, audio, or video form and ask them to apply it to their experiences or observations of youths. Respondents are not provided a definition of bullying and the word "bullying" was not used
04	Other method(s) (Specify)

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

BULLYING OF YOUTH

1.07 FREQUENCY OF BEING BULLIED DURING A SPECIFIED TIME PERIOD

Definition/Description: This measures the frequency a youth was bullied during a specified time period.

Uses: Provides an overall estimate of the prevalence and frequency of bullying over a specified time period. Collecting this information is critical in understanding the prevalence of bullying and how often youth confront bullying.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: When estimating the prevalence of bullying victimization, assessments need to measure all three key components of the definition of bullying (i.e., aggression, repeated aggression or high likelihood of aggression being repeated, and an observed or perceived power imbalance favoring the perpetrator). Measuring these components is critical in order to distinguish bullying from general aggressive behaviors, assertive behaviors, arguments, rough and tumble play, or other types of violence (e.g., physical fighting). Additionally, this data element should include all types of bullying and aggregate the different types of bullying (i.e., physical, verbal, relational, and property).

The definition of repeated aggression and power imbalance may result in victims and perpetrators classifying slightly different phenomenon as bullying. Specifically, youths who are victimized may classify multiple experiences of aggression (regardless of the identity of the perpetrator) as bullying. Also, perpetrators and youths who are victimized may have different perceptions of whether certain behaviors were aggressive or involved a power imbalance. Finally, the number and percentage of youths perpetrating bullying may differ from the number and percentage of youths who have experienced bullying because a single perpetrator can bully multiple youths or multiple perpetrators can bully a single youth.

Reports from observers such as teachers, peers, and parents may underestimate the prevalence and frequency of bullying because the observers may not have witnessed all incidents experienced by a youth.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Although numeric response categories are provided below, the reader should identify frequency categories that are appropriate for their population (e.g., identify categories or scales that may be more easily understood for younger versus older youth). Also, the categories may need to be modified based on the data collection system used or time period assessed. For instance, alternatives include collecting the raw number of times a youth was bullied or using Likert scales (e.g., rarely bullied, sometimes bullied, often bullied, always bullied).

Code	Description
00	Youth did not experience any bullying during the specified period of time
01	Youth experienced bullying once
02	Youth experienced bullying 2 to 5 times
03	Youth experienced bullying 6 to 10 times
04	The youth was bullied more than 10 times
99	Unknown if bullying occurred during the specified time period

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

1.08 FREQUENCY OF BEING PHYSICALLY BULLIED DURING A SPECIFIED TIME PERIOD

Definition/Description: This measures how often a youth was physically bullied during a specified time period. Physical bullying involves the use of physical force by the aggressor against the victim. Examples include but are not limited to behaviors such as hitting, kicking, punching, spitting, tripping, and pushing.

Uses: Provides an estimate of how many youths are physically bullied as well as how often they are physically bullied. This in turn improves understanding of the types of aggression that are being used to bully youths.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: When estimating the prevalence of physical bullying, assessments need to measure all three key components of the definition of bullying (i.e., physical aggression, repeated physical aggression or high likelihood of physical aggression being repeated, and an observed or perceived power imbalance favoring the perpetrator). Physical bullying captures a wide range of behaviors where physical force is used by the aggressor against the targeted youth. In order to help respondents understand physical bullying, questions about physical bullying should delineate the types of physical bullying being measured with behaviorally specific items (e.g., were you hit), definitions, or examples. Reports from observers such as teachers, peers, and parents may underestimate the prevalence and the frequency of physical bullying because the observers may not have witnessed all incidents experienced by a youth.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Although numeric response categories are provided below, the reader should identify frequency categories that are appropriate for their population (e.g., identifying categories or scales that may be more easily understood for younger versus older youth). Also, the categories may need to be modified based on the data collection system used or time period assessed. For instance, alternatives include collecting the raw number of times a youth was physically bullied or using Likert scales (e.g., rarely physically bullied, sometimes physically bullied, often physically bullied, always physically bullied).

Code	Description
00	Youth did not experience any physical bullying during the specified period of time
01	Youth experienced physical bullying once
02	Youth experienced physical bullying 2 to 5 times
03	Youth experienced physical bullying 6 to 10 times
04	The youth was physically bullied more than 10 times
99	Unknown if physical bullying occurred during the specified time period

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

1.09 FREQUENCY OF BEING VERBALLY BULLIED DURING A SPECIFIED TIME PERIOD

Definition/Description: This measures the frequency with which a youth has been verbally bullied over a specified time period. Verbal bullying is harmful oral or written communication against a targeted youth. Examples include, but are not limited to mean taunting, calling a youth names, inappropriate sexual comments, or threatening a youth verbally, in written notes, or with hand gestures.

Uses: Provides an estimate of how many youths are verbally bullied as well as how often they are verbally bullied. More broadly, this measure provides insight into how youths are bullied.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: When estimating the prevalence of verbal bullying, assessments need to measure all three key components of the definition of bullying (i.e., verbal aggression, repeated verbal aggression or high likelihood of verbal aggression being repeated, and an observed or perceived power imbalance favoring the perpetrator). Verbal bullying can involve a wide a range of oral or written communication. In order to help respondents understand verbal bullying, questions about verbal bullying should delineate the types of verbal bullying being measured with behaviorally specific items (e.g., were you threatened), definitions, or examples. Reports from observers such as teachers, peers, and parents may underestimate the prevalence and frequency of verbal bullying because the observers may not have witnessed all incidents experienced by a youth.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Although numeric response categories are provided below, the reader should identify frequency categories that are appropriate for their population (e.g., identifying categories or scales that may be more easily understood for younger versus older youth). Also, the categories may need to be modified based on the data collection system used or time period assessed. For instance, alternatives include collecting the raw number of times a youth was verbally bullied or using Likert scales (e.g., rarely verbally bullied, sometimes verbally bullied, often verbally bullied, always verbally bullied).

Code	Description
00	Youth did not experience any verbal bullying during the specified period of time
01	Youth experienced verbal bullying once
02	Youth experienced verbal bullying 2 to 5 times
03	Youth experienced verbal bullying 6 to 10 times
04	The youth was verbally bullied more than 10 times
99	Unknown if verbal bullying occurred during the specified time period

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

1.10 FREQUENCY OF EXPERIENCING RELATIONAL BULLYING (EFFORTS TO UNDERMINE A YOUTH'S RELATIONSHIPS OR REPUTATION) DURING A SPECIFIED TIME PERIOD

Definition/Description: This measures how often a youth experienced relational bullying during a specified time period. Relational bullying (i.e., efforts to harm a youth's reputation and relationships) includes but is not limited to efforts to isolate the targeted youth by keeping him or her from interacting with their peers or ignoring the targeted youth.

Uses: Provides an estimate of how many youths are relationally bullied as well as how often they are bullied in this way. More broadly, this measure provides insight into how youths are bullied.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: When estimating the prevalence of relational bullying, assessments need to measure all three key components of the definition of bullying (i.e., relational aggression, repeated relational aggression or high likelihood of relational aggression being repeated, and an observed or perceived power imbalance favoring the perpetrator). Relational bullying can involve a wide a range behaviors including spreading rumors and isolating targeted youth. In order to help respondents understand relational bullying, questions about relational bullying should delineate the types of relational bullying being measured with behaviorally specific items (e.g., spread rumors about you), definitions, or examples.

Incidents of relational bullying may overlap with incidents of physical, verbal, and property bullying because attacks on a youth's relationships or reputation involve aggressive acts such as spreading rumors or excluding a youth through the use of verbal threats or insults. Multiple questions, definitions, or examples involving multiple behaviors are often used to assess the different aspects of relational bullying such as being excluded or being the target of harmful rumors. Reports from observers such as teachers, peers, and parents may underestimate the prevalence and frequency of relational bullying because the observers may not have witnessed all incidents experienced by a youth.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Although numeric response categories are provided below, the reader should identify frequency categories that are appropriate for their population (e.g., identifying categories or scales that may be more easily understood for younger versus older youth). Also, the categories may need to be modified based on the data collection system used or time period assessed. For instance, alternatives include collecting the raw number of times a youth experienced relational bullying or using Likert scales (e.g., rarely experienced relational bullying, sometimes experienced relational bullying, often experienced relational bullying, always experienced relational bullying).

Code	Description
00	Youth did not experience any relational bullying during the specified period of time
01	Youth experienced relational bullying once
02	Youth experienced relational bullying 2 to 5 times
03	Youth experienced relational bullying 6 to 10 times
04	The youth experienced relational bullying more than 10 times
99	Unknown if relational bullying occurred during the specified time period

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

1.11 FREQUENCY OF BEING BULLIED BY HAVING PROPERTY DAMAGED DURING A SPECIFIED TIME PERIOD

Definition/Description: This measures the frequency in which a youth was bullied by having their property damaged during a specified time period. Property damage is defined as theft, alteration or destruction of a person's property in an effort to cause harm to the youth. These behaviors can include but are not limited to taking a youth's personal property and refusing to give it back, destroying a youth's property in their presence, or deleting or damaging electronic information.

Uses: This measure provides information on how often youths experience property bullying. More broadly, this measure provides insight into how youths are bullied.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: When estimating the prevalence of property bullying, assessments need to measure all three key components of the definition of bullying (i.e., property aggression, repeated property aggression or high likelihood of property aggression being repeated, and an observed or perceived power imbalance favoring the perpetrator). Property bullying can involve a wide a range of behaviors including property theft and destruction. In order to help respondents understand property bullying, questions about property bullying should delineate the types of property bullying being measured with behaviorally specific items (e.g., having your property destroyed on purpose), definitions, or examples. Reports from observers such as teachers, peers, and parents may underestimate the prevalence and frequency of this type of bullying because the observers may not have witnessed all incidents experienced by a youth.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Although numeric response categories are provided below, the reader should identify frequency categories that are appropriate for their population (e.g., identifying categories or scales that may be more easily understood for younger versus older youth). Also, the categories may need to be modified based on the data collection system used or time period assessed. For instance, alternatives include collecting the raw number of times a youth experienced property bullying or using Likert scales (e.g., rarely experienced property bullying, sometimes experienced property bullying, often experienced property bullying, always experienced property bullying).

Code	Description
00	Youth did not experience any property bullying during the specified period of time
01	Youth experienced property bullying once
02	Youth experienced property bullying 2 to 5 times
03	Youth experienced property bullying 6 to 10 times
04	The youth experienced property bullying more than 10 times
99	Unknown if property bullying occurred during the specified time period

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

1.12 FREQUENCY OF BEING ELECTRONICALLY BULLIED DURING A SPECIFIED TIME PERIOD

Definition/Description: Electronic bullying is bullying behaviors that use technology including but not limited to phones, email, chat rooms, instant messaging, and online posts. How technology is used to bully youths can change as new technologies or applications of existing technology are developed.

Uses: Track and monitor the percentage of youths being bullied with technology as well as how often they are electronically bullied. The data element may assist in developing, designing, and evaluating interventions.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: Bullying using technology or electronics is considered a context in which bullying occurs and is not considered conceptually distinct from bullying that occurs in-person. It is important, whenever possible, to maintain consistent rules when measuring in-person and electronic bullying (e.g., if watching a youth being bullied is not considered bullying than reading a derogatory message about bullying should also not be considered bullying) and note where electronic bullying is treated differently (e.g., some consider posting a harmful video on the Internet as bullying). Also, reviewing recent assessments of electronic bullying (Hamburger et al., 2011) can provide guidance on how to measure electronic bullying and capture how youths perpetrate and experience electronic bullying.

Because there is debate about how to assess key components of the bullying definition in the electronic context, key considerations when measuring electronic bullying are provided.

Aggression: Electronic bullying involves primarily verbal aggression (e.g., threatening or harassing electronic communications) and relational aggression (e.g., spreading rumors electronically). Electronic bullying, however, can also involve property damage resulting from electronic attacks that lead to the modification, dissemination, damage, or destruction of a youth's privately stored electronic information.

Repeated or high likelihood to be repeated: Direct aggressive electronic communication such as threatening text messages are similar to in-person verbal bullying in that single incidents can be distinguished from repeated aggressive communications. Also, similar definitions of repeated aggression can be used for relational aggression. For instance, if a youth spreading a false rumor told to him by a peer is considered repeated aggression, forwarding a false rumor to friends electronically also should be considered repeated aggression. The ability of electronic communications to occur rapidly, spread quickly to a larger number of people, and be anonymous may create instances that are more difficult to classify (e.g., the broad distribution of a private video or picture) (David-Ferdon & Hertz, 2009). In these instances, the stakeholders involved in the collection of data on bullying should explain their rationale for classifying the aggression as repeated or not.

Observed or perceived power imbalance: Similar to assessing bullying occurring in the physical world, assessing whether a power imbalance has occurred electronically is dependent on the subjective experience of the youth being targeted and her or his perceived ability to stop the aggressive behavior. Factors such as anonymity or technical ability to block messages may or may not contribute to a feeling of a power imbalance.

The prevalence of electronic bullying can be tracked using the percentage of youths reporting electronic bullying. Reports from observers such as teachers, peers, and parents may underestimate the prevalence of bullying because the observers may not have witnessed all incidents experienced by a youth.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Although numeric response categories are provided below, the reader should identify frequency categories that are appropriate for their population (e.g., identifying categories or scales that may be more easily understood for younger versus older youth). Also, the categories may need to be modified based on the data collection system used or time period assessed. For instance, alternatives include collecting the raw number of times a youth was electronically bullied or using Likert scales (e.g., rarely electronically bullied, sometimes electronically bullied, often electronically bullied, always electronically bullied).

Code	Description
00	Youth did not experience any electronic bullying during the specified period of time
01	Youth experienced electronic bullying once
02	Youth experienced electronic bullying 2 to 5 times
03	Youth experienced electronic bullying 6 to 10 times
04	The youth was electronically bullied more than 10 times
99	Unknown if electronic bullying occurred during the specified time period

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: For information on different types of electronic bullying: Hinduja & Patchin (2009)

DESCRIPTION OF YOUTHS WHO WERE BULLIED

1.13 SEX OF THE YOUTH WHO WAS BULLIED

Definition/Description: Biological sex of youth who was bullied during a specified time period.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying victimization varies by sex. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: The United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) requires, to the extent possible, the standardized collection of race, ethnicity, primary language, sex, and disability status in all national population health surveys that use self-reported information. Implementation guidance for these standards is available from DHHS (<http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>). Using national DHHS standards is important because it allows comparison of national and local information.

The type of bullying may vary by sex. For instance, a national study of middle and high school student found that males reported experiencing more physical bullying than females while females reported being subjects of rumors more often than males (Nansel et al., 2001).

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: The following response categories are DHHS standards.

Code	Description
M	Male
F	Female
O	Other (Specify)
U	Missing or Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Implementation Guidance on Data Collection Standards for Race, Ethnicity, Sex, Primary Language, and Disability Status; <http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>.

Other References: None

1.14 RACE OF THE YOUTH WHO WAS BULLIED

Definition/Description: This is the race of the youth who was bullied during a specified time period. Race is a concept used to differentiate population groups largely on the basis of physical characteristics transmitted by descent racial categories are neither precise nor mutually exclusive, and the concept of race lacks clear scientific definition.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying victimization varies across racial groups. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: The United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) requires, to the extent possible, the standardized collection of race, ethnicity, primary language, sex, and disability status in all national population health surveys that use self-reported information. Implementation guidance for these standards is available from DHHS (<http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>). When collecting information on race, personal self-identification is preferable to observer-identification. A recent review examined bullying across student's race and ethnicity and found varying results across studies. The authors noted that students whose racial or ethnic group was a numerical minority within a school were more likely to experience bullying (Scherr & Larson, 2010).

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: Yes, a person can have multiple racial backgrounds.

Field Values/Coding Instructions: The DHHS coding categories provide more extensive information than the minimum categories recommended by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). For comparison purposes, the DHHS categories can be aggregated into the five OMB categories. Specifically, the DHHS codes 1 through 3 correspond to the OMB categories of White, Black or African-American, and American Indian or Alaska Native, respectively. Combining codes 4 through 10 creates the OMB category of Asian and combining the codes 11 through 14 creates the OMB category of Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. Finally, the Department of Education has standard guidelines for collecting, aggregating and reporting information on race and ethnicity (see <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2007-10-19/html/E7-20613.htm>). Readers should use the categorization scheme most appropriate to their context and purpose.

Race			
Code	Description	Code	Description
01	White	09	Vietnamese
02	Black or African American	10	Other Asian
03	American Indian or Alaska Native	11	Native Hawaiian
04	Asian Indian	12	Guamanian or Chamorro
05	Chinese	13	Samoan
06	Filipino	14	Other Pacific Islander
07	Japanese	99	Unknown
08	Korean		

Data Standards or Guidelines: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Implementation Guidance on Data Collection Standards for Race, Ethnicity, Sex, Primary Language, and Disability Status; <http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>; Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education. ED 72 FR 59266 (October 19, 2007); <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2007-10-19/html/E7-20613.htm>).

Other References: American Society for Testing and Materials (1996); U.S. Office of Management and Budget (1978); U.S. Office of Management and Budget (1997).

1.15 ETHNICITY OF THE YOUTH WHO WAS BULLIED

Definition/Description: This is the ethnicity of a youth who experienced any bullying during the specified time period. Ethnicity is a demographic classification that takes into account the shared cultural characteristics and geographic origin of a population group. Language, patterns of social interaction, religion, and styles of dress are among a variety of cultural attributes that contribute to differentiation in ethnicity.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying victimization varies across ethnic groups. This may inform the design of prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: The United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) requires, to the extent possible, the standardized collection of race, ethnicity, primary language, sex, and disability status in all national population health surveys that use self-reported information. Implementation guidance for these standards is available from DHHS (<http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>). Personal self-identification of ethnicity is preferable to observer-identification. A recent review examined bullying across student's race and ethnicity and found varying results across studies. The authors noted that students whose racial or ethnic group was a numerical minority within a school were more likely to experience bullying (Scherr & Larson, 2010).

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: Yes, a person can have multiple ethnicities.

Field Values/Coding Instructions: The DHHS coding categories provide more extensive information than the minimum categories recommended by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The DHHS categories can be aggregated into the OMB categories. Code 1 in the DHHS is part of the current OMB standard and DHHS codes 2 through 5 can be added together to calculate the OMB category of Hispanic or Latino. Finally, the Department of Education has standard guidelines for collecting, aggregating and reporting information on race and ethnicity (see <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2007-10-19/html/E7-20613.htm>). Readers should use the categorization scheme most appropriate to their context and purpose.

Code	Description
01	Not of Hispanic, Latino/a, or Spanish origin
02	Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano/a
03	Puerto Rican
04	Cuban
05	Another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
09	Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: U. S. Department of Health and Human Services Implementation Guidance on Data Collection Standards for Race, Ethnicity, Sex, Primary Language, and Disability Status; <http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>; Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education. ED 72 FR 59266 (October 19, 2007); <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2007-10-19/html/E7-20613.htm>.

Other References: American Society for Testing and Materials (1996); U.S. Office of Management and Budget (1978); U.S. Office of Management and Budget (1997).

1.16 AGE OF THE YOUTH WHO WAS BULLIED

Definition/Description: This data element is the age in whole numbers of the youth who was bullied (e.g., 13 years old). Most often, the recorded age is the age of the youth when the data was collected. Some studies may choose the age of the youth when the first or last incident of bullying occurred.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying victimization varies across age groups and developmental stage. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: Bullying assessments should be worded in a manner appropriate to the age group being assessed. Although physical and relational aggression have successfully been measured among children as young as 3 years old using observation and interviews (Crick et al., 2006), the use of multiple methods has been recommended by some researchers to measure aggression among children younger than 8 years old (Monks, Smith, & Swettenham, 2003). Also, the developmental ability of children and youths to recall events over long periods of time should be considered when determining the time period over which to ask about bullying (e.g., one month versus one year). Finally, a national study suggests that a slightly higher percentage of middle school students experience bullying than high school students (Nansel et al., 2001).

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: The whole number age of the youth should be collected and if needed later collapsed into age groups. If actual age is unknown, the age should be estimated whenever possible using the categories provided below. The school grade of the youth may be used to estimate the age of the youth if no other information is available. If using school grade to estimate age, the estimate should take into account the guidelines of the school district or area in which the data are being collected. Also, the grade and age of a youth may not match due to a youth being retained in the same grade or a youth skipping a grade.

Preferred option is to collect the age of youth in years		If the age of the youth is not available, please try to use grade or other information to estimate the approximate age of the youth.	
Code	Description	Code	Description
Age in Years	Youth is 1 to 18 years old during the specified time period	01	8 years old or younger
99	Missing or Unknown	02	9 to 12 years old
		03	13 to 15 years old
		04	16 to 18 years old
		05	Older than 18 (Exclude from youth studies of bullying)
		99	Missing or Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: Health Level 7 (HL7) (1996).

Other References: None

1.17 CURRENT GRADE LEVEL OF THE YOUTH WHO WAS BULLIED

Definition/Description: Grade level of the youth who was bullied anytime during a specified time period.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying victimization varies across grade level. This may inform prevention and intervention programs, especially programs targeting specific grade levels within a school.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: Because the age of youths in a school grade varies and school interventions may be designed to target school grades instead of age groups, it is recommended that both the school grade and age of students be collected. Also, the prevalence of bullying varies by school grade, with middle school students reporting higher levels of bullying than high school students (Nansel et al., 2001). Grade level and youth's age will not always match because some students are retained in the same grade or skip grades during their school career. Also, the guidelines used by local education authorities to assign youth to grade levels based on age vary across jurisdictions. Some users may want to use the grade and age variable in combination to see if youths old or young for their grade are bullied at different rates than other youths.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: If a student changed grade levels during the school year, the most current grade level should be recorded.

Grade Level			
Code	Description	Code	Description
00	Kindergarten	08	Eighth Grade
01	First Grade	09	Ninth Grade
02	Second Grade	10	Tenth Grade
03	Third Grade	11	Eleventh Grade
04	Fourth Grade	12	Twelfth Grade
05	Fifth Grade	88	Youth is not in school
06	Sixth Grade	99	Missing or Unknown
07	Seventh Grade		

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

1.18 DISABILITY STATUS OF THE YOUTH WHO WAS BULLIED

Definition/Description: This assesses the disability status of the youth who was bullied.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying victimization varies across disability status. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: Youths with disabilities are bullied more than their peers (Carter & Spencer, 2006). Thus, it is critical to monitor the extent to which youths with disabilities may be more at-risk than their peers. The United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) requires, to the extent possible, the standardized collection of race, ethnicity, primary language, sex, and disability status in all national population health surveys that use self-reported information. Implementation guidance for these standards is available from DHHS (<http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>).

For youths 5 years and older, it is recommended to assess disability status by asking respondents about five areas: 1) serious difficulty hearing or deafness, 2) serious difficulty seeing or blindness, 3) difficulty concentrating, remembering, or making decisions because of a physical, mental or emotional condition, 4) difficulty walking or climbing stairs, and 5) difficulty dressing or bathing. This data element complements information collected on the special education status of youths (see data element 1.19) and is especially useful for collecting information on youths who are no longer enrolled in school or have not been evaluated for special education services. Users may choose to collect more detailed information on these disabilities (e.g., reasons why a youth may have difficulty climbing the stairs) depending on their context and purpose of their data collection.

Self-report assessments of bullying need to be cognitively appropriate and administered in a manner (e.g., extended time or assistance) appropriate for youths with disabilities. Also, multiple methods of collecting information on bullying may be needed to capture the full extent some students with disabilities, especially those with cognitive disabilities, experience bullying. Youths with some cognitive disabilities may under-report their experiences of bullying because they do not recognize the aggressive behaviors as inappropriate.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: Yes

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
00	Youth has no known disabilities
01	Youth is deaf or has serious difficulty hearing
02	Youth is blind or has serious difficulty seeing even with glasses
03	Youth has difficulty concentrating, remembering, or making decisions because of a physical, mental or emotional condition
04	Youth has difficulty walking or climbing stairs
05	Youth has difficulty dressing or bathing
06	Youth has another type of disability
99	It is unknown whether the youth has a disability

Data Standards or Guidelines: U. S. Department of Health and Human Services Implementation Guidance on Data Collection Standards for Race, Ethnicity, Sex, Primary Language, and Disability Status; <http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>.

Other References: None

1.19 SPECIAL EDUCATION CLASSIFICATION OF YOUTH WHO WAS BULLIED

Definition/Description: This data element assesses whether a youth who was bullied is receiving special education and related services pursuant to an individualized education program (IEP) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Also, the disability category for which the youth is receiving services is collected. Under the IDEA, local educational agencies provide special education and related services to youths with disabilities that adversely affect the youth's educational performance (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). IDEA disability categories include physical, sensory, developmental, intellectual, emotional, and other health conditions that the youth may have.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying victimization varies across a student's special education classification. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: Because research suggests that youths with disabilities are more likely to be bullied than other youths (Carter & Spencer, 2006), it is important to monitor the percentage of youths with disabilities that are bullied and understand if youths with certain types of disabilities are bullied more often than youths with no disabilities. This data element provides more detail on youths's disability than data element 1.18. A youth with a disability may not be receiving services under the IDEA because their disability does not interfere with their educational performance, the youth has not been evaluated for eligibility for services under the IDEA, or the youth is not enrolled in school.

Self-report assessments of bullying need to be cognitively appropriate and administered in a manner (e.g., extended time or assistance) appropriate for youths with disabilities. Also, multiple methods of collecting information on bullying may be needed to capture the full extent some students with disabilities, especially those with cognitive disabilities, experience bullying. Youths with some cognitive disabilities may under-report their experiences of bullying because they do not recognize the aggressive behaviors as inappropriate.

Fourteen categories are used in IDEA to describe youths with disabilities: autism, deaf-blindness, deafness, developmental delay, emotional disturbance, hearing impairment, intellectual disability, multiple disabilities, orthopedic impairment, other health impairment, specific learning disability, speech or language impairment, traumatic brain injury, and visual impairment including blindness. An in-depth description of each term can be found at: <http://nichcy.org/disability/categories#dontsee>. Users may choose to collect more detailed information on these disabilities (e.g., severity) depending on their context and purpose of their data collection.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No, the multiple disability category captures students with "concomitant [simultaneous] impairments (such as intellectual disability-blindness, intellectual disability-orthopedic impairment, etc.), the combination of which causes such severe educational needs that they cannot be accommodated in a special education program solely for one of the impairments. The term does not include deaf-blindness." See <http://nichcy.org/disability/categories#dontsee>.

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
01	Autism
02	Deaf-blindness
03	Deafness
04	Developmental delay
05	Emotional disturbance
06	Hearing impairment
07	Intellectual disability
08	Multiple disabilities
09	Orthopedic impairment
10	Other health impairment (e.g., ADHD)
11	Specific learning disability
12	Speech or language impairment
13	Traumatic brain injury
14	Visual impairment, including blindness
15	No documented pre-existing disabilities or health conditions
16	Not in school
88	Other (Specify)
99	Unknown if the youth has a disability

Data Standards or Guidelines: IDEA 2004.

Other References: Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/osep/index.html>; National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities, training curriculum on IDEA 2004, <http://nichcy.org/laws/idea/legacy>.

1.20 ENGLISH PROFICIENCY OF THE YOUTH WHO WAS BULLIED

Definition/Description: This data element measures the English proficiency of a youth who was bullied.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying victimization varies across English proficiency. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: The United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) requires, to the extent possible, the standardized collection of race, ethnicity, primary language, sex, and disability status in all national population health surveys that use self-reported information. Implementation guidance for these standards is available from DHHS (<http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>). The standard for primary language is English proficiency. DHHS recommends measuring English proficiency for youths 5 years of age or older.

Collecting information on English proficiency has multiple advantages. First, past work has found that health disparities are associated with English language proficiency rather than specific language spoken. For instance, a national study of 6th- to 10th-graders found that students who speak another language at home are more likely to report being bullied than non-Hispanic white youths who speak English at home (Yu, Huang, Schwalberg, Overpeck, & Kogan, 2003). If information is being gathered for clinical purposes, both specific language and proficiency, however, need to be collected (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Minority Health, 2011). Second, information on these dimensions can be compared to Census data which has been collected on both English proficiency and language spoken other than English since 1980.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
00	Respondent speaks English VERY WELL
01	Respondent speaks English WELL
02	Respondent speaks English NOT WELL
03	Respondent DOES NOT speak English AT ALL
99	Missing or Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: U. S. Department of Health and Human Services Implementation Guidance on Data Collection Standards for Race, Ethnicity, Sex, Primary Language, and Disability Status; <http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>

Other References: None

1.21 RELIGION OF THE YOUTH WHO WAS BULLIED

Definition/Description: This data element records the religion of a youth who was bullied during the specified time period.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying victimization varies across religious background. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: There is concern that youths from certain religious backgrounds are bullied more often (Austin, Nakamoto, & Bailey, 2010; Britto, 2011).

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: Yes

Field Values/Coding Instructions: The following response categories are United States Census Bureau standards. The religious categories, especially the Christian category, can be further broken down into more specific religious identifications such as Catholic, Baptist, or Protestant that may be more reflective of the religions of youths. More detailed religious categories, however, should be constructed in a way that they can be aggregated into the eight categories listed below.

Code	Description
01	Christian
02	Jewish
03	Buddhist
04	Muslim
05	Unitarian/Universalist
06	Hindu
07	Unaffiliated
08	Other (Specify)
99	Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: United States Census Bureau. (September 27, 2011). The 2012 Statistical Abstract: The National Data Book. <http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/cats/population/religion.html>.

1.22 SEXUAL ORIENTATION OF THE YOUTH WHO WAS BULLIED

Definition/Description: Sexual orientation of a youth who was bullied. Sexual orientation is a multi-component construct that is commonly measured in three ways: attraction (e.g., the sex of a person one is sexually attracted to), behavior (e.g., ask respondents to report on the sex of people with whom they had willing sexual experiences), and self-identification (e.g., how would you describe your sexual orientation) (Badgett & Goldberg, 2009; Saewyc et al., 2004).

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying victimization varies across sexual orientation. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: The United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) is developing a national data plan to integrate sexual orientation into DHHS national surveys (http://minorityhealth.hhs.gov/assets/pdf/checked/1/Fact_Sheet_LGBT.pdf). Once this data collection information is available, including age group to whom the questions should be asked, the DHHS measure of sexual orientation should be used in place of the ones presented in this document.

Tracking bullying by sexual orientation is important because youths who are lesbian, gay, or bisexual report higher levels of physical, verbal, and relational aggression and bullying (Rivers, 2001).

If there is limited space in the surveillance system, one evaluation of survey questions measuring sexual orientation among adolescents indicates that the highest priority health concerns are best detected by measuring sexual behavior and attraction (Saewyc et al., 2004). Another report evaluating assessments of sexual orientation among adolescents lists four key considerations when assessing sexual orientation: 1) using measures of attraction is generally the best approach for this age group (except for studies focusing on sexual health), 2) ensuring privacy and anonymity is critical due to prevalence of sexual orientation-based harassment among this age group, 3) considering where to place questions on self-report surveys is important to ensure privacy and lower non-response rates, and 4) all measures will be limited by the fact that a significant portion of adolescents may not have had sexual experience, formed a sexual identity, or sexual attractions when surveyed (Badgett & Goldberg, 2009; Saewyc et al., 2004). Finally, the developmental level of youths should be considered when using these questions because these questions may be inappropriate for children or elementary students.

Transgender is a conceptually distinct concept from sexual orientation and is included as a separate data element (see 1.23).

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: Yes, multiple responses can be provided when measuring sexual orientation. A single response should be collected when assessing attraction and sexual behavior.

Field Values/Coding Instructions: The response categories were designed using recommendations by Badgett & Goldberg (2009) and Saewyc et al. (2004). When assessing sexual orientation using attraction or behavior measures, research suggests, when feasible, that the first response categories for male respondents on a self-report survey should be “female” and that the first response category for female respondents on a self-report survey should be “male” (see Badgett & Goldberg (2009) for more in-depth discussion).

Response Categories for Attraction Measure of Sexual Orientation		Response Categories for Self-Identification Measure of Sexual Orientation*		Response Categories for Behavioral Measures of Sexual Orientation	
Code	Description	Code	Description	Code	Description
01	Attracted to males	01	Lesbian or gay	01	Willing sexual experiences with females
02	Attracted to females	02	Straight, that is, not gay	02	Willing sexual experiences with males
03	Both men and women	03	Bisexual	03	Willing sexual experiences with both females and males
04	Not sure	04	Something else	04	I have not had any sexual experiences
		05	Not sure yet	05	Other (Specify)
		06	Not sure what the question means		
99	Missing or Unknown	99	Missing or Unknown	99	Missing or Unknown

*One strategy for gathering information about sexual orientation based on a respondent's self-identification is asking, "Do you think of yourself as: lesbian or gay; straight, that is not gay; bisexual, or something else". If a respondent says something else, you can ask them to describe or explain further.

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: Badgett & Goldberg (2009); Saewyc et al., (2004)

1.23 TRANSGENDER STATUS OF THE YOUTH WHO WAS BULLIED

Definition/Description: Describes youths “who experience incongruence between birth sex and gender identity” (Badgett, & Goldberg, 2009, p. iv).

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying victimization varies by transgender status. This may inform prevention and intervention programs

Type of Data Element: Core

Discussion: The United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) is developing a national data plan to integrate measures of gender identity and transgender status into DHHS national surveys (http://minorityhealth.hhs.gov/assets/pdf/checked/1/Fact_Sheet_LGBT.pdf). Once this data collection information is available, including the age group to whom the questions should be asked, the DHHS measure of transgender status should be used in place of the element presented in this document. Currently, a variety of approaches exist to measure whether a person is transgender through self-reports (see Badgett & Goldberg, 2009 for a discussion of factors to consider when measuring transgender status).

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: The category of transgender can be divided into more specific categories such as female-to-male transgender or male-to-female transgender. If more detailed categories are used, these categories should be able to be collapsed into the three listed categories.

Code	Description
01	Not transgender
02	Transgender
99	Missing / Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: Badgett, L., & Goldberg, N. (2009). *Best Practices for Asking Questions about Sexual Orientation on Surveys*. Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute.

4.4 Expanded Data Elements

If resources allow, collection of the expanded data elements—which includes the core data elements—will yield additional information about the context and perpetration of bullying. The order the data elements are listed within this section are not intended to suggest a hierarchy of importance. Users should prioritize inclusion based on their needs and context. For instance, a data collection system established in a school that is implementing an intervention that encourages peers and adults to intervene when they witness an incident of bullying may want to collect expanded data elements related to witnesses' responses to bullying. The expanded data elements are listed below and are grouped into eight categories.

COMMUNITY OR SCHOOL CLIMATE: Adults and youths who witness bullying play an important role in reinforcing or disrupting bullying. Also, social norms around bullying influence its prevalence. These data elements assess witnesses' responses to bullying and social norms around bullying.

- 2.01 Fear of being bullied over the next month
- 2.02 How often a youth witnessed bullying during a specified time period
- 2.03 Number of youths who witnessed the most recent incident of bullying
- 2.04 Response of youths who witnessed the most recent incident of bullying
- 2.05 Youth fears helping peers who are bullied
- 2.06 Number of adults present during the most recent incident of bullying
- 2.07 Response of adult(s) who witnessed the most recent incident of bullying
- 2.08 Youth trust adults to stop bullying incidents

WHOM THE YOUTH TOLD ABOUT BULLYING: This captures whether youths tell anybody about being bullied and who they tell.

- 2.09 Who the youth told about bullying

DESCRIPTION OF BULLYING INCIDENT: These data elements describe the context around bullying incidents such as where and when they occur. This information can improve targeting of prevention and intervention programs.

- 2.10 Perceived reason for the most recent incident of bullying
- 2.11 Location of the most recent incident of bullying
- 2.12 Time most recent incident of bullying occurred
- 2.13 One or more aggressors perpetrated the most recent incident of bullying
- 2.14 Previous bullying by the youth(s) perpetrating the most recent incident of bullying
- 2.15 Length of time the youth was bullied
- 2.16 Relationship between the youth who was bullied and the aggressor(s) in the most recent incident of bullying

HARM RELATED TO BEING BULLIED: These data elements measure the harm experienced by youths who are bullied and help estimate and describe the educational and health problems associated with bullying.

- 2.17 Physical injury experienced as a result of being bullied
- 2.18 Psychological harm experienced as a result of being bullied
- 2.19 Educational harm experienced as a result of being bullied
- 2.20 Social harm experienced as a result of being bullied

ADDITIONAL DESCRIPTION OF THE YOUTH WHO WAS BULLIED: These data elements provide additional descriptive information on youths who were bullied.

- 2.21 Youth who was bullied received a free or reduced priced lunch
- 2.22 Highest level of education of youth's parent(s) or guardian(s)

BULLYING PERPETRATED BY YOUTH(S): This assesses the number and percentage of youths involved in perpetrating bullying. This will differ from the number and percentage of youths experiencing bullying because multiple youths can bully a single youth or a single youth can bully multiple youths. Because bullying can involve a range of aggressive behaviors, it is important when feasible to measure the types of bullying perpetrated.

- 2.23 How often a youth bullied other youths during a specified time period
- 2.24 How often a youth physically bullied other youths during a specified time period
- 2.25 How often a youth verbally bullied other youths during a specified time period
- 2.26 How often a youth engaged in relational bullying (an effort to undermine the relationships or reputation of other youths) during a specified time period
- 2.27 How often a youth bullied by damaging another youth's property
- 2.28 How often a youth electronically bullied during a specified time period

DESCRIPTION OF YOUTH(S) PERPETRATING BULLYING: This information helps describe the problem and determine whether the prevalence of bullying perpetration varies across demographic groups. Although this information can be used to assess the frequency of bullying among and across groups, it cannot be used to determine whether youths have been targeted based on their demographic characteristics (e.g., bullied because of their sex).

- 2.29 Sex of the youth who perpetrated bullying
- 2.30 Race of the youth who perpetrated bullying
- 2.31 Ethnicity of the youth who perpetrated bullying
- 2.32 Age of the youth who perpetrated bullying
- 2.33 Current grade level of the youth who perpetrating bullying
- 2.34 Disability status of the youth who perpetrated bullying

- 2.35 Special Education Classification of the youth who perpetrated bullying
- 2.36 English proficiency of the youth who perpetrated bullying
- 2.37 Religion of the youth who perpetrated bullying
- 2.38 Sexual orientation of the youth who perpetrated bullying
- 2.39 Transgender status of the youth who perpetrated bullying
- 2.40 Youth who perpetrated bullying received a free or reduced priced lunch
- 2.41 Highest level of education of youth's parent(s) or guardian(s) who perpetrated bullying

OTHER INFORMATION: These data elements provide information on current bullying interventions as well as harassment. Harassment is included due to overlap with bullying.

- 2.42 Bullying prevention programs and policies
- 2.43 Youth was harassed during a specified time period

COMMUNITY OR SCHOOL CLIMATE

2.01 FEAR OF BEING BULLIED OVER THE NEXT MONTH

Definition/Description: This data element measures the extent to which the youth fears being bullied over the next month regardless of whether they reported being bullied.

Uses: Estimate the number and percentage of youths that currently fear being bullied. Aggregating this information to the school or community level can provide an estimate of the extent to which youths in a school or community climate fear being bullied.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: This data element captures whether youths fear they will be bullied regardless of their current or past experiences of bullying. A youth's fear of being bullied as well as general fear of bullying may limit the youth's social or educational opportunities even if they have not been directly bullied. Measuring the youth's fear of bullying over the period of the next month may be more useful than other time periods because the youth may have difficulty assessing their fears over longer periods of time while reports over a day or week may fluctuate and change. Also, adoption of a single time period facilitates comparison across different monitoring and surveillance systems.

If this data element is aggregated to assess school or community climate, assessments of both youths who have and have not been bullied should be included. Measuring the school or community climate is important because a positive school climate is associated with lower levels of bullying (Bandyopadhyay, Cornell, & Konold, 2009; Guerra, Williams, & Sadek, 2011).

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
01	Youth was NOT afraid of being bullied in the next month
02	Youth was SOMEWHAT afraid of being bullied in the next month
03	Youth was AFRAID of being bullied in the next month
04	Youth was VERY AFRAID of being bullied in the next month
99	Missing or Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

2.02 HOW OFTEN A YOUTH WITNESSED BULLYING DURING A SPECIFIED TIME PERIOD

Definition/Description: This assesses how often a youth witnessed bullying during a specified time period.

Uses: Track the percentage of youths who witness bullying and how often they witness bullying. This in turn better assesses the full impact of bullying on youths, identifies possible opportunities for interventions by witnesses of bullying, and estimates how public bullying behaviors are in a specific group of youths.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: Tracking the percentage of youths who witness bullying is important because research suggests that witnessing bullying has negative effects on youths (Nishina & Juvonen, 2005; Rivers, Poterat, Noret, & Ashurst, 2009). Also, tracking the percentage of youths who regularly witness bullying helps assess the scope of the bullying problem. If a youth reports being bullied, the incident or incidents should not be counted as witnessing bullying. Reports from observers such as teachers, peers, and parents may underestimate how often youths witness bullying because the observers may not be aware or seen all incidents experienced by youths.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: If the specified time period is short, such as week or month, it is better to capture the number of times that the youth witnessed bullying. For longer time periods, categorized responses are suggested. The reader may want to use a numeric or Likert-type scale. The numeric or Likert-type scale selected should be appropriate for the developmental ability of the respondents (e.g., simpler scales for younger versus older youths should be used) as well as the context and methodology of the data collection system. Two examples of possible response categories are provided.

Number of Times the Youth Witnessed Bullying (Suggested for Short Time Periods)		Likert-type Scale Categories (Suggested for Longer Time Periods)	
Code	Description	Code	Description
00	The youth did not witness any incidents of bullying	00	Never, the youth did not witness any incidents of bullying
01	The youth witnessed one bullying incident	01	The youth rarely witnessed bullying
02	The youth witnessed bullying 2 to 5 times	02	The youth sometimes witnessed bullying
03	The youth witnessed bullying 6 to 10 times	03	The youth often witnessed bullying
04	The youth witnessed bullying more than 10 times	04	The youth almost always witnessed bullying
99	Unknown if the youth witnessed bullying during the specified time period	99	Unknown if the youth witnessed bullying during the specified time period

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

2.03 NUMBER OF YOUTHS WHO WITNESSED THE MOST RECENT INCIDENT OF BULLYING

Definition/Description: This element describes the number of youths who witnessed the most recent incident of bullying.

Uses: This information can be used to estimate the percentage of bullying incidents that are witnessed by other youths. This in turn can inform prevention and intervention efforts.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: Because peer witnesses of bullying may be able to disrupt or provide support for bullying, (Twemlow, Fonagy, & Sacco, 2010) understanding how many incidents of bullying are witnessed is important. Also, this information can inform prevention and intervention efforts targeting peer groups as well as aggressors and youths who are bullied (Salmivalli, 2010).

The most recent incident of bullying is asked about in order to provide the most recent information on bullying and improve the recall of respondents by focusing on a single recent event. If data on bullying are collected over shorter periods of time (e.g., over the last week or over the last month), then it may be useful to gather this information on all incidents occurring in the timeframe. Collecting information on all or multiple bullying incidents occurring over long periods of time requires additional resources and may not be appropriate or feasible for certain data collection systems. If the information on bullying was collected from observers, peers, or through administrative records, the data element should focus on the most recent bullying incident observed or recorded.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Because a large number of youths may witness a specific event, the user may want to use categories such as the one displayed below instead of asking respondents for exact numbers of witnesses. The frequency categories selected should be appropriate for the population (e.g., easier scales for younger versus older youths). Also, the categories may need to be modified based on the data collection system used or time period assessed.

Code	Description
00	No youth witnessed the most recent bullying incident
01	1 youth witnessed the most recent bullying incident
02	2 to 5 youths witnessed the most recent bullying incident
03	6 to 10 youths witnessed the most recent bullying incident
04	More than 10 youths witnessed the most recent bullying incident
99	Unknown how many youths witnessed the most recent bullying incident

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

2.04 RESPONSE OF YOUTHS WHO WITNESSED THE MOST RECENT INCIDENT OF BULLYING

Definition/Description: For the most recent incident of bullying, this data element collects information on the immediate response of the youths who witnessed the incident.

Uses: Peers witnessing bullying can encourage or discourage bullying through their responses (Twemlow et al., 2010). This variable helps track current peer norms towards bullying which in turn can inform prevention and intervention efforts.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: This data element captures the immediate response of youth witnesses to bullying. After the bullying incident is over, youths may respond by supporting the youth who was bullied, encouraging the youth perpetrating bullying, or ignore the event. This information should be measured and tracked separately.

The most recent incident of bullying is asked about in order to provide the most recent information on bullying and improve the recall of respondents by focusing on a single recent event. If data on bullying are collected over short periods of time (e.g., over the last week or over the last month), then it may be useful to gather this information on all incidents occurring in the timeframe. Collecting information on all or multiple bullying incidents occurring over long periods of time requires additional resources and may not be appropriate or feasible for certain data collection systems. If the information on bullying was collected from observers, peers, or through administrative records, the data element should focus on the most recent bullying incident observed or recorded. Finally, youths' responses to bullying can be aggregated to the community, school, or classroom level to gain insight into peer norms about bullying.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: Yes, the same witness may have multiple responses or the responses of different witnesses to the same bullying incident may vary. Much more detailed categories can be used than the ones proposed, but those categories should be designed to be aggregated into the current categories when possible.

Field Values/Coding Instructions: These response categories are modifications of categories developed by Salmivalli & Voeten (2004).

Code	Description
00	No youth witnessed the most recent incident of bullying
01	Directly intervened to try and stop the bullying or support the youth who was bullied
02	Got an adult to intervene to stop the bullying
03	Encouraged the youth who was doing the bullying through such behaviors as laughing or cheering on their bullying.
04	Watched the bullying incident, but did not intervene to support the youth who was bullied or the youth engaged in bullying
05	Ignored the bullying (e.g., saw the incident happening and kept on walking)
06	Other response (Specify)
99	Response of youth witnesses is unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: Salmivalli & Voeten (2004)

2.05 YOUTH FEARS HELPING PEERS WHO ARE BULLIED

Definition/Description: This assesses whether a youth who witnessed bullying is afraid to help the youth(s) who were bullied.

Uses: Estimate the extent to which youths fear retaliation for assisting peers who are bullied. High levels of fear may be a barrier for youths helping peers who are bullied and inform the design of prevention and intervention efforts.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: This provides information on whether witnesses feel safe intervening in bullying incidents. If high levels of fear among youths are found, additional information on why youths are afraid may need to be collected.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
00	Did not witness bullying
01	Was never afraid of helping a peer who was being bullied
02	Sometimes was afraid of helping a peer who was being bullied
03	Often was afraid of helping a peer who was being bullied
04	Almost always was afraid of helping a peer who was being bullied
99	Missing or Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

2.06 NUMBER OF ADULTS PRESENT DURING THE MOST RECENT INCIDENT OF BULLYING

Definition/Description: This assesses whether an adult was present when the most recent incident of bullying occurred.

Uses: This data element documents the extent to which bullying is occurring in the presence of adults who could potentially intervene.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: Tracking the percentage of incidents that occur in the presence of adults is important because adults can disrupt bullying behavior. Also, a substantial percentage of educators witness bullying. A national survey of educators in the U.S. found that 62% witnessed bullying two or more times in the last month and 41% indicated they had witnessed bullying once a week or more (Bradshaw, Waasdrop, O'Brennan, & Gulemetova, 2011). Different interventions may be indicated if few or most incidents of bullying are witnessed by an adult in a school or a community. One might also want to collect descriptive information on the adult witnessing the bullying, such as what percentage were parents, teachers, or other adults.

The most recent incident of bullying is asked about in order to provide recent information on bullying and improve the recall of respondents by focusing on a single recent event. If data on bullying are collected over short periods of time (e.g., over the last week or over the last month), then it may be useful to gather this information on all incidents occurring in the timeframe. Collecting information on all or multiple bullying incidents occurring over long periods of time requires additional resources and may not be appropriate or feasible for certain data collection systems. If the information on bullying was collected from observers, peers, or through administrative records, the data element should focus on the most recent bullying incident observed or recorded.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Because a large number of adults may witness a specific event, the user may want to use categories instead of asking respondents for an exact number of adult witnesses. Example categories are provided.

Code	Description
00	No adult witnessed the most recent bullying incident
01	One adult witnessed the most recent bullying incident
02	2 to 5 adults witnessed the most recent bullying incident
03	6 to 10 adults witnessed the most recent bullying incident
04	More than 10 adults witnessed the most recent bullying incident
99	Unknown how many adult(s) witnessed the most recent bullying incident

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

2.07 RESPONSE OF ADULT(S) WHO WITNESSED THE MOST RECENT INCIDENT OF BULLYING

Definition/ Description: For adults who witness the most recent incident of bullying, this describes their response to the incident.

Uses: Adults can disrupt or reinforce bullying through their responses to bullying. Thus, tracking adults' responses to bullying incidents is an important measure of the context or climate in which bullying occurs.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: This data element tracks adults' responses to bullying incidents and provides insight into the extent to which adults disrupt, ignore, or support bullying as it occurs. In order to prevent bullying, prevention and intervention efforts will need to address the climate in which bullying occurs and relationships between adults and youths. This data element captures the immediate responses of adults who witness the bullying incident as it is occurring. After the bullying incident is over, adults may respond by supporting the youth who was bullied, disciplining the youth who perpetrated the bullying, or ignoring the event. This information should be measured and tracked separately.

The most recent incident of bullying is asked about in order to provide the most recent information on bullying and improve the recall of respondents by focusing on a single recent event. If data on bullying are collected over short periods of time (e.g., over the last week or over the last month), then it may be useful to gather this information on all incidents occurring in the timeframe. Collecting information on all or multiple bullying incidents occurring over long periods of time requires additional resources and may not be appropriate or feasible for certain data collection systems. If the information on bullying was collected from observers, peers, or through administrative records, the data element should focus on the most recent bullying incident observed or recorded.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: Yes, an adult may have multiple responses to the same incident or the responses of different adults to the same incident may vary.

Field Values/Coding Instructions: These response categories are modifications of categories developed by Salmivalli & Voeten (2004).

Code	Description
00	No adult witnessed the most recent incident of bullying
01	Directly intervened to try and stop the bullying or support the youth who was bullied
02	Encouraged the youth who was doing the bullying through such behaviors as laughing or cheering on their bullying
03	Watched the bullying incident, but did not intervene to support the youth who was bullied or the youth engaged in bullying
04	Ignored the bullying (e.g., saw the incident happening and kept on walking)
05	Other response (Specify)
99	Responses of adult witnesses are unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: Salmivalli & Voeten (2004)

2.08 YOUTH TRUST ADULTS TO STOP BULLYING INCIDENTS

Definition/Description: This measures the extent to which youths trust adults to intervene and stop incidents of bullying.

Uses: Measure the extent that youths believe adults are intolerant of bullying and will work to stop it. This in turn can inform intervention and prevention efforts, especially interventions designed to increase adults' response to bullying among youth.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: Tracking youths' perceptions of how likely they think adults are to intervene to stop bullying is important because this may influence social norms around bullying and its prevalence. This may or may not be highly related to the extent adults actually intervene to stop bullying. For instance, the tendency for adults to intervene may lead bullying to occur in limited places where adults do not witness or intervene in bullying. Depending on context, it may be useful to ask about the extent to which youth trust specific groups of adults, such as teachers or parents, to stop bullying.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
00	Adults will rarely intervene to stop bullying
01	Adults will sometimes intervene to stop bullying
02	Adults will often intervene to stop bullying
03	Adults almost always intervene to stop bullying
99	Missing or Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

WHO THE YOUTH TOLD ABOUT BULLYING

2.09 WHO THE YOUTH TOLD ABOUT BEING BULLIED

Definition/Description: This data element captures whether a youth who was bullied told anybody about being bullied and who they told.

Uses: Knowing how many youths seek support for being bullied can provide insight into the need to encourage and provide support to youths to seek assistance about bullying. Also, examining whom youths tell about being bullied can inform efforts to provide guidance to people who are told about bullying on how to respond effectively.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: Youths may feel comfortable approaching different youths or adults about being bullied. This may also vary by the age of the youth and the context of the bullying.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: Yes, a youth can tell multiple people.

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Person Youth Told about Being Bullied			
Code	Description	Code	Description
	Peers		Family
00	Told no one	04	Parent
01	Friend or classmate	05	Sibling/step-sibling
02	Boyfriend/girlfriend (Note: Use only if age appropriate)	06	Aunt/uncle
03	Other youths (Specify)	07	Other family member (e.g., cousin, grandparent)
	Adults at School		Other Adults
08	A teacher/teacher's aid	15	Adult who leads a club, activity, or youth group
09	A school principal	16	Counselor
10	A counselor/guidance officer	17	A religious leader
11	School security /resource officer	18	Security/law enforcement
12	Adult involved in a school club or extracurricular activity (theatre director, club leader, or coach)	19	Other adult (Specify)
13	A bus driver		
14	Other school employee (Specify)		
88	Unknown if youth told anyone		
99	Unknown who youth told		

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

DESCRIPTION OF BULLYING INCIDENT

2.10 PERCEIVED REASON FOR THE MOST RECENT INCIDENT OF BULLYING

Definition/Description: The perceived reason for bullying behaviors can include, but is not limited to, physical characteristics of the target (e.g., weight, coordination, physical strength, dress, or grooming), intelligence or cognitive abilities (e.g., academic performance or perceived intelligence), personality characteristics (e.g., youth perceived as “shy” or “different”), demographic characteristics (e.g., sex, race, or socio-economic status), perceived or real sexual experience, and social characteristics (e.g., youth does not act according to social or cultural expectations for boys or girls, or youth breaks other behavioral, cultural, or social norms).

Uses: Help delineate biases driving bullying and assess whether bullying is targeting students based on demographic (e.g., sex, race, or ethnicity) or social characteristics. This in turn may assist in the design and implementation of bullying prevention programs.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: Understanding the perceived reasons for bullying may help identify biases or negative perceptions that support bullying in youth. This in turn may help inform the approaches and types of bullying prevention programs used. Broad categories are provided. Users will need to develop specific categories that are most appropriate to their context and prevention or intervention efforts.

The data element collects information on the most recent incident of bullying instead of all bullying incidents in order to improve recall of the details of the incident and provide timely descriptions of the context of bullying. If data on bullying are collected over short periods of time (e.g., the last week or the last month), then it may be useful to gather this information on all incidents occurring in the timeframe. Collecting information on all or multiple bullying incidents occurring over longer periods of time requires additional resources and may not be appropriate or feasible for certain data collection systems.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: Yes, the respondent can report that the most recent incident of bullying involved different types of content.

Field Values/Coding Instructions: A list of broad categories is provided because the specific reasons are likely to vary across different age groups and contexts. Discussions with youths are critical in identifying the different content and reasons for bullying and how to ask about these issues. This is, especially important because knowledge of the content and reasons for bullying are evolving (See Swearer & Cary, 2003 for an example of a comprehensive list of reasons).

Code	Description
00	Not bullied during the specified time period
01	Physical appearance or characteristics of the targeted student (e.g., weight, coordination, physical strength, or other aspects of physical appearance)
02	Intelligence or cognitive abilities (e.g., good or poor school performance)
03	Personality characteristics (e.g., youth perceived as “shy”, “mean”, or “different”)
04	Demographic characteristics of the youth (e.g., religion, socio-economic status, sex, race, ethnicity or first language)
05	Sexual activity (e.g., youth perceived as sexually promiscuous)
06	Social characteristics (e.g., conformity to perceived gender norms)
07	Other
08	Do not know reason / Unclear reason
99	Missing

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: Swearer & Cary (2003); Swearer, Turner, Givens, & Pollack (2008)

2.11 LOCATION OF THE MOST RECENT INCIDENT OF BULLYING

Definition/Description: This data element captures where a youth was bullied during their most recent incident of bullying.

Uses: Identify and target prevention efforts on high risk locations. Also, this information can be used to better understand factors that make some areas feel safe.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: The data element collects information on the most recent incident of bullying instead of all bullying incidents in order to improve recall of the details of the incident and provide timely descriptions. If data on bullying are collected over short periods of time (e.g., over the last week or over the last month), then it may be useful to gather this information on all incidents occurring in the timeframe. Collecting information on all or multiple bullying incidents occurring over long periods of time requires additional resources and may not be appropriate or feasible for certain data collection systems.

Some bullying interventions ask youths to mark on maps where bullying incidents occur. This type of information may be especially useful for data collection systems established in a single school or a small community.

Data Type: Text or map of geographic locations

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Different response categories are suggested for data collected only about bullying in schools versus bullying occurring in communities and schools. If data are collected only in schools, coding specific school locations such as hallways or classrooms may be helpful to target specific school locations. In contrast, broader categories may be more appropriate if bullying in the school and community are being examined. The response categories include different types of electronic communication because bullying that occurs while using electronic devices is conceptualized as occurring in cyberspace and not the physical location at which the youth receives or is engaging in the communication. If there is interest in capturing more specific locations than those represented below, we suggest that they be designed as subcategories of the listed response categories. This will facilitate comparisons by allowing these subcategories to be aggregated into the categories listed below.

Response Categories for Data Collected Only in Schools		Response Categories for Data Collected in Communities and Schools	
Code	Description	Code	Description
01	Cafeteria	01	Youth's residence
02	Classroom at school	02	Home of a friend or youth
03	Hallway or stairway at school	03	Inside school (e.g., classroom, hallway, or gym)
04	Bathroom or locker room at school	04	On school grounds (e.g., in front of school)
05	School playground	05	Travelling to or from school
06	Auditorium	06	At school bus stop
07	Gym	07	Religious institution
08	Sports field/stadium	08	Sports facility (e.g., gym, playing field, pool, ice rink)
09	On school bus	09	Public park
10	At school bus stop	10	Street/highway
11	Parking lot	11	Cyberspace: While using a phone (e.g., receive threatening texts or phone call)
12	Cyberspace: While using a phone at school (e.g., receive threatening texts or phone call)	12	Cyberspace: While communicating with other youths using a computer
13	Cyberspace: While communicating with other youths using a computer at school	88	Other location (Specify:)
14	Somewhere else inside school building	99	Unspecified location / Unknown
15	Somewhere else outside of school except sports field or parking lot		
88	Other location (Specify:)		
99	Unspecified location / Unknown		

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: DeVoe & Bauer (2011); Robers et al., (2013); Hamburger et al. (2011)

2.12 TIME MOST RECENT INDICENT OF BULLYING OCCURRED

Definition/Description: This captures when during the day the most recent incident of bullying occurred.

Uses: Information on when youths are bullied can be used to identify times that youths are most at-risk of being bullied. This in turn can inform prevention and intervention efforts.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: The data element collects information on the most recent incident of bullying instead of all bullying incidents in order to improve accuracy of recall and provide timely descriptions. If data on bullying are collected over short periods of time (e.g., over the last week or over the last month), then it may be useful to gather this information on all incidents occurring in the timeframe. Collecting information on all or multiple bullying incidents occurring over long periods of time requires additional resources and may not be appropriate or feasible for certain data collection systems.

If data are being collected in schools, class periods can also be recorded and used to determine what time of day the bullying incident occurred (e.g. 1st period). Using this strategy, however, makes comparing data across surveillance systems or even within surveillance systems difficult because the number and timing of class periods varies across schools and grades. Consequently, time information should be collected whenever possible. Also, it may be difficult for youths to recall the exact periods in which bullying occurred.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No.

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Separate categories are suggested for data gathered only in schools and data gathered in the community. Also, if appropriate and useful, more specific categories and times can be added. When possible, additional categories should be designed in a manner that allows them to be combined into the suggested categories.

Response Categories for Data Collected Only in Schools		Response Categories for Data Collected in Communities and Schools	
Code	Description	Code	Description
01	Coming to school	01	Midnight to early morning (00:00 AM to 5:59 AM)
02	Before school	02	Morning (6:00 AM to 10:59 AM)
03	During classes in the morning	03	Lunch time (11:00 AM to 12:59 PM)
04	Moving between classes in the morning (Use only if appropriate)	04	Afternoon (1:00 PM to 3:59 PM)
05	Morning recess (Use only if appropriate)	05	Early Evening (4:00 PM to 6:59 PM)
06	Lunchtime	06	Evening/Night (7:00 PM to 11:59 PM)
07	Afternoon classes	99	Timing of bullying is unknown
08	After school		
09	Moving between classes in the afternoon (Use only if appropriate)		
10	Afternoon recess (Use only if appropriate)		
11	Going home from school		
99	Timing of bullying unknown		

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

2.13 ONE OR MORE AGGRESSORS PERPETRATED THE MOST RECENT INCIDENT OF BULLYING

Definition/Description: This assesses whether the most recent incident of bullying involves one aggressor or two or more aggressors.

Uses: Estimate the percentage of bullying incidents involving more than one aggressor.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: Bullying incidents involving more than one aggressor may differ in nature from those involving only one aggressor. Consequently, this information may assist educators, health officials, and parents target prevention efforts and understand the nature of bullying in their school(s). The data element collects information on the most recent incident of bullying instead of all bullying incidents in order to improve recall of the incident and provide timely descriptions. If data on bullying are collected over short periods of time (e.g., over the last week or over the last month), then it may be useful to gather this information on all incidents occurring in the timeframe. Collecting information on all or multiple bullying incidents occurring over long periods of time requires additional resources and may not be appropriate or feasible for certain data collection systems.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No.

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Please collect the number of aggressors involved up to 10 aggressors. Incidents involving 11 or more aggressors should be grouped together and examined to ensure data quality. Information on the number of perpetrators can later be categorized (e.g., incidents involving 5 to 10 aggressors) for analysis. If the number of aggressors is unknown, please record as “99”.

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: Basile & Saltzman (2002)

2.14 PREVIOUS BULLYING BY THE YOUTH(S) PERPETRATING THE MOST RECENT INCIDENT OF BULLYING

Definition/Description: This measures the number of times the perpetrator(s) of the most recent incident of bullying have bullied the same youth previously.

Uses: Assists in determining the percentage of bullying that is related to repeated aggression by the same perpetrator(s) compared to aggression by a wide number of perpetrators.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: In some instances, a few youths may repeatedly bully the same youth and in other instances a youth may be bullied by different youths over time. This data element provides more detailed information than assessments of the number of times a youth was bullied. Better understanding of how bullying occurs will inform prevention and intervention efforts. If data on bullying are collected over short periods of time (e.g., over the last week or over the last month), then it may be useful to gather this information on all incidents occurring in the timeframe. Collecting information on all or multiple bullying incidents occurring over long periods of time requires additional resources and may not be appropriate or feasible for certain data collection systems.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
00	Besides the most recent incident, the perpetrators(s) did not bully the youth during the specified time period
01	The perpetrator(s) bullied the youth one other time during the specified time period
02	The perpetrator(s) bullied the youth 2 to 5 times during the specified time period
03	The perpetrator(s) bullied the youth 6 to 10 times during the specified time period
04	The perpetrator(s) bullied the youth more than 10 times during the specified time period
99	Missing or Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

2.15 LENGTH OF TIME THE YOUTH WAS BULLIED

Definition/Description: For youths who report being bullied, this measures the length of time the youth has been bullied. Bullying that is continual may have different health impacts than bullying that occurs for only a short period of time before stopping.

Uses: Information on the length of time the student was bullied is useful in examining the stability of bullying over time as well as the severity of bullying.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: For youths who report being bullied, this data element helps track how long youths are experiencing bullying and determine the health, educational, and social impact of extended bullying. Disrupting bullying that is occurring chronically is an important goal of prevention and intervention efforts. Bullying among older youths tends to be more stable over time (i.e., the same perpetrator is targeting the same youth) than bullying among younger children, especially preschool (Vlachou, Andreou, Botsoglou, & Didaskalou, 2011).

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
00	Was not bullied
01	Bullied less than week
02	Bullied about a week
03	Bullied around a month
04	Bullied for a few months (e.g., this semester at school)
05	Bullied longer than a few months
99	Missing or Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: For alternative response categories that cover longer periods of time (e.g., 6 months or a year) please see Solberg & Olweus (2003).

2.16 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE YOUTH WHO WAS BULLIED AND THE AGGRESSOR(S) IN THE MOST RECENT INCIDENT OF BULLYING

Definition/Description: This data element describes the relationship between the youth who was bullied and the aggressor(s) in the most recent bullying incident.

Uses: Understanding the relationships between the aggressor(s) and youths experiencing bullying may help improve the focus of prevention and intervention efforts.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: The data element collects information on the most recent incident of bullying instead of all bullying incidents in order to improve recall of the details of the incident and provide timely descriptions. If data on bullying are collected over short periods of time (e.g., over the last week or over the last month), then it may be useful to gather this information on all incidents occurring in the timeframe. Collecting information on all or multiple bullying incidents occurring over long periods of time requires additional resources and may not be appropriate or feasible for certain data collection systems. Bullying can occur among friends, acquaintances, classmates, or strangers. Thus, understanding the relationship between the bully and the victim is important.

If multiple aggressors were involved in the bullying incident, relationships with the primary aggressor or the three aggressors that the targeted youth knows best should be recorded.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: Yes.

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
01	Friend
02	Classmate who is not a friend
03	Neighborhood youth who is not a friend
04	Stranger
05	Other (Specify)
99	Relationship is not known

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

HARM RELATED TO BEING BULLIED

2.17 PHYSICAL INJURY EXPERIENCED AS A RESULT OF BEING BULLIED

Definition/Description: This assesses physical injuries experienced as a result of being bullied over a specific period of time. Physical injury is defined as physical harm, including death, occurring to the body. Examples include but are not limited to cuts, scrapes, bruises, swelling, loss of consciousness, a concussion, chemical burns, choking, internal bleeding, or broken bones.

Uses: Estimate the number and percentage of youths that experience physical injury as a result of bullying. The data element can also be used to explore the types and severity of physical injury experienced as a result of bullying.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: This data element only tracks physical injuries that directly resulted from bullying during the specified time period. In order to better understand the physical injuries associated with bullying, some users may want to collect more detailed information on the type of injury, location of the injury on the body, and severity of physical injuries (e.g., did the injury require medical treatment) experienced by the youth who was bullied.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
00	Youth was not bullied during the specified time period
01	Youth was bullied, but did NOT suffer any physical harm as a result of being bullied
02	Youth was bullied and suffered physical harm as a result of being bullied
99	Unknown if youth was bullied or suffered physical harm as a result of being bullied

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

2.18 PSYCHOLOGICAL HARM EXPERIENCED AS A RESULT OF BEING BULLIED

Definition/Description: This data element captures psychological harm experienced as a result of being bullied during a specified period of time. Psychological harm is defined as decreases in the intellectual, mental health, emotional, behavioral, or social role functioning of the youth bullied. Changes in psychological functioning can be either temporary or intermittent (i.e., persisting for 180 days or less) or chronic (i.e., likely to be of an extended and continuous duration persisting for a period greater than 180 days) (Basile & Saltzman, 2002). Examples of changes in psychological functioning include, but are not limited to, increases in or development of anxiety, depression, insomnia, eating disorders, post-traumatic stress disorder, dissociation, inattention, memory impairment, self-medication, self-mutilation, sexual dysfunction, and suicide thoughts or attempts (Basile & Saltzman, 2002).

Uses: Estimate the number and percentage of youths that experience psychological harm as a result of being bullied.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: This data element only tracks psychological harm experienced as a result of the youth being bullied during the specific time period. Not all psychological harm will be immediate or easily recognizable to the various groups providing information. Collecting and tracking this information, however, is important because youths who are bullied tend to report feelings of depression, anxiety, low self-esteem, and isolation (see *Background* section above). In order to better understand the specific types of harm caused by bullying in general or different types of bullying, some users may wish to gather more detailed information on the types of psychological harm the youth who was bullied experienced as a result of being bullied.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
00	Youth was not bullied during the specified time period
01	Youth was bullied, but did NOT report or show observable signs of suffering psychological harm as a result of being bullied
02	Youth was bullied and suffered psychological harm as a result of being bullied
99	Unknown if youth was bullied or suffered psychological harm as a result of being bullied

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: Basile & Saltzman (2002)

2.19 EDUCATIONAL HARM EXPERIENCED AS A RESULT OF BEING BULLIED

Definition/Description: This assesses the educational harm experienced as a result of being bullied during a specified time period. Educational harm is defined as decreases in academic performance (e.g., lower grades), diminished school engagement (e.g., poor attendance or dropping out of school), missed educational opportunities (e.g., the youth is scared to go to tutoring program or class), negative perceptions of school or other educational activities (e.g., the youth is afraid to go to school, hates school, or does not trust adults in the school), or decreased participation in school-sponsored extracurricular activities such as band, team sports, theatre, and school clubs.

Uses: Helps estimate the number and percentage of youths who experience educational harm as a result of being bullied. The data element can also be used to better understand the negative impact bullying has on the educational experiences of youths.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: This data element only tracks educational harm experienced as a result of the youth being bullied during the specific time period. If the harm to a youth involves their involvement in community activities such as a youth club, avoiding a playground, or private sports league, this should be coded as social harm instead of educational harm. Not all educational harm, such as decreases in educational achievement, will be immediate or easily recognizable to the various groups providing information. Collecting and tracking this information, however, is important because youth who experience bullying tend to report poorer school performance as a result of bullying (see *Background* section). In order to better understand the specific types of educational harm caused by bullying, some researchers may wish to gather more detailed information on the types and severity of educational harm.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
00	Youth was not bullied during the specified time period
01	Youth was bullied, but did NOT report or show observable signs of educational harm as a result of being bullied
02	Youth was bullied and suffered educational harm as a result of being bullied
99	Unknown if youth was bullied or suffered educational harm as a result of being bullied

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

2.20 SOCIAL HARM EXPERIENCED AS A RESULT OF BEING BULLIED

Definition/Description: This data element measures the social harm experienced as a result of being bullied during a specific time period. Social harm is defined as negative changes in the relationships or reputations that result from the youth being bullied. Examples include, but are not limited, to loss of friends, peers avoiding the youth who was bullied, youth avoiding certain locations such as a playground or youth center due to fear of being bullied, or youth who were bullied dropping out of community activities, such as a youth group, intramural league not associated with school, community club, or youth camp.

Uses: Estimate of the number and percentage of youths that experience social harm as a result of being bullied.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: This data element tracks social harm experienced as a result of the youth being bullied during the specific time period. Harm related to education, such as increasing absenteeism, avoiding tutoring sessions, or dropping out of school-sponsored extracurricular activities (e.g., theatre, school clubs, or school sports teams), should be recorded as educational harm and not as social harm. Not all social harm will be immediate or easily recognizable to the various groups providing information. Collecting and tracking this information is important because youth who are bullied may lose social support and become isolated as a result of bullying (see *Background* section). Some bullying surveillance systems may wish to gather more detailed information on the types of social harm the youth who are bullied experience in order to better understand the impact of bullying.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
00	Youth was not bullied during the specified time period
01	Youth was bullied, but did NOT report or show observable signs of social harm as a result of being bullied
02	Youth was bullied and suffered social harm as a result of being bullied
99	Unknown if youth was bullied or suffered social harm as a result of being bullied

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

ADDITIONAL DESCRIPTION OF THE YOUTH WHO WAS BULLIED

2.21 YOUTH WHO WAS BULLIED RECEIVED A FREE OR REDUCED PRICED LUNCH

Definition/Description: This assesses whether a youth who is attending school is receiving a free or reduced price lunch under the federally funded National School Lunch Program (NLSP). The National School Lunch Program is a federally assisted meal program that operates in over 100,000 public and non-profit private schools as well as residential child care institutions (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2011). NLSP provides nutritionally balanced, low-cost, or free lunches to millions of children. A student's eligibility for a free or reduced-price lunch is based on the income of his or her family, and the program targets children in families with incomes near, at, or below the federal poverty level. (See <http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/lunch/aboutlunch/NSLPFactSheet.pdf> for a description of the NLSP program and eligibility requirements.)

Uses: Free and reduced lunch status can be used to estimate how often youths from families with incomes near, below, and above the poverty line are bullied.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: Schools participating in the NLSP have records indicating which students participate in NLSP. This information may be linked with surveillance information on bullying when proper permission to use the information is obtained and the confidentiality of the information is protected. Information on free and reduced-price lunches can also be directly collected from youths or families. Although participation in NLSP provides some socioeconomic information on the families of students, youths receiving free and reduced-price lunch come from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds. Also, this data element will not be available for youths who are not enrolled in school and some youths whose families are eligible for the program may not be enrolled or participating in the program.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
00	Youth did not receive a free or reduced lunch under NLSP
01	Youth received a free lunch under NLSP
02	Youth received a reduced priced lunch under NLSP
03	Youth is not currently enrolled in school or is enrolled in a school that is not participating in NLSP
99	Missing or Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: United States Department of Agriculture website on the National School Lunch Program (<http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/lunch/>) and National School Lunch Program Fact Sheet (<http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/lunch/aboutlunch/NSLPFactSheet.pdf>).

2.22 HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF YOUTH'S PARENT(S) OR GUARDIAN(S)

Definition/Description: This measures the highest level of education a youth's parents or guardian has attained within a formal educational system.

Uses: The highest education level of the youth's parents is one indicator of the socioeconomic status of the youth's family and can be used to examine the extent to which bullying varies by the educational level of the youth's parent or guardian.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: When assessing this information, it is important to capture information about the parents and guardians with whom the youth is currently living. The indicator also should focus on capturing the highest educational level of either parent (e.g., mother or father) or primary guardian(s). When feasible, directly collecting this information from parents is preferable to asking youths about their parents' education levels.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: When possible, the response categories should be consistent with the categories provided by the Bureau of the Census. Because youths may not have full information about their parent's education, broader categories may be more appropriate when asking youths about their parent's educational background.

Census Education Categories*		Broader Education Categories	
Code	Description	Code	Description
00	Less than 1st grade	00	Not a high school graduate
01	1st – 4th grade		
02	5th – 8th grade		
03	9th grade		
04	10th grade		
05	11th grade		
06	12th grade or high school graduate	01	High school graduate
07	Some college or associate's degree	02	Some college or associate's degree
08	Bachelor's degree	03	Bachelor's degree
09	More advanced than bachelor's degree	04	More advanced than bachelor's degree
99	Missing or Unknown	99	Missing or Unknown

* Individuals with a foreign education can be mapped onto these categories using the UNESCO ISCED (International Standard Classification of Education) referenced below.

Data Standards or Guidelines: *Core Health Data Elements* (National Committee on Vital Health Statistics, 1996).

Other References: American Society for Testing and Materials (1996); Health Level 7 (HL7) (1996); Bureau of the Census *Current Population Survey*; Bureau of the Census 2000; National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs/eiip/eiip.html>; United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); *International Standard Classification of Education* (ISCED) <http://unesco.org/Documents/isced.asp>

BULLYING PERPETRATED BY YOUTH(S)

2.23 HOW OFTEN A YOUTH BULLIED OTHER YOUTHS DURING A SPECIFIED TIME PERIOD

Definition/Description: This measures how often a youth perpetrated any type of bullying (i.e., physical, verbal, relational, or property) during a specified time period.

Uses: Estimate the percentage of youths who engage in any bullying behavior. This information may assist in developing, implementing, and evaluating prevention and intervention efforts.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: When estimating the prevalence of bullying perpetration, assessments need to measure all three key components of the definition of bullying (i.e., aggression, repeated or high likelihood of being repeated, and a power imbalance favoring the perpetrator). Measuring these components is critical in order to distinguish bullying from general aggressive behaviors, assertive behaviors, arguments, rough and tumble play, or other types of violence (e.g., physical fighting). Additionally, this data element should include all types of bullying and aggregate the different types of bullying (i.e., physical, verbal, relational, and property).

The definition of repeated aggression and power imbalance may result in victims and perpetrators classifying slightly different phenomenon as bullying. Specifically, youths who are victimized may classify multiple experiences of aggression (regardless of the identity of the perpetrator) as bullying. Also, perpetrators and youths who are victimized may have different perceptions of whether certain behaviors were aggressive or involved a power imbalance. Finally, the number and percentage of youths perpetrating bullying may differ from the number and percentage of youths who have experienced bullying because a single perpetrator can bully multiple youths or multiple perpetrators can bully a single youth. Reports from observers such as teachers, peers, and parents may underestimate the number or percentage of youths involved in bullying because the observer did not have the opportunity to witness all bullying incidents.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Although numeric response categories are provided below, readers should identify frequency categories that are appropriate for their populations (e.g., identifying categories or scales that may be more easily understood for younger versus older youths). Also, the categories may need to be modified based on the data collection system used or time period assessed. For instance, alternatives include collecting the raw number of times a youth engaged in bullying or using Likert scales (e.g., rarely bullied, sometimes bullied, often bullied, always bullied).

Code	Description
00	Youth did not bully other youth(s) during the specified period of time
01	Youth bullied other youth(s) once
02	Youth bullied other youth(s) 2 to 5 times
03	Youth bullied other youth(s) 6 to 10 times
04	The youth bullied other youth(s) more than 10 times
99	Unknown if youth engaged in bullying during the specified time period

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

2.24 HOW OFTEN A YOUTH PHYSICALLY BULLIED OTHER YOUTHS DURING A SPECIFIED TIME PERIOD

Definition/Description: This measures how often a youth engaged in physical bullying (e.g., pushed, slapped, or kicked) of other youths during a specified time period. Physical bullying involves the use of physical force by the perpetrator against another youth. Examples include but are not limited to behaviors such as hitting, kicking, pinching, spitting, tripping, and pushing.

Uses: Tracking and monitoring the extent to which youths use physical force when bullying other youths. This information may assist in developing, implementing, and evaluating prevention and intervention efforts.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: When estimating the prevalence of physical bullying, assessments need to measure all three key components of the definition of bullying (i.e., physical aggression, repeated physical aggression or high likelihood of physical aggression being repeated, and an observed or perceived power imbalance favoring the perpetrator). Physical bullying captures a wide range of behaviors where physical force is used by the aggressor against the targeted youth. In order to help respondents understand physical bullying, questions about physical bullying should delineate the types of physical bullying being measured with behaviorally specific items (e.g., have you hit), definitions, or examples. Reports from observers such as teachers, peers, and parents may underestimate the prevalence and frequency of physical bullying because the observers may not have witnessed all incidents.

Because a single perpetrator can physically bully multiple youths or multiple perpetrators can physically bully a single youth, the number and percentage of youths perpetrating physical bullying may differ from the number and percentage of youths who report being physically bullied.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Although numeric response categories are provided below, readers should identify frequency categories that are appropriate for their populations (e.g., identifying categories or scales that may be more easily understood for younger versus older youths). Also, the categories may need to be modified based on the data collection system used or time period assessed. For instance, alternatives include collecting the raw number of times a youth physically bullied other youths or using Likert scales (e.g., rarely physically bullied, sometimes physically bullied, often physically bullied, always physically bullied).

Code	Description
00	Youth did not engage in physical bullying during the specified period of time
01	The youth physically bullied once
02	The youth physically bullied 2 to 5 times
03	The youth physically bullied 6 to 10 times
04	The youth physically bullied more than 10 times
99	Unknown if youth engaged in physical bullying during the specified time period

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

2.25 HOW OFTEN A YOUTH VERBALLY BULLIED OTHER YOUTHS DURING A SPECIFIED TIME PERIOD

Definition/Description: This measures how often a youth has verbally bullied another youth over a specified time period. Verbal bullying is harmful oral or written communication with another youth. Verbal bullying includes, but is not limited to, taunting, calling a youth names, inappropriate sexual comments, taunting, or threatening a youth verbally, through electronic communication (e.g., phone texts or emails), or in written notes.

Uses: Estimate how often youths are engaging in verbal bullying. This information may assist in developing, implementing, and evaluating prevention and intervention efforts.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: When estimating the prevalence of verbal bullying, assessments need to measure all three key components of the definition of bullying (i.e., verbal aggression, repeated verbal aggression or high likelihood of verbal aggression being repeated, and an observed or perceived power imbalance favoring the perpetrator). Verbal bullying can involve a wide a range of oral or written communications. In order to help respondents understand verbal bullying, questions about verbal bullying should delineate the types of verbal bullying being measured with behaviorally specific items (e.g., have you threatened), definitions, or examples. Reports from observers such as teachers, peers, and parents may underestimate the prevalence and frequency of verbal bullying because the observers may not have witnessed all incidents.

Because a single perpetrator can verbally bully multiple youths or multiple perpetrators can verbally bully a single youth, the number and percentage of youths perpetrating verbal bullying may differ from the number and percentage of youths who report being verbally bullied.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Although numeric response categories are provided below, readers should identify frequency categories that are appropriate for their populations (e.g., identifying categories or scales that may be more easily understood for younger versus older youths). Also, the categories may need to be modified based on the data collection system used or time period assessed. For instance, alternatives include collecting the raw number of times a youth engaged in verbal bullying or using Likert scales (e.g., rarely verbally bullied, sometimes verbally bullied, often verbally bullied, always verbally bullied).

Code	Description
00	Youth did not engage in verbal bullying during the specified period of time
01	Youth verbally bullied once
02	Youth verbally bullied 2 to 5 times
03	Youth verbally bullied 6 to 10 times
04	The youth verbally bullied more than 10 times
99	Unknown if the youth engaged in verbal bullying during the specified time period

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

2.26 HOW OFTEN A YOUTH ENGAGED IN RELATIONAL BULLYING (AN EFFORT TO UNDERMINE THE RELATIONSHIPS OR REPUTATION OF ANOTHER YOUTH) DURING A SPECIFIED TIME PERIOD

Definition/Description: This measures how often a youth has engaged in relational bullying during a specified time period. Relational bullying (i.e., efforts to undermine a youth's relationships) involves manipulating a youth's relationships with others in a harmful manner such as excluding a youth from activities or spreading harmful rumors about a youth.

Uses: Estimate how often relational bullying occurs. This information may assist in developing, implementing, and evaluating prevention and intervention efforts.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: When estimating the prevalence of relational bullying, assessments need to measure all three key components of the definition of bullying (i.e., relational aggression, repeated relational aggression or high likelihood of relational aggression being repeated, and an observed or perceived power imbalance favoring the perpetrator). Relational bullying can involve a wide a range behaviors including spreading rumors and isolating targeted youth. In order to help respondents understand relational bullying, questions about relational bullying should delineate the types of relational bullying being measured with behaviorally specific items (e.g., have you spread rumors about a youth), definitions, or examples.

Incidents of relational bullying may overlap with incidents of physical, verbal, and property bullying because attacks on a youth's relationships or reputation involve aggressive acts such as spreading rumors or excluding a youth through the use of verbal threats or insults. Multiple questions are often used to assess the different aspects of relational bullying such as being excluded or being the target of harmful rumors. Reports from observers such as teachers, peers, and parents may underestimate the prevalence and frequency of relational bullying because the observers may not have witnessed all incidents.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Although numeric response categories are provided below, readers should identify frequency categories that are appropriate for their populations (e.g., identifying categories or scales that may be more easily understood for younger versus older youths). Also, the categories may need to be modified based on the data collection system used or time period assessed. For instance, alternatives include collecting the raw number of times a youth engaged in relational bullying or using Likert scales (e.g., rarely engaged in relational bullying, sometimes engaged in relational bullying, often engaged in relational bullying, always engaged in relational bullying).

Code	Description
00	Youth did not engage in relational bullying during the specified period of time
01	Youth relationally bullied once
02	Youth relationally bullied 2 to 5 times
03	Youth relationally bullied 6 to 10 times
04	The youth relationally bullied more than 10 times
99	Unknown if youth engaged in relational bullying during the specified time period

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

2.27 HOW OFTEN A YOUTH BULLIED BY DAMAGING ANOTHER YOUTH'S PROPERTY

Definition/Description: This measures how often a youth bullied another youth by damaging his or her property during a specified time period, referred to as property bullying. Property damage is defined as theft, alteration or destruction of a person's property in an effort to cause harm to the youth. These behaviors include taking a person's property from their body and refusing to give it back or stealing or destroying their property in front of them.

Uses: Estimate how often property bullying occurs. More broadly, this measure provides insight into how youths bully.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: When estimating the prevalence of property bullying, assessments need to measure all three key components of the definition of bullying (i.e., property aggression, repeated property aggression or high likelihood of property aggression being repeated, and an observed or perceived power imbalance favoring the perpetrator). Property bullying can involve a wide a range of behaviors including property theft and destruction. In order to help respondents understand property bullying, questions about property bullying should delineate the types of property bullying being measured with behaviorally specific items (e.g., have you damaged someone's property on purpose), definitions, or examples. Reports from observers such as teachers, peers, and parents may underestimate the prevalence and frequency of this type of bullying because the observers may not have witnessed all incidents.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Although numeric response categories are provided below, readers should identify frequency categories that are appropriate for their populations (e.g., identifying categories or scales that may be more easily understood for younger versus older youths). Also, the categories may need to be modified based on the data collection system used or time period assessed. For instance, alternatives include collecting the raw number of times a youth engaged in property bullying or using Likert scales (e.g., rarely engaged in property bullying, sometimes engaged in property bullying, often engaged in property bullying, always engaged in property bullying).

Code	Description
00	Youth did not engage in property bullying during the specified period of time
01	Youth property bullied once
02	Youth property bullied 2 to 5 times
03	Youth property bullied 6 to 10 times
04	The youth property bullied more than 10 times
99	Unknown if youth engaged in property bullying during the specified time period

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

2.28 HOW OFTEN A YOUTH ELECTRONICALLY BULLIED DURING A SPECIFIED TIME PERIOD

Definition: Electronic bullying is defined as bullying behaviors that occur using technology including, but not limited to, phones, email, chat rooms, instant messaging, and online posts. How technology is used to bully youths can change as new technologies are developed.

Uses: Tracking and monitoring the extent to which youths bully other youths using technology is important because technology is used by a large percentage of youths and youths are using technology to bully each other. This information may assist in developing, implementing, and evaluating prevention and intervention efforts.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: Bullying using technology or electronics is considered a context in which bullying occurs and is not considered conceptually distinct from bullying that occurs in-person. It is important whenever possible to maintain consistent rules when measuring in-person and electronic bullying (e.g., if watching a youth being bullied is not considered bullying than reading a derogatory message about bullying should also not be considered bullying). Where electronic bullying is treated differently (e.g., some consider posting a harmful video on the Internet as bullying) than in-person bullying, it should be noted. Also, reviewing recent assessments of electronic bullying (Hamburger et al., 2011) can provide guidance on how to measure electronic bullying and capture how youths perpetrate and experience electronic bullying. Reports from observers such as teachers, peers, and parents may underestimate the prevalence of electronic bullying because observers may have a difficult time knowing that a youth was bullied.

Because there is debate about how to assess key components of the bullying definition in the electronic context, considerations when measuring electronic bullying are provided.

Aggression: Electronic bullying involves primarily verbal aggression (e.g., threatening or harassing electronic communications or distribution of electronic images or video) and relational aggression (e.g., spreading rumors electronically). Electronic bullying, however, can also involve property damage resulting from electronic attacks that lead to the modification, dissemination, damage, or destruction of a youth's privately stored electronic information.

Repeated or high likelihood to be repeated: Direct aggressive electronic communications, such as threatening text messages, are similar to in-person verbal bullying in that single incidents can be distinguished from repeated aggressive communications. Also, similar definitions of repeated aggression can be used for relational aggression. For instance, if a youth spreading a false rumor told to him by a peer is considered a repeat aggressor, forwarding a false rumor to friends electronically also should be considered repeated aggression. The ability of electronic communications to occur rapidly, spread quickly to a larger number of people, and be anonymous may create a few instances that are difficult to define as repeated (e.g., the broad distribution of a private video or picture) (David-Ferdon & Hertz, 2009). In these instances, the stakeholders of the surveillance system should explain their rationale for classifying the aggression as repeated or not.

Power imbalance: Similar to assessing bullying occurring in the physical world, assessing whether a power imbalance has occurred electronically is dependent on the subjective experience of the youth being targeted and her or his perceived ability to stop the aggressive behavior. Factors such as anonymity or technical ability to block messages may or may not contribute to a feeling of a power imbalance.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Although numeric response categories are provided below, readers should identify frequency categories that are appropriate for their populations (e.g., identifying categories or scales that may be more easily understood for younger versus older youths). Also, the categories may need to be modified based on the data collection system used or time period assessed. For instance, alternatives include collecting the raw number of times a youth engaged in electronic bullying or using Likert scales (e.g., rarely engaged in electronic bullying, sometimes engaged in electronic bullying, often engaged in electronic bullying, always engaged in electronic bullying).

Code	Description
00	Youth did not engage in electronic bullying during the specified period of time
01	Youth engaged in electronic bullying once
02	Youth engaged in electronic bullying 2 to 5 times
03	Youth engaged in electronic bullying 6 to 10 times
04	The youth engaged in electronic bullying more than 10 times
99	Unknown if electronic bullying occurred during the specified time period

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: Hinduja & Patchin (2009)

DESCRIPTION OF YOUTH PERPETRATING BULLYING

2.29 SEX OF THE YOUTH WHO PERPETRATED BULLYING

Definition/Description: Biological sex of the youth who perpetrated bullying during the specific time period.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying perpetration varies by sex. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: The United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) requires, to the extent possible, the standardized collection of race, ethnicity, primary language, sex, and disability status in all national population health surveys that use self-reported information. Implementation guidance for these standards is available from DHHS at <http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>. Using national DHHS standards is important because it allows comparison of national and local information.

The prevalence and types of bullying perpetrated by youths varies by sex. Studies tend to agree that more males engage in direct physical bullying and verbal confrontations than females (Card et al., 2011; Nansel et al., 2004). There is also some evidence that more females engage in indirect forms of bullying, such as spreading rumors or social isolation than males, but this difference is small (Card et al., 2011). The socialization experiences of males and females may account for some of the differences in bullying behavior (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995). If the data collection system is gathering information on bullying incidents instead of on youths, it should collect information on the sex of the perpetrator for every incident. In incidents where there are multiple perpetrators, the sex of the primary perpetrator should be collected and when feasible information on the sex of the three primary perpetrators should be collected.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: The following response categories are DHHS standards.

Code	Description
M	Male
F	Female
O	Other (Specify)
U	Missing or Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: U. S. Department of Health and Human Services Implementation Guidance on Data Collection Standards for Race, Ethnicity, Sex, Primary Language, and Disability Status; <http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>.

Other References: None

2.30 RACE OF THE YOUTH WHO PERPETRATED BULLYING

Definition/Description: This is the race of a youth who perpetrated any bullying during a specified time period. Race is a concept used to differentiate population groups largely on the basis of physical characteristics transmitted by descent. Racial categories are neither precise nor mutually exclusive, and the concept of race lacks clear scientific definition.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying perpetration varies across racial groups. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: The United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) requires, to the extent possible, the standardized collection of race, ethnicity, primary language, sex, and disability status in all national population health surveys that use self-reported information. Implementation guidance for these standards is available from DHHS at <http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>. When collecting race information, personal self-identification is preferable to observer-identification. If the data collection system is gathering information on bullying incidents instead of youths, it should collect information on the race of the perpetrator for every incident. In incidents where there are multiple perpetrators, the race of the primary perpetrator should be collected and, when feasible, information on the race of the three primary perpetrators should be collected.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: Yes, a person can have multiple racial backgrounds.

Field Values/Coding Instructions: The DHHS coding categories provide more extensive information than the minimum categories recommended by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). For comparison purposes, the DHHS categories can be aggregated into the five OMB categories. Specifically, the DHHS codes 1 through 3 correspond to the OMB categories of White, Black or African-American, and American Indian or Alaska Native, respectively. Combining codes 4 through 10 creates the OMB category of Asian and combining the codes 11 through 14 creates the OMB category of Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. Finally, the Department of Education has standard guidelines for collecting, aggregating and reporting information on race and ethnicity (see <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2007-10-19/html/E7-20613.htm>). Readers should use the categorization scheme most appropriate to their contexts and purposes.

Race			
Code	Description	Code	Description
01	White	09	Vietnamese
02	Black or African American	10	Other Asian
03	American Indian or Alaska Native	11	Native Hawaiian
04	Asian Indian	12	Guamanian or Chamorro
05	Chinese	13	Samoan
06	Filipino	14	Other Pacific Islander
07	Japanese	99	Unknown
08	Korean		

Data Standards or Guidelines: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Implementation Guidance on Data Collection;

Standards for Race, Ethnicity, Sex, Primary Language, and Disability Status; <http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>; Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education. ED 72 FR 59266 (October 19, 2007); <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2007-10-19/html/E7-20613.htm>.

Other References: American Society for Testing and Materials (1996); U.S. Office of Management and Budget (1978); US Office of Management and Budget (1997).

2.31 ETHNICITY OF THE YOUTH WHO PERPETRATED BULLYING

Definition/Description: This is the ethnicity of a youth who perpetrated bullying during a specified time period. Ethnicity is a demographic classification that takes into account the shared cultural characteristics and geographic origin of a population group. Language, patterns of social interaction, religion, and styles of dress are among a variety of cultural attributes that contribute to differentiation in ethnicity.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying perpetration varies across ethnic groups. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: The United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) requires, to the extent possible, the standardized collection of race, ethnicity, primary language, sex, and disability status in all national population health surveys that use self-reported information. Implementation guidance for these standards is available from DHHS at <http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>. Personal self-identification of ethnicity is preferable to observer-identification. If the data collection system is gathering information on bullying incidents instead of youths, it should collect information on the ethnicity of the perpetrator for every incident. In incidents where there are multiple perpetrators, the ethnicity of the primary perpetrator should be collected and when feasible information on the ethnicity of the three primary perpetrators should be collected.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: Yes, a person can have multiple ethnicities.

Field Values/Coding Instructions: The DHHS coding categories provide more extensive information than the minimum categories recommended by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The DHHS categories can be aggregated into the OMB categories. Code 1 in the DHHS is part of the current OMB standard and DHHS codes 2 through 5 can be added together to calculate the OMB category of Hispanic or Latino. Finally, the Department of Education has standard guidelines for collecting, aggregating and reporting information on race and ethnicity (see <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2007-10-19/html/E7-20613.htm>). Readers should use the categorization scheme most appropriate to their contexts and purposes.

Code	Description
01	Not of Hispanic, Latino/a, or Spanish origin
02	Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano/a
03	Puerto Rican
04	Cuban
05	Another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
09	Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Implementation Guidance on Data Collection; Standards for Race, Ethnicity, Sex, Primary Language, and Disability Status; <http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>; Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education. ED 72 FR 59266 (October 19, 2007); <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2007-10-19/html/E7-20613.htm>.

Other References: American Society for Testing and Materials (1996); U.S. Office of Management and Budget (1978); U.S. Office of Management and Budget (1997).

2.32 AGE OF THE YOUTH WHO PERPETRATED BULLYING

Definition/Description: This data element is the age in whole numbers (e.g., 13 years old) of a youth perpetrating bullying during a specified time period. Most often, the recorded age is the age of the youth when the data was collected. Some studies may choose the age of the youth when the first or last incident of bullying occurred

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying perpetration varies across age groups and developmental stages. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: Bullying assessments should be worded in a manner appropriate to the age group being assessed. Although physical and relational aggression have successfully been measured among children as young as 36 months using observation and interviews (Crick et al., 2006), the use of multiple methods has been recommended by some researchers to measure aggression among children younger than 8 years old (Monks et al., 2003). Also, the developmental ability of children and youths to recall events over long periods of time should be considered when determining the time period over which to ask about bullying (e.g., one month versus one year). Finally, a national study suggests that a slightly higher percentage of middle school perpetrate bullying than high school students (Nansel et al., 2001).

If the data collection system is gathering information on bullying incidents instead of youths, it should collect information on the age of the perpetrator for every incident. In incidents where there are multiple perpetrators, the age of the primary perpetrator should be collected and, when feasible, information on the age of the three primary perpetrators should be collected.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: The whole number age of the youth should be collected and if needed later collapsed into age groups. If actual age is unknown, the age should be estimated whenever possible using the categories provided below. The school grade of the youth may be used to estimate the age of the youth if no other information is available. If using school grade to estimate age, the estimate should take into account the guidelines of the school district or area in which the data are being collected. Also, the grade and age of youths may not match due to a youth being retained in the same grade or a youth skipping a grade.

Preferred option is to collect the age of youth in years		If the age of the youth is not available, please try to use grade or other information to estimate the approximate age of the youth.	
Code	Description	Code	Description
Age in Years	Youth is 1 to 18 years old during the specified time period	01	8 years old or younger
99	Missing or Unknown	02	9 to 12 years old
		03	13 to 15 years old
		04	16 to 18 years old
		05	Older than 18 (Exclude from youth studies of bullying)
		99	Missing or Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: Health Level 7 (HL7) (1996).

Other References: None

2.33 CURRENT GRADE LEVEL OF THE YOUTH WHO PERPETRATED BULLYING

Definition/Description: Grade level of the youth who perpetrated bullying during a specified time period.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying perpetration varies across grade levels. This may inform prevention and intervention programs, especially programs for specific grade levels.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: Because the age of youths in a school grade varies and school interventions may be designed to target school grades instead of age groups, it is recommended that both the school grades and ages of students be collected. Also, the prevalence of bullying varies by school grade, with middle school students perpetrating bullying at higher levels than high school students (Nansel et al., 2001). Grade levels and youths' ages will not always match because some students are retained in the same grade or skip grades during their school careers. Also, the guidelines used by local education authorities to assign youth to grade levels based on age vary across jurisdictions. Some users may want to use the grade and age variable in combination to see if youth old or young for their grade are engaging in bullying at different rates than other youth.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: If a student changes grades during the school year, this should assess their most current grade.

Grade Level			
Code	Description	Code	Description
00	Kindergarten	08	Eighth Grade
01	First Grade	09	Ninth Grade
02	Second Grade	10	Tenth Grade
03	Third Grade	11	Eleventh Grade
04	Fourth Grade	12	Twelfth Grade
05	Fifth Grade	88	Youth is not in school
06	Sixth Grade	99	Missing or Unknown
07	Seventh Grade		

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

2.34 DISABILITY STATUS OF THE YOUTH WHO PERPETRATED BULLYING

Definition/Description: This assesses the disability status of the youth who perpetrated bullying over the specified time period.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying perpetration varies across disability status. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: The United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) requires, to the extent possible, the standardized collection of race, ethnicity, primary language, sex, and disability status in all national population health surveys that use self-reported information. Implementation guidance for these standards is available from DHHS at <http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>. For youths 5 years and older, it is recommended to assess disability status by asking respondents about five areas: 1) serious difficulty hearing or deafness, 2) serious difficulty seeing or blindness, 3) difficulty concentrating, remembering, or making decisions because of a physical, mental or emotional condition, 4) difficulty walking or climbing stairs, and 5) difficulty dressing or bathing. This data element complements information collected on the special education status of youths (see Data Element 2.35) and is especially useful for collecting information on youths who are no longer enrolled in school or have not been evaluated for special education services. Users may choose to collect more detailed information on these disabilities (e.g., reasons why a youth may have difficulty climbing the stairs) depending on their context and purpose of their data collection.

Self-reported assessments of bullying need to be cognitively appropriate and administered in a manner (e.g., extended time or assistance) appropriate for youths with disabilities. Also, multiple methods of collecting information on bullying may be needed to capture the full extent to which some students with disabilities, especially those with cognitive disabilities, are engaged in bullying. Youths with some cognitive disabilities may have difficulty reporting on the different components of the definition.

If the data collection system is gathering information on bullying incidents instead of youths, it should collect information on the disability status of the perpetrator for every incident. In incidents where there are multiple perpetrators, the disability status of the primary perpetrator should be collected and, when feasible, information on the disability status of the three primary perpetrators should be collected.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: Yes

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
00	Youth has no known disabilities
01	Youth is deaf or has serious difficulty hearing
02	Youth is blind or has serious difficulty seeing even with glasses
03	Youth has difficulty concentrating, remembering, or making decisions because of a physical, mental or emotional condition
04	Youth has difficulty walking or climbing stairs
05	Youth has difficulty dressing or bathing
06	Youth has another type of disability
99	It is unknown whether the youth has a disability

Data Standards or Guidelines: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Implementation Guidance on Data Collection Standards for Race, Ethnicity, Sex, Primary Language, and Disability Status; <http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>

Other References: None

2.35 SPECIAL EDUCATION CLASSIFICATION OF THE YOUTH WHO PERPETRATED BULLYING

Definition/Description: This assesses whether a youth perpetrating bullying is receiving special education and related services pursuant to an individualized education program (IEP) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Also, the disability category for which the youth is receiving services is collected. Under the IDEA, local educational agencies provide special education and related services to youths with disabilities that adversely affect the youth's educational performance (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). IDEA disability categories include physical, sensory, developmental, intellectual, emotional, and other health conditions that the youth may have.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying perpetration varies by special education classification. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: A youth with a disability may not be receiving services under the IDEA because his or her disability does not interfere with educational performance, the youth has not been evaluated for eligibility for services under the IDEA, or the youth is not enrolled in school. Self-reported assessments of bullying need to be cognitively appropriate and administered in a manner (e.g., extended time or assistance) appropriate for youths with disabilities. Also, multiple methods of collecting information on bullying may be needed to capture the full extent to which some students with disabilities, especially those with cognitive disabilities, are engaged in bullying. Youths with some cognitive disabilities may have difficulty reporting on the different components of the definition.

Fourteen categories are used in IDEA to describe youths with disabilities: autism, deaf-blindness, deafness, developmental delay, emotional disturbance, hearing impairment, intellectual disability, multiple disabilities, orthopedic impairment, other health impairment, specific learning disability, speech or language impairment, traumatic brain injury, and visual impairment including blindness. An in-depth description of each term can be found at <http://nichcy.org/disability/categories#dontsee>. Users may choose to collect more detailed information on these categories (e.g., severity) depending on their context and purpose of their data collection.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No, the multiple disability category captures students with "concomitant [simultaneous] impairments (such as intellectual disability-blindness, intellectual disability-orthopedic impairment, etc.), the combination of which causes such severe educational needs that they cannot be accommodated in a special education program solely for one of the impairments. The term does not include deaf-blindness." See <http://nichcy.org/disability/categories#dontsee>.

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
01	Autism
02	Deaf-blindness
03	Deafness
04	Developmental delay
05	Emotional disturbance
06	Hearing impairment
07	Intellectual disability
08	Multiple disabilities
09	Orthopedic impairment
10	Other health impairment (e.g., ADHD)
11	Specific learning disability
12	Speech or language impairment
13	Traumatic brain injury
14	Visual impairment, including blindness
15	No documented preexisting disabilities or health conditions
16	Not in school
88	Other (Specify)
99	Unknown if the youth has a disability

Data Standards or Guidelines: IDEA 2004.

Other References: Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/osep/index.html> and National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities, training curriculum on IDEA 2004, <http://nichcy.org/laws/idea/legacy>.

2.36 ENGLISH PROFICIENCY OF THE YOUTH WHO PERPETRATED BULLYING

Definition/Description: This measures the English proficiency of youths who perpetrated bullying.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying perpetration varies across English proficiency. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: The United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) requires, to the extent possible, the standardized collection of race, ethnicity, primary language, sex, and disability status in all national population health surveys that use self-reported information. Implementation guidance for these standards is available from DHHS at <http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtm>. The standard for primary language is English proficiency. DHHS recommends measuring English proficiency for youths 5 years of age or older.

Collecting information on English proficiency has multiple advantages. First, past work has found that health disparities are associated with English language proficiency rather than specific language spoken. If information is being collected for clinical purposes, both specific language and proficiency, however, need to be collected (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2011). Second, information on these dimensions can be compared to U.S. Census data which has been collected on both English proficiency and language spoken other than English since 1980.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
00	Respondent speaks English VERY WELL
01	Respondent speaks English WELL
02	Respondent speaks English NOT WELL
03	Respondent DOES NOT speak English AT ALL
99	Missing or Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: U. S. Department of Health and Human Services Implementation Guidance on Data Collection Standards for Race, Ethnicity, Sex, Primary Language, and Disability Status; <http://aspe.hhs.gov/datacncl/standards/ACA/4302/index.shtml>.

Other References: None

2.37 RELIGION OF THE YOUTH WHO PERPETRATED BULLYING

Definition/Description: This data element records the religion of a youth who perpetrated bullying.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying perpetration varies across religions. This may inform the design of prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: Little is known about whether youths from certain religious backgrounds perpetrate bullying more often than other youths or whether they bully youths from their same or a different religious background.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: Yes

Field Values/Coding Instructions: The following response categories are United States Census Bureau standards. The religious categories, especially the Christian category, can be further broken down into more specific religious identifications such as Catholic, Baptist, or Protestant that may be more reflective of religions of youths. More detailed religious categories, however, should be constructed in a way that they can be aggregated into the eight categories listed below.

Code	Description
01	Christian
02	Jewish
03	Buddhist
04	Muslim
05	Unitarian/Universalist
06	Hindu
07	Unaffiliated
08	Other (Specify)
99	Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: United States Census Bureau. The 2012 Statistical Abstract: The National Data Book. <http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/cats/population/religion.html>.

2.38 SEXUAL ORIENTATION OF THE YOUTH WHO PERPETRATED BULLYING

Definition/Description: Sexual orientation of youths who perpetrated bullying. Sexual orientation is a multi-component construct that is commonly measured in adolescents in three ways: attraction (e.g., the sex of the person you are sexually attracted to), behavior (e.g., ask respondents to report on the sex of people with whom they had willing sexual experiences), and self-identification (e.g., how would you describe your sexual orientation) (Badgett & Goldberg, 2009; Saewyc et al., 2004).

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying perpetration varies across sexual orientation. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: The United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) is developing a national data plan to integrate sexual orientation into DHHS national surveys (http://minorityhealth.hhs.gov/assets/pdf/checked/1/Fact_Sheet_LGBT.pdf.) Once this data collection information is available, including the age group to whom the questions should be asked, the DHHS measure of sexual orientation should be used in place of the ones presented in this document.

If there is limited space in the surveillance system, one evaluation of survey questions measuring sexual orientation among adolescents indicates that the highest priority health concerns are best detected by measuring behavior and attraction (Saewyc et al., 2004). Another report on assessing sexual orientation among adolescents lists four key considerations when assessing sexual orientation: 1) using measures of attraction is generally the best approach for this age group (except for studies focusing on sexual health), 2) ensuring privacy and anonymity is critical due to prevalence of sexual orientation-based harassment among this age group, 3) considering where to place questions on self-report surveys is important to ensure privacy and lower non-response rates, and 4) all measures will be limited by the fact that a significant portion of adolescents may not have had sexual experience, formed a sexual identity, or had sexual attractions when surveyed (Badgett & Goldberg, 2009). Finally, the developmental level of youths should be considered when using these questions because these questions may be inappropriate for children or elementary students.

Transgender is a conceptually distinct concept from sexual orientation and is included as a separate data element.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: Yes, multiple responses can be provided when measuring sexual orientation. A single response should be collected when assessing attraction and sexual behavior.

Field Values/Coding Instructions: The response categories were designed using recommendations by Badgett & Goldberg (2009) and Saewyc et al. (2004). When assessing sexual orientation using attraction or behavior measures, research suggests, when feasible, that the first response categories for male respondents on a self-report survey should be “female” and that the first response category for female respondents on a self-report survey should be “male” (See Badgett & Goldberg (2009) for more in-depth discussion).

Response Categories for Attraction Measure of Sexual Orientation		Response Categories for Self-Identification Measure of Sexual Orientation*		Response Categories for Behavioral Measures of Sexual Orientation	
Code	Description	Code	Description	Code	Description
01	Attracted to males	01	Lesbian or gay	01	Willing sexual experiences with females
02	Attracted to females	02	Straight, that is, not gay	02	Willing sexual experiences with males
03	Both men and women	03	Bisexual	03	Willing sexual experiences with both females and males
04	Not sure	04	Something else	04	I have not had any sexual experiences
		05	Not sure yet	05	Other (Specify)
		06	Not sure what the question means		
99	Missing or Unknown	99	Missing or Unknown	99	Missing or Unknown

*One strategy for gathering information about sexual orientation based on a respondent's self-identification is by asking "Do you think of yourself as lesbian or gay; straight, that is not gay; bisexual; or something else." If a respondent says something else, you can ask him or her to describe or explain further.

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: Badgett & Goldberg (2009); Saewyc et al. (2004)

2.39 TRANSGENDER STATUS OF THE YOUTH WHO PERPETRATED BULLYING

Definition/Description: Describes youths “who experience incongruence between birth sex and gender identity” (Badgett, & Goldberg, 2009, p. iv).

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying perpetration varies by transgender status. This may inform prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: The United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) is developing a national data plan to integrate measures of gender identity or transgender status into DHHS national surveys (http://minorityhealth.hhs.gov/assets/pdf/checked/1/Fact_Sheet_LGBT.pdf.) Once this data collection information is available, including age group to whom the questions should be asked, the DHHS measure of transgender status should be used in place of the ones presented in this document. Currently, a variety of approaches exist to measure whether a person is transgender through self-reports (see Badgett & Goldberg, 2009 for a discussion of factors to consider when measuring transgender status).

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: The category of transgender can be divided into more specific categories, such as female-to-male transgender or male-to-female transgender. If more detailed categories are used, these categories should be able to be collapsed into the three listed categories.

Code	Description
01	Not transgender
02	Transgender
99	Missing / Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: Badgett, L., & Goldberg, N. (2009). *Best Practices for Asking Questions about Sexual Orientation on Surveys*. Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute.

2.40 YOUTH WHO PERPETRATED BULLYING RECEIVED A FREE OR REDUCED PRICED LUNCH

Definition/Description: This assesses whether a youth who is attending school is receiving a free or reduced-price lunch under the federally funded National School Lunch Program (NLSP). The National School Lunch Program is a federally assisted meal program that operates in over 100,000 public and non-profit private schools as well as residential child care institutions (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2011). NLSP provides nutritionally balanced, low-cost, or free lunches to millions of children. A student's eligibility for a free or reduced-price lunch is based on the income of his or her family, and the program targets children in families with incomes near, at, or below the federal poverty level. See (<http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/lunch/aboutlunch/NSLPFactSheet.pdf>) for a description of the NLSP program and eligibility requirements.

Uses: Determine whether the prevalence and type of bullying perpetration varies by free lunch status. This may inform the design of prevention and intervention programs.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: Schools participating in the NLSP have records indicating which students participate in NLSP. This information may be linked with surveillance information on bullying when proper permission to use the information is obtained and the confidentiality of the information is protected. Information on free and reduced-price lunches can also be directly collected from youths or families. Although participation in NLSP provides some socioeconomic information on the families of students, youths receiving free and reduced lunch come from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds. Also, this data element will not be available for youths who are not enrolled in school and some youths whose families are eligible for the program may not be enrolled or participating in the program.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
00	Youth did not receive a free or reduced-price lunch under NLSP
01	Youth received a free lunch under NLSP
02	Youth received a reduced-price lunch under NLSP
03	Youth is not currently enrolled in school or is enrolled in a school that is not participating in NLSP
99	Missing or Unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: United States Department of Agriculture website on the National School Lunch Program (<http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/lunch/>) and National School Lunch Program Fact Sheet (<http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/lunch/aboutlunch/NSLPFactSheet.pdf>)

2.41 HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF THE PARENT(S) OR GUARDIAN(S) OF YOUTH PERPETRATING BULLYING

Definition/Description: This measures the highest level of education of the parents or guardians of youths who have perpetrated bullying

Uses: The highest education level of the youth's parents is one indicator of the socioeconomic status of the youth's family and can be used to determine whether bullying perpetration varies across socio-economic status.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: When assessing this information, it is important to capture information about the parents and guardians with whom the youth is currently living. The indicator also should focus on capturing the highest educational level of either parent (e.g., mother or father) or primary guardian(s). When feasible, directly collecting this information from parents is preferable to asking the youth about his or her parents' education levels.

Data Type: Numeric

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions: When possible, the response categories should be consistent with the categories provided by the Bureau of the Census. Because youths may not have full information about their parents' education, broader categories may be more appropriate when asking youths about their parents' educational backgrounds.

Census Education Categories*		Broader Education Categories	
Code	Description	Code	Description
00	Less than 1st grade	00	Not a high school graduate
01	1st – 4th grade		
02	5th – 8th grade		
03	9th grade		
04	10th grade		
05	11th grade		
06	12th grade or high school graduate	01	High school graduate
07	Some college or associate's degree	02	Some college or associate's degree
08	Bachelor's degree	03	Bachelor's degree
09	More advanced than bachelor's degree	04	More advanced than bachelor's degree
99	Missing or Unknown	99	Missing or Unknown

*Individuals with a foreign education can be mapped onto these categories using the UNESCO ISCED (International Standard Classification of Education) referenced below.

Data Standards or Guidelines: Core Health Data Elements (National Committee on Vital Health Statistics, 1996).

Other References: American Society for Testing and Materials (1996); Health Level 7 (HL7) (1996); Bureau of the Census Current Population Survey; Bureau of the Census 2000; National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs/eiip/eiip.html>; United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); *International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED)* <http://unesco.org/Documents/isced.asp>

OTHER INFORMATION

2.42 BULLYING PREVENTION PROGRAMS AND POLICIES

Definition/Description: This assesses whether bullying prevention policies or programs exist in the schools, communities, or target locations participating in the data collection system. Prevention policies and programs aim to prevent bullying from happening in the first place (e.g., by teaching youths skills to solve problems without resorting to aggression). Examples include classroom training sessions, increased monitoring of public places such as playgrounds, parenting programs or trainings, rules prohibiting bullying, and school-wide efforts or campaigns designed to create an environment where bullying is not tolerated.

Uses: Examining the percentage of schools, communities, and youths that are exposed to bullying prevention programs. This information can also be used in conjunction with information on the prevalence of bullying to track the impact of prevention programs over time.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: A state, county, city, or school district data collection system may also be designed to gather information about the specific bullying policies and prevention programs implemented in their areas. This information may help track the types of prevention programs being implemented, the percentage of youths exposed to each program, and the impact of these prevention programs over time. This information may be available from administrative sources. Collecting this information from youths needs to be done with care because youths may not be aware of all prevention programs, especially those targeting teachers, parents, or the social environment, or know the names of the prevention programs.

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: Yes, a community or school may be implementing multiple programs and policies.

Field Values/Coding Instructions: Bullying prevention policies and programs will vary greatly across different contexts and age groups. Consequently, the response categories used should reflect the prevention programs or policies being implemented in the schools or communities participating in the data collection system. Some general categories are provided, but a list of programs and policies should be used if possible.

Customized List of Prevention Programs or Policies (Suggested Approach)

General Prevention Program or Policy Categories

Code	Description	Code	Description
00	No bullying prevention programs or policies	00	No bullying prevention programs or policies
01 to 10	List of up to 10 commonly implemented bullying prevention programs and policies	01	School bullying prevention program targeting students
99	Missing or unknown	02	School bullying prevention program targeting school adults
		03	School bullying prevention program targeting school parents
		04	Community bullying prevention program targeting youth
		05	Community bullying prevention program targeting parents or other adults who interact with youth
		06	School bullying prevention policies targeting students
		07	School bullying prevention policies targeting school adults
		08	Community bullying prevention policies targeting youth
		09	Community bullying prevention policies targeting parents or other adults who interact with youth
		99	Missing or unknown

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

2.43 YOUTH WAS HARASSED BASED ON RACE, COLOR, NATIONAL ORIGIN, SEX, RELIGION, OR DISABILITY DURING A SPECIFIC TIME PERIOD

Definition/Description: This data element assesses whether or not a youth was harassed based on race, color, national origin, sex, religion, or disability during a specific time period. The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) in the U.S. Department of Education (U.S. Department of Education, 2010) describes harassment in the following way:

“Harassing conduct may take many forms, including verbal acts and name-calling; graphic and written statements, which may include use of cell phones or the Internet; or other conduct that may be physically threatening, harmful, or humiliating. Harassment does not have to include intent to harm, be directed at a specific target, or involve repeated incidents. Harassment creates a hostile environment when the conduct is sufficiently severe, pervasive, or persistent so as to interfere with or limit a student’s ability to participate in or benefit from the services, activities, or opportunities offered by a school. When such harassment is based on race, color, national origin, sex, or disability, it violates the civil rights laws that OCR enforces.”

Uses: This data element can be used to track the number and percentage of youths who are harassed based on race, color, national origin, sex, religion, or disability and better understand the type of aggression and violence being experienced by youths.

Type of Data Element: Expanded

Discussion: Bullying and harassment overlap and bullying may involve harassment (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Consequently, assessing both harassment and bullying will provide more complete information on the type of aggression and violence experienced by youths. This in turn may support improvements in response to both types of violence (Felix & Green, 2010).

Data Type: Text

Respondent Can Provide Multiple Answers: No

Field Values/Coding Instructions:

Code	Description
00	Youth <i>DID NOT</i> experience harassment in a specific time period
01	Youth <i>DID</i> experience harassment in a specific time period
09	<i>UNKNOWN</i> whether or not victim experienced harassment in a specific time period

Data Standards or Guidelines: None

Other References: None

SECTION 5: FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RESOURCES ON BULLYING

StopBullying.gov: The federal government's primary source for information on bullying is at <http://www.stopbullying.gov/>.

How Often Does Bullying Occur Nationally or in My State?

Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS): National and state information on how often bullying occurs can be accessed at <http://apps.nccd.cdc.gov/youthonline/App/Default.aspx/>.

Indicators of School Crime and Safety, 2012: Results from the 2011 School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey can be accessed at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2013036>

Questions to Measure Bullying

CDC Bullying Compendium: If you are looking for questions to measure bullying, this document contains questionnaires that have been used to measure bullying among youth and adolescents and is available at http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pub/measuring_bullying.html/.

Legal

Legal Guidance in Harassment and Bullying in School: U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, *Dear Colleague Letter: Harassment and Bullying:* This letter explains how student misconduct that falls under an anti-bullying policy also may trigger responsibilities under federal civil rights laws and is available at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201010.pdf/>.

U.S. Department of Education, Analysis of State Laws and Bullying Policies 2011: This reviews the extent to which state laws, state model bullying policies, and school district policies address key legislative and policy components identified by the department of Education. The report also looks at the extent state laws have translated into practice in schools and is available at <http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/bullying/state-bullying-laws/state-bullying-laws.pdf/>.

Electronic Aggression

Youth Violence: Electronic Media and Youth Violence: The CDC conducted an expert panel on aggression over the Internet.

For educators and caregivers: <http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/pub/EA-brief.html>

For researchers: http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/pub/EM_YouthViolence.html

REFERENCES

- American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) (1996). E1384-96: *Standard Guide for Content and Structure of the Computer-Based Patient Record*. West Conshohocken, Pennsylvania.
- American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) (1996). E1633-96: *Standard Specification for Coded Values Used in the Computer-Based Patient Record*. West Conshohocken, Pennsylvania.
- Arora, C. (1996). Defining bullying: Towards a clearer general understanding and more effective intervention strategies. *School Psychology International, 17*, 317-329.
- Austin, G., Nakamoto, J., & Bailey, J. (2010). *Harassment among California students, 2006-08*. Los Alamitos, CA.
- Badgett, L., & Goldberg, N. (2009). *Best Practices for Asking Questions about Sexual Orientation on Surveys*. Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute.
- Bandyopadhyay, S., Cornell, D., & Konold T. (2009). Validity of three school climate scales to assess bullying, aggressive attitudes, and help seeking. *School Psychology Review, 38*, 338-355.
- Basile, K. C., & Saltzman, L.E. (2002). *Sexual violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Bond, L., Carlin, J., Thomas, L., Rubin, K., & Patton, G. (2001). Does bullying cause emotional problems? A prospective study of young teenagers. *British Medical Journal, 323*, 480-484.
- Bradshaw, C. P., Sawyer, A. L., & O'Brennan, L. M. (2007). Bullying and peer victimization at school: Perceptual differences between students and school staff. *School Psychology Review, 36*, 361-382.
- Bradshaw, C., Waasdrop, T., O'Brennan, L., & Gulemetova, M. (2011). *Findings from the National Education Association's nationwide study of bullying: Teachers' and education support professionals' perspectives*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Britto, P. (2011). *Global battleground or school playground: The bullying of America's Muslim children*. Washington, DC: Institute for Social Policy and Understanding.
- Card, N., Stucky, B., Sawalani, G., & Little, T. (2011). Direct and indirect aggression during childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic review of gender differences, intercorrelations, and relations to maladjustment. *Child Development, 79*, 1185-1229.
- Carter, B., & Spencer, V. (2006). The fear factor: Bullying and students with Disabilities. *International Journal of Special Education, 21*, 11-23.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2012). Understanding Teen Dating Violence: Fact Sheet. Retrieved September 21, 2012, from <http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/pdf/TeenDatingViolence2012-a.pdf>
- Cook, C., Williams, K., Guerra, N., & Kim, T. (2010). Variability in the prevalence of bullying and victimization: A cross-national and methodological analysis. In S. Jimmerson, S. Swearer, & D. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 347-362). New York: Routledge.
- Cornell, D., & Bandyopadhyay, S. (2010). The assessment of bullying. In S. Jimerson, S. Swearer, & D. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 265-276). New York: Routledge.
- Crick, N., & Grotpeter, J. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development, 66*, 710-722.
- Crick, N., Ostrov, J., Burr, J., Cullertonsen-Sen, C., Jansen-Yeh, E., & Ralston, P. (2006). A longitudinal study of relational and physical aggression in preschool. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 27*, 254-268.

- Crosby, A. E., Ortega, L., & Melanson, C. (2011). *Self-directed violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Division of Violence Prevention.
- Dahlberg, L., & Krug, E. (2002). Violence - a global health problem. In E. Krug, L. Dahlberg, J. Mercy, A. Zwi, & R. Lozano (Eds.), *World report on violence and health* (pp 3-21). Geneva: World Health Organization.
- David-Ferdon, C., & Hertz, M. (2009). *Electronic media and youth violence*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- DeVoe, J. F., & Bauer, L. (2011). *Student Victimization in U.S. Schools: Results from the 2009 School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey. NCES 2012-314*: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved September 17, 2012, from <http://nces.ed.gov/>.
- Duke, N. N., Pettingell, S. L., McMorris, B. J., & Borowsky, I. W. (2010). Adolescent violence perpetration: Associations with multiple types of adverse childhood experiences. *Pediatrics*, 125, e778-e786.
- Eaton, D., Kann, L., Kinchen, S., & et al. (2012). Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance — United States, 2011. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 61(SS-4), 1-162.
- Eisenberg, M., Neumark-Sztainer, D., & Perry, C. (2003). Peer harassment, school connectedness and school success. *Journal of School Health*, 73, 311-316.
- Espelage, D. L., Basile, K. C., & Hamburger, M. E. (2012). Bullying perpetration and subsequent sexual violence perpetration among middle school students. *The Journal of Adolescent Health*, 50, 60-65.
- Espelage, D., & Swearer, S. (2010). A social-ecological model for bullying prevention and intervention: Understanding the impact of adults in the social ecology of youngsters. In S. Jimerson, S. Swearer, & D. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 61-71). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Iannotti, R. J. (2012). Health Behavior in School-Aged Children (HBSC), 2005-2006. ICPSR28241-v1. *Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor]*, 02-29.
- Farrington, D., Loeber, R., Stallings, R., & Ttofi M. (2011). Bullying perpetration and victimization as predictors of delinquency and depression in the Pittsburgh Youth Study. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict, and Peace Research*, 3, 74-81.
- Felix, E., & Green, J. (2010). Popular girls and brawny boys: The role of gender in bullying and victimization experiences. In S. Jimerson, S. Swearer, & D. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 173-185). New York: Routledge.
- Felix, E., Sharkey, J., Furlong, M., & 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.
- Ferguson, C. J., San Miguel, C., Kilburn, J. C., & Sanchez, P (2007). The effectiveness of school-based anti-bullying programs: A meta-analytic review. *Criminal Justice Review*, 32, 401-414.
- Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R., & Turner, H. (2007). Poly-victimization: A neglected component in child victimization. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 31, 7-26.
- Finkelhor, D., Turner, H. A., & Hamby, S. (2012). Let's prevent peer victimization, not just bullying. *Child Abuse and Neglect—the International Journal*, 36, 271.
- Furlong, M., Sharkey, J., Felix, E., Tanigawa, D., & Green, J. (2010). Bullying assessment: A call for increased precision of self-reporting procedures. In S. Jimerson, S. Swearer, & D. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 329-346). New York: Routledge.

- Gini, G., & Pozzoli, T. (2009). Association between bullying and psychosomatic problems: A meta-analysis. *Pediatrics*, *123*, 1059-1065.
- Gladstone, G., Parker, G., & Malhi, G. (2006). Do bullied children become anxious and depressed adults?: A cross-sectional investigation of the correlates of bullying and anxious depression. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, *194*, 201-208.
- Green, S. (2001). Systematic vs individualistic approaches to bullying. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *286*, 787-788.
- Guerra, N., Williams, K., & Sadek, S. (2011). Understanding bullying and victimization during childhood and adolescence: A mixed methods study. *Child Development*, *82*, 295-310.
- Hamburger, M., Basile, K., & Vivolo, A. (2011). *Measuring bullying victimization, perpetration, & bystander experiences: A compendium of assessment tools*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.
- Hawker, D., & Boulton, M. (2000). Twenty years' research on peer victimization and psychosocial maladjustment: A meta-analytic review of cross-sectional studies. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *41*, 441-455.
- Haynie, D. L., Nansel, T., Eitel, P., Crump, A. D., Saylor, K., Yu, K., & Simons-Morton, B. (2001) Bullies, Victims, and Bully/Victims: Distinct Groups of At-Risk Youth. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *21*, 29-49.
- Health Level 7 (HL7) (1996). *Health Level 7, Version 2.3*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: HL7.
- Heise, L., & Garcia-Moreno, C. (2002). Violence by intimate partners. In E. Krug, L. Dahlberg, J. Mercy, A. Zwi, & R. Lozano (Eds.), *World report on violence and health* (pp. 89-121). Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Hinduja, S. & Patchin, J.W. (2009). *Bullying beyond the schoolyard: Preventing and responding to cyberbullying*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hunter, S., Boyle, J., & Warden, D. (2007). Perceptions and correlates of peer-victimization and bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *77*, 797-810.
- Institute of Medicine (IOM) (1988). *The Future of Public Health*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Klomek, A., Marrocco, F., Kleinman, M., Schonfeld, I., & Gould, M. (2007). Bullying, depression, and suicidality in adolescents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychology*, *46*, 40-49.
- Leeb, R., Paulozzi, L., Melanson, C., Simon, T., & Arias, I. (2008). *Child maltreatment surveillance: Uniform definitions for public health and recommended data elements, version 1.0*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.
- Lenhart, A., Madden, M., Smith, A., Purcell, K., Zickuhr, K., & Rainie, L. (2011). *Teens, kindness and cruelty on social network sites: How American teens navigate the new world of 'digital citizenship'*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center's Internet & American Life Project.
- Li, Q. (2007). New bottle but old wine: A research of cyberbullying in schools. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *23*, 1777-1791.
- Monks, C., Smith, P., & Swettenham, J. (2003). Aggressors, victims and defenders in preschool: Peer, self and teacher reports. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *49*, 453-469.
- Nansel, T., Craig, W., & Overpeck, M. (2004). The Health Behaviour in School-aged Children Bullying Analysis Working Group. Cross-national consistency in the relationship between bullying behaviors and psychosocial adjustment. *Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine*, *158*, 730-736.
- Nansel, T., Overpeck, M., Haynie, D., Ruan, W., & Scheidt, P. (2003). Relationships between bullying and violence among U.S. youth. *Archives of Pediatric Adolescent Medicine*, *157*, 348-353.

- Nansel, T., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among U.S. youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *285*, 2094-2100.
- National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics (1996). Core Health Data Elements: Report of the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics. GPO publication 1996-722-677/83245.
- Nishina, A., & Juvonen, J. (2005). Daily reports of witnessing and experiencing peer harassment in middle school. *Child Development*, *76*, 435-450.
- O'Brennen, L., & Bradshaw, C. (2009). Examining developmental differences in the social-emotional problems among frequent bullies, victims, and bully/victims. *Psychology in Schools*, *46*, 100-115.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Olweus, D. (1994). Bully at school: Long-term outcomes for the victims and an effective school-based intervention program. In L. Huesmann (Ed.), *Aggressive behavior: Current perspectives* (pp. 97-129). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Parks, S. E., Annet, J. L., Hill, H. A., & Karch, D. L. (2012). *Pediatric Abusive Head Trauma: Recommended Definitions for Public Health Surveillance and Research*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Rigby, K. (1999). Peer victimization at school and the health of secondary students. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *69*, 95-104.
- Rivers, I. (2001). The bullying of sexual minorities at school: Its nature and long-term correlates. *Educational and Child Psychology*, *18*, 32-46.
- Rivers, I., Poteat, V. P., Noret, N., & Ashurst, N. (2009). Observing bullying at school: The mental health implication of witness status. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *24*, 211-233.
- Robers, S., Kemp, J., & Truman, J. (2013). Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2012 (NCES 2013-036/NCJ 241446). Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, and Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Saewyc, E. M., Bauer, G. R., Skay, C. L., Bearinger, L. H., Resnick, M. D., Reis, E., & Murphy, A. (2004). Measuring sexual orientation in adolescent health surveys: Evaluation of eight school-based surveys. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *35*, 345e1-e15.
- Salmivalli, C., (2010). Bullying and peer group: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *15*, 112-120.
- Salmivalli, C., & Voeten, M. (2004). Connections between attitudes, group norms, and behaviors associated with bullying in schools. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *28*, 246-258.
- Saltzman, L., Fanslow, J., McMahon, P., & Shelley, G. (1999). *Intimate partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements, version 1.0*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.
- Scherr, T., & Larson, J. (2010). Bullying dynamics associated with race, ethnicity, and immigration status. In S. Jimerson, S. Swearer, & D. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 223-234). New York: Routledge.
- Solberg, M., & Olweus, D. (2003). Prevalence estimation of school bullying with the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior*, *29*, 239-268.
- Sourander, A., Helstelä, L., Heleinus, H., & Piha, J. (2000). Persistence of bullying from childhood to adolescence—a longitudinal 8-year follow-up study. *Child Abuse Neglect*, *24*, 873-881.

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.

Swearer, S., & Doll, B. (2001). Bullying in schools: An ecological framework. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 2*, 7-23.

Swearer, S. M., Turner, R. K., Givens, J. E., & Pollack, W.S. (2008). "You're so gay!": Do different forms of bullying matter for adolescent males? *School Psychology Review, 37*, 160-173.

Swearer, S., Siebecker, A., Johnsen-Frerichs, L., & Wang, C. (2010). Assessment of bullying/victimization: The problem of comparability across studies and across methods. In S. Jimerson, S. Swearer, & D. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 305-327). New York, NY: Routledge.

Taub, J. (2001). Evaluation of the Second Step Violence Prevention Program at a rural elementary school. *School Psychology Review, 31*, 186-200.

Thacker, S. B., & Berkelman, R. L. (1988). Public health surveillance in the United States. *Epidemiological Reviews, 10*, 164-190.

Ttofi, M., Farrington, D., Losel, F., & Loeber, R. (2011). Do the victims of school bullies tend to become depressed later in life? A systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict, and Peace Research, 3*, 63-73.

Turner, H., Finkelhor, D., & Ormrod, R. (2010). Poly-victimization in a national sample of children and youth. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 38*, 323-330.

Twemlow, S., Fonagy, P., & Sacco, F. (2010). The etiological cast to the role of the bystander in the social architecture of bullying and violence in the schools and communities. In S. Jimerson, S. Swearer, & D. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 73-86).

United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (1997). *International Standard Classification of Education: ISCED 1997*. Paris.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (2012). The 2012 Statistical Abstract: The National Data Book. Population: Households, Families, Group Quarters. http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/cats/population/households_families_group_quarters.html

U.S. Bureau of the Census for the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2012). Current Population Survey, 2012 Annual Social and Economic (ASEC) Supplement. Washington: U.S. Census Bureau.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (2011). National school lunch program fact sheet. Retrieved September 17, 2012, from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/lunch/aboutlunch/NSLPFactSheet.pdf>.

U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (2010). Dear colleague letter: Harassment and bullying. Washington: U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights.

U.S. Department of Education (2004). Building the Legacy: IDEA. Retrieved September 17, 2012, from <http://idea.ed.gov/>

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Minority Health (2011). Final Data Collection Standards for Race, Ethnicity, Primary Language, Sex, and Disability Status Required by Section 4302 of the Affordable Care Act. <http://minorityhealth.hhs.gov/templates/browse.aspx?lvl=2&lvlid=208>.

U.S. Office of Management and Budget (1978). Race and ethnic standards for federal statistics and administrative reporting: Statistical Policy Directive 15. Retrieved September 17, 2012, from <http://wonder.cdc.gov/wonder/help/populations/bridged-race/directive15.html>

U.S. Office of Management and Budget (1997). Revisions to the standards for the classification of federal data on race and ethnicity. Federal Register 62FR58781-58790, October 30, 1997. Retrieved September 17, 2012, from www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/race/ombdir15.html.

Van Schoiack-Edstrom, L., Frey, K., & Beland, K. (2002). Changing adolescents' attitudes about relational and physical aggression: An early evaluation of a school-based intervention. *School Psychology Review, 31*, 201-216.

Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Oldehinkel, A. J., DeWinter, A. F., Verhulst, F. C., & Ormel, J. (2005). Bullying and Victimization in Elementary Schools: A Comparison of Bullies, Victims, Bully/Victims, and Uninvolved Preadolescents. *Developmental Psychology, 41*, 672-682.

Vivolo, A., Holt, M., & Massetti, G. (2011). Individual and contextual factors for bullying and peer victimization: Implications for prevention. *Journal of School Violence, 10*, 201-211.

Vlachou, M., Andreou, P., Botsoglou, K., Didaskalou, E. (2011). Bully/victim problems among preschool children: A review of current research evidence. *Educational Psychology Review, 23*, 329-358.

Williams, K., & Guerra, N. (2007). Prevalence and predictors of internet bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41*, S14-S21.

Ybarra, M., Boyd, D., Korchmaros, J. D., & Oppenheim, J. (2012). Defining and Measuring Cyberbullying Within the Larger Context of Bullying Victimization. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 51*, 53-58.

Ybarra, M., Mitchell, K., & Espelage, D. (2012). Comparison of bully and unwanted sexual experiences online and offline among a national sample of youth. *Complementary Pediatrics, 203-216*.

Yu, S., Huang, Z., Schwalberg, R., Overpeck, M., & Kogan, M. (2003). Acculturation and the health and well-being of U.S. immigrant adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 33*, 479-488.

APPENDIX A: FAMILY EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT (FERPA) AND THE PROTECTION OF PUPIL RIGHTS AMENDMENT (PPRA)

Educational agencies or institutions must take special care to comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment (PPRA) when collecting, storing, maintaining, and sharing bullying data that involves the use of students' education records. The FERPA (20 U.S.C. § 1232g) generally requires that parents and eligible students (i.e., students who have reached 18 years old or attending a postsecondary institution at any age) provide written consent before an educational agency or institution discloses personally identifiable information from students' education records. There are several exceptions to FERPA's general consent rule that permits schools to disclose personally identifiable information from education records, such as for specified types of studies that are conducted for, or on behalf of, the educational agency or institution. Additionally, FERPA does not apply to student data that has been properly de-identified. In this regard, the educational agency or institution or other party disclosing FERPA-protected records must make a reasonable determination that a student's identity is not personally identifiable because of unique patterns of information about that student, whether through single or multiple releases, and taking into account other reasonably available information.

For local educational agencies (LEAs) that receive Federal funds under a program administered by the U.S. Department of Education, the PPRA (20 U.S.C. § 1232h) governs the administration to students of a survey, analysis, or evaluation that concerns one or more of the following eight protected areas: (1) political affiliations or beliefs of the student or the student's parent; (2) mental or psychological problems of the student or the student's family; (3) sex behavior or attitudes; (4) illegal, anti-social, self-incriminating, or demeaning behavior; (5) critical appraisals of other individuals with whom respondents have close family relationships; (6) legally recognized privileged or analogous relationships, such as those of lawyers, physicians, and ministers; (7) religious practices, affiliations, or beliefs of the student or student's parent; or (8) income (other than that required by law to determine eligibility for participation in a program or for receiving financial assistance under such program). With regard to surveys subject to PPRA, a LEA must "directly" notify, such as through U.S. Mail or email, parents of students who are scheduled to participate in the specific activities or surveys listed above and provide an opportunity for parents to provide consent or opt their children out of participation in the specific survey. The PPRA also provides parents with rights to request to inspect any survey about one or more of the eight protected areas or any survey created by a third party before the survey is administered or distributed by the LEA to a student.

The PPRA contains similar but slightly different requirements that apply to a survey about one of the eight protected areas if the survey is funded by the U.S. Department of Education (ED) as part of a program that ED administers and students are required to take the survey. In this case, parents must provide prior written consent before students are required to take the survey. For other surveys that ask about one of the eight protected areas but where students are not required to participate and without regard to who funds the survey, parents must be provided with direct notification regarding the schedule for the administration of the survey and offering parents the opportunity to opt their children out of taking the survey. More information on FERPA and PPRA can be found on the U.S. Department of Education's Family Policy Compliance Office website: www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/.

PPRA also contains similar requirements as to when LEAs need to engage in parental notification and to make other arrangements to protect student privacy in other areas, such as the collection, disclosure, or use of personal information collected from students for the purpose of marketing or for selling that information and the administration of certain physical examinations to minors. The rights under PPRA transfer from the parents to a student who is 18 years old or an emancipated minor under State law at any age.

For more information, please contact:

Division of Violence Prevention

National Center for Injury Prevention and Control

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

4770 Buford Highway, MS F-64, Atlanta, GA 30341

Telephone: 1-800-CDC-INFO (232-4636)/TTY:1-888-232-6348

Web: www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention