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ABSTRACT

Youth violence remains a major public health issue in the United States. Bullying is one form of youth violence, and one that can result in physical injury, social and emotional distress, and even death. Research has supported the use of a social ecological approach to address the complex and multi-faceted nature of youth violence and bullying. This includes policies at the legislative, regulatory, and organizational levels. Unfortunately, a gap still remains between the data emerging from scientific and empirical studies and the policymaking process. This three-part dissertation aims to examine how research and evidence can be better connected to practice, specifically policy. Kingdon’s “three streams” concept, and landmark work on agenda setting and policy formation, serves as the foundation for the conceptual framework of this dissertation. The first study employed quantitative methods to determine the scope and risk-protective factors of bullying and youth violence among high school youth in Hawai‘i, by analyzing Youth Risk Behavior Survey data. The second study summarized and synthesized recommendations from empirical evaluations of bullying and youth violence policies, using the scientific literature. The third study used a qualitative methodology (key informant interviews) to examine factors that influence the process of translating public health evidence to policymaking, and contrasted the perspectives of organizational professionals with legislators in Hawai‘i. Ultimately, this dissertation research hopes to provide a deeper understanding of the issue of youth violence and bullying, and how that information can be used to strengthen prevention policies.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Youth Violence

Youth violence is a major public health problem, with the United States (US) having the highest rate of serious youth violence among developed nations (Thornton, Craft, Dahlberg, Lynch, & Baer, 2002; U.S. Department of Health & Human Services [DHHS], 2001; World Health Organization [WHO], 2002). In the US, homicide is among the top four leading causes of death for youth ages 1 through 24 years old (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2009). According to the CDC, 5,764 youth aged 10 to 24 were murdered in the US in 2007 (CDC, 2010). In addition, more than 1.1 million juvenile arrests occur annually, with more than 350,000 of those for violent crimes (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2012).

Youth violence encompasses a variety of adverse behaviors that may cause physical harm, emotional harm, serious injury, or even death (CDC, 2010). These behaviors can begin in early childhood and continue into young adulthood. A youth can be affected by violence as a victim, perpetrator, witness, or any combination of these.

The scientific literature identifies multiple risk and protective factors for youth. The major risk factors for violence are prior history of or exposure to violence, substance use, poor academic performance, poor social relationships, and poverty in the community (CDC, 2010). Recent studies have added evidence to support other associated factors. For example, Rudatsikira, Muula, and Siziya (2008) suggested that adolescents younger than age 14 are more likely than older adolescents to perpetrate violence, possibly due to
underdeveloped conflict resolution skills at that age. Wegner, Garcia-Santiago, Nishimura, and Hishinuma (2010) showed that having a positive bond with teachers, family members, and neighborhood can act as a protective factor. Goebert and colleagues (2012) examined multiple risk and protective factors for violence and suicide across multiple social ecological domains. In addition to individual factors, such as violence victimization and perpetration, other components were also examined including family (interactive and permissive parenting styles, parent’s attitudes condoning violence, and family fighting behaviors) and community (community cohesion and exposure to violence).

The effects of youth violence are numerous and far-reaching. Not only are there grave effects on the youth involved, but a tragic ripple effect on the family, community, and society has been demonstrated as well. Possible adverse consequences include physical harm, decreased sense of social-emotional well-being, and financial costs such as increased health care costs, decreased property values, and disruption of social services (Mercy, Butchart, Farrington, & Cerda, 2002). In the US, violent crime costs society $47 billion annually when including elements such as total medical and work loss costs, 31% of which can be attributed to youth ages 10 to 24 (CDC, 2011a).

**Bullying**

Bullying is a form of youth violence, and one that can result in physical injury, social and emotional distress, and even death (CDC, 2011b). There has recently been needed attention to bullying both at the national (e.g., Shepherd, 2011) and local (e.g., Vorsino, 2011) levels. Bullying has been defined in different ways, but the
commonalities among definitions include: (1) aggressive behavior, 2) a pattern over time, and 3) an imbalance of power and/or strength. The Hawai‘i State Department of Health (HSDOH; 2010) has compiled and synthesized definitions from a variety of sources, and has put forth the following:

A variety of negative physical (hitting, kicking, spitting, pushing, taking personal belongings), verbal (taunting, malicious teasing, name calling, making threats) and psychological acts (spreading rumors, manipulating social relationships, or engaging in social exclusion, extortion, or intimidation) carried out repeatedly over time. (p. 1)

According to the National Youth Violence Prevention Resource Center (NYVPRC), approximately 30% of youth in the US are involved in bullying, as either a bully, a victim, or both (NYVPRC, 2007). Bullying behavior has been associated with other forms of antisocial behavior, such as vandalism, shoplifting, skipping and dropping out of school, fighting, and substance use (HSDOH, 2010). Being victimized by bullying has also been associated with increased risk of mental health issues, including suicidality (Meltzer, Vostanis, Ford, Bebbington, & Dennis, 2011).

Just within the past several years, the exponential increase in the use of and access to technology has added much complexity to the identification and prevention of bullying (David-Ferdon & Hertz, 2007). “Cyber-bullying” is now referred to as bullying or aggression that occurs through e-mail, a chat room, instant messaging, a website, text messaging, or videos or pictures posted on websites or sent through cell phones (David-Ferdon & Hertz, 2009). Although the core concepts of bullying extend to cyber-bullying,
there are several noteworthy differences that make the latter much more devastating for all parties involved. These include: (1) Anonymity – the perpetrator’s identity can be hidden behind a computer, cell phone, or other mobile device; (2) “Viral” actions – a large number of people can be perpetrators and/or observers of a given attack; (3) Victim response – the perpetrator may not realize the harm caused due to the physical separation from the victim; and (4) Adult intervention – while adults are becoming more vigilant about this issue, most are not savvy enough with technology to keep track of what youth are doing online (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010). Since popular culture and social networks are so intertwined with young people’s daily lives, it has been recommended that policies and interventions should work with modern methods and technology instead of trying to fight them (Shariff, 2004).

It must be further added that cyber-bullying has largely eliminated the time and space boundaries of “traditional” bullying (i.e., cyber-bullying can occur anywhere and anytime technology exists, including in what used to be the sanctity of the home). According to the U.S. Department of Education, 4% of students reported having been cyber-bullied during the 2007-2008 school year, and of those students, 26% indicated it had occurred more than just once or twice during the time period (Robers, Zhang, Truman, & Snyder, 2011). Recent studies have shown that cyber-bullying can result in emotional distress, depression, anxiety, substance use, and suicidality (Beran & Li, 2007; Goebert, Else, Matsu, Chung-Do, & Chang, 2010; Ybarra, Mitchell, Wolak, & Finkelhor, 2006). However, programs and policies have struggled to come up novel means to
educate and police the responsible use of technology (Goebert, Else, Matsu, Chung-Do, & Chang, 2010).

**Bullying in the State of Hawai‘i**

Bullying is a major issue in Hawai‘i, with the impact of cyber-bullying also growing rapidly. According to the 2009 Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), 51.2% of Hawai‘i high school students and 63.3% of middle school students strongly agreed or agreed that harassment and bullying by other students was a problem in their school (University of Hawai‘i Curriculum Research and Development Group [UHCRDG], 2010). Victimization from cyber-bullying has increased from 23.8% in 2007 to 31.8% in 2009 among high school students (UHCRDG, 2010). The Hawai‘i State Department of Education’s (HSDOE’s) annual School Quality Survey measures a number of dimensions, including student support, school involvement, safety, and overall satisfaction. In 2009, 69.3% of elementary school students reported they felt safe in school, compared to only 49.6% of middle school students and 45.7% of high school students (HSDOE, 2009).

One study conducted with Hawai‘i middle school students found 33% of girls and 20% of boys reported being a cyber-victim or perpetrator in the past year (Mark & Ratliffe, 2011). However, higher rates were found for Hawai‘i high school students. A study conducted by the Asian/Pacific Islander Youth Violence Prevention Center (APIYVPC) was among the first in Hawai‘i to directly measure cyber-bullying and its correlates (Goebert, Else, Matsu, Chung-Do, & Chang, 2010). In a study of 881 students from two high schools in Hawai‘i, more than 1 in 2 (56.1%) had been victims of cyber-
bullying in the last year. Filipino and Samoan youth were more likely to report feeling badly about themselves as a result of cyber-bullying. The study also found the following results of cyber-bullying: (1) an increased likelihood of substance use, with binge drinking and marijuana use both approximately 2.5 times more likely to occur in those who were cyber-bullied, compared to those who were not; (2) an increased likelihood of depression by almost 2 times; and (3) increased suicide attempts by 3.2 times for females and 4.5 times for males.

**Policy as Part of a Comprehensive and Multi-Faceted Solution**

The complex nature of youth violence and bullying has led major health agencies, such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and World Health Organization (WHO), to call for a comprehensive approach addressing youth violence. This approach integrates complementary programs and interventions within a social ecological context and promotes sustainable community-wide impact (Thornton, Craft, Dahlberg, Lynch, & Baer, 2002; World Health Organization [WHO], 2002). The literature also confirms the effectiveness of a comprehensive and multi-faceted approach (Goebert, et al., 2012; Hishinuma, et al., 2009; Umemoto, et al., 2009). In particular, policy changes are important aspects of a comprehensive approach to youth violence prevention, but are often overlooked components, secondary products, or missing completely (Limbos et al., 2007; U.S. DHHS, 2001). Policy may be defined as legislative or regulatory action taken by federal, state, city, or local governments, government agencies, or non-governmental organizations such as schools or
corporations. It provides an organizing structure and guidance for individual and collective behavior changes to improve public health.

Certainly there is reason for the lack of policy interventions, as interventions that focus on the intra- and interpersonal levels tend to have more immediate and direct influence on an individual’s behavior. Also, while it is easy to acknowledge the need to incorporate the societal level of the social ecological model to achieve maximum impact, it is difficult to strategically integrate these various dimensions and the linkages among them into an encompassing action agenda. However, narrow interventions that do not consider policy/systems approaches will miss valuable opportunities to have broad-reaching impact across communities (Szapocznik & Coatsworth, 1999). The following policy recommendations have been offered by leading researchers in the field of youth violence prevention: (1) apply a social ecological approach; (2) utilize a positive youth development and restorative approach; (3) develop culturally based interventions; (4) build capacity for youth-serving organizations; (5) develop and strengthen collaborations; (6) institute juvenile justice reforms; and (7) encourage research that disaggregates ethnic groups and gives greater consideration to community perspectives (Umemoto & Hishinuma, 2011).

**Policy and Public Health Evidence**

Over the past several decades, the importance of “evidence-based” strategies has been growing among public health practitioners. At the most basic level, public health evidence can be defined as: “…some form of data – including epidemiologic (quantitative) data, results of program or policy evaluations, and qualitative data – to use
in making judgments or decisions” (Chambers & Kerner, 2007, p. 1). There are multiple sources of public health evidence, including the scientific literature, surveillance data, program evaluations, community and other stakeholder data, media/marketing data, word-of-mouth, and personal experience (Chambers & Kerner, 2007). It has been widely recommended that public health evidence should always be incorporated in the selection and implementation of programs, policies, and evaluation plans (Brownson, Gurney & Land, 1999). For example, data and evidence permeate all four steps of CDC’s public health approach to prevention: 1) Describe the problem and perform surveillance; 2) Identify causes and risk/protective factors; 3) Develop, implement, and evaluate prevention strategies, and 4) Disseminate and ensure widespread adoption (Mercy, Rosenberg, Powell, Broome, & Roper, 1993).

Translational research is the sequence of events in which a proven scientific discovery is successfully institutionalized into established practice and policy. In public health, the use of translational approaches have gained momentum in order to attain the greatest level of impact by applying sound evidence to the design of interventions (Type 1 translation), as well as expanding high-quality, real-world implementation of evidence-based interventions into widespread practice (Type 2 translation) (Spoth, 2008). The use of such approaches has been adopted particularly in areas such as youth/adolescent development and risky behaviors, given the complex and multi-dimensional nature of these subjects (Bell, Allen, Hogan, & Martinez, 2008).

However, challenges remain that impede translational research and actions, particularly in youth violence prevention. For example, many effective violence
prevention interventions have been identified, but few have gained wide community acceptance, and little is known about the best ways to encourage their broader use (Spoth, 2008). In addition, the broader challenge that remains is how to efficiently and effectively translate public health evidence not only to individual- and community-level interventions, but also societal-level interventions such as public policy. To make an impact on youth violence from a systems and policy perspective, public health evidence must be generated, policies must be grounded in the evidence, interventions must be implemented as designed, and evaluation findings must be disseminated broadly.

**Emergence of Anti-Bullying Policies**

Bullying prevention policies have become widespread at the school level, although no standard policy exists. There is general agreement among both the education and policymaking communities on the importance of having an effective, school-wide, anti-bullying policy (Swearer, Limber, & Alley, 2009). Samara and Smith’s study (2008) found that whole school policies can be very effective when combined with other supportive efforts, such as in-class curricula, peer mediation programs, and playground redesign to ensure all areas accessible to children are in view of an adult. Having an anti-bullying policy signals that the school, its administration, and its teachers and staff are serious and dedicated to deal with and reduce bullying (Smith, Smith, Osborn, & Samara, 2008). However, experts in policymaking have recommended that a daunting task such as school safety should not be left up to individual schools or districts, but instead should be standardized for an entire state (Srabstein, Berkman, & Pyntikova, 2008).
There has also been an increased feeling of urgency around the need for bullying prevention policies and laws at local and state legislative levels (Srabstein, Berkman, & Pyntikova, 2008). This gradually intensifying focus has been attributed to factors such as high-profile school violence events, a number of highly visible suicides among youth that were linked to bullying in media reports, and the expansion of empirical evidence describing the severe and long-term consequences of bullying behavior (Stuart-Cassel, Bell, & Springer, 2011). This increased legislative attention is evidenced by the number of states and countries that have passed anti-bullying laws over the past two decades, as well as the increase in the number of court cases filed that are seeking legal remedies for victimized students (Greene & Ross, 2005). In 1999, none of the states in the US had any laws specific to school bullying (Snyder, 2010). Today, there are 49 states with bullying prevention legislation (U.S. DHHS, 2013). This urgency often has come not from legislators, but from school and community concern for the welfare of bullying victims and the climate of school campuses (Stuart-Cassel, Bell, & Springer, 2011).

There is also a growing trend among policymakers to hold youth accountable for their behavior, including bullying, using criminal repercussions (Shariff, 2004). Tragic incidents such as the Columbine High School shooting in Littleton, Colorado have pushed educators and legislators to respond with increased safety measures and punitive policies (Theriot, 2009). At the US federal level in November 2008, the adult whose cyber-bullying led to the 2006 suicide of a 13-year-old girl was found guilty of a misdemeanor under the federal Computer Fraud and Abuse Act for gaining online “unauthorized access” (Cheng, 2008). Criminalization has also made its way onto school
campuses. However, findings are far from conclusive on whether or not punitive school measures, such as the use of metal detectors and increasing police presence on campus, are effective (Brown, 2005). Schools have also employed the use of zero tolerance policies as means for schools to immediately banish students that do not conform to organizational norms of appropriate behavior (DiGiulio, 2001). Such swift and punitive policies have become a wall of defense against litigation, and are often driven by schools’ lack of knowledge and clarity of legal boundaries of their responsibilities to students (Shariff, 2004).

**Status of Anti-Bullying Policies**

There have been several reviews of anti-bullying legislation in the US, each of which categorized and assessed policies using different criteria. In 2003, Limber and Small (2003) conducted a policy review of the 15 states that, by that year, had passed laws addressing bullying among school children. The authors commented that the major predictors of the effectiveness of an anti-bullying law are: 1) the care with which the law is written, including consistency with relevant research; and 2) how effectively the law influences school-level policies and interventions. The purpose of their study was to review the content of existing legislation, and determine the presence or absence and nature of the following components: 1) definition of bullying; 2) legislative findings about bullying (i.e., conclusions reached by the legislature that justify taking action); and 3) statutory directives such as programs, training, reporting, disciplinary procedures, protection of victims, and improvement of communication among staff and students. Limber and Smith found that the 15 states varied widely in their approaches to anti-
bullying legislation, and offered recommendations to policymakers which mirrored the review criteria employed for the study. One of the authors’ recommendations to state legislators was to, “Recommend (but do not require) that such policies [of local schools or school boards] promote adoption of research-based comprehensive bullying prevention programs” (Limber & Small, 2003, p. 454).

Srabstein, Berkman, and Pyntikova (2008) conducted a review of anti-bullying legislation enacted through June 2007. Their review was framed from a public health perspective, and rated policies based on the Anti-Bullying Public Health Policy Criteria Index, which the authors devised based on the core functions of public health (assessment, policy development, and assurance). Srabstein and colleagues found that, of the 35 state laws reviewed, only 16 had enacted policies that incorporated basic public health anti-bullying principles. Of the recommendations discussed, one point emphasized was the collaboration between policymakers and public health officials. Specifically, public health officials should help to promote community understanding of the impacts of bullying, provide guidelines for identification of bullying and its effects, and offer periodic assessments of bullying prevalence and correlates. The authors specifically suggested that the periodic assessments could be done by adding bullying-related questions to existing surveillance programs, such as the Youth Risk Behavior Survey.

A study commissioned by the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) was the most recent to conduct a comprehensive, large-scale policy analysis of anti-bullying legislation in the US (Stuart-Cassel, Bell, & Springer, 2011). Legislation from all 50 states were reviewed against 11 key criteria for any state anti-bullying legislation that
aims to address the issue in the school setting: 1) purpose statement that outlines bullying as a problem; 2) statement of scope that the policy covers any school-related location/event; 3) specific description of prohibited behavior; 4) examples of groups that may be targeted; 5) directive/instructions for local implementation of the legislation; 6) provision for regular review of local policies; 7) directive/instructions for development of district-/school-level policies; 8) mechanism of communication with students and parents; 9) provision for districts to provide training to all school staff; 10) provision for districts to regularly monitor and report incidents; and 11) statement that the policy does not preclude victims from also pursuing other legal remedies (USDOE, 2010). Policies were given a score for each of the 11 components – “0” if the item was missing or minimally expansive; “1” if the item existed but was moderate or limited; and “2” if the item was progressive, specific, and/or extensive. The USDOE identified these 11 recommendations based on previous reviews, including the two studies discussed above, as well as a review of existing state legislation (the component was present in at least two current state statutes). Similar to previous reviews, the USDOE’s 2011 policy analysis found significant variation among states, with only two states addressing all 11 key components. The USDOE reports are part of the Department’s efforts to provide technical assistance for those stakeholders looking to develop or revise anti-bullying legislation or policies, and to standardize language and components across states.

All of the above reviews lend valuable insight to the status of anti-bullying legislation in the US, as well as pose comprehensive recommendations for policymakers to consider. However, gaps still remain in the continuum from empirical evidence to
policymaking recommendations decisions. Srabstein and colleagues’ analysis was the closest to connecting empirical evidence (core public health principals) with policy recommendations. The USDOE report offered suggestions on how key components could be communicated to policymakers (e.g., providing a template letter for states to adapt). A disconnect still remains in how “research to practice,” specifically policy, can be a normalized and systematic process as opposed to one that occurs infrequently due to the many barriers discussed earlier. In addition, all three reviews identified but did not discuss another disconnect that remains – the translation of policy decisions to implementation, the collection of evidence on fidelity and impact implementation, and re-evaluation of the original policy if needed.

**Kingdon’s Three Streams Framework**

Kingdon’s landmark work on agenda setting and policy formation serves as the foundation for the conceptual framework of this dissertation study. Kingdon’s most widely recognized concept is his “three streams” framework (see Figure 1.1) for the three processes of policymaking: 1) problems emerge as a result of a crisis/event or changes in some type of data indicator; 2) policy proposals/alternatives develop as a result of gradual accumulation of knowledge and perspectives on the specific problem; and 3) political events occur that may influence the overall climate, such as changes of administration or swings in public opinion (Kingdon, 2011). These three streams, along with the various stakeholders that participate in the policymaking process, float around in what Kingdon coins the policy “primeval soup.”
Policy action occurs when the three separate streams of the process become aligned; that is, a problem is recognized, a solution is developed and becomes available in the community, and a political change occurs that facilitates policy change despite barriers. Kingdon (2011) describes this type of occurrence as a policy window. Such windows can open for a variety of reasons, such as a change in political administration, a shift in the partisan distribution of seats in the legislative body, a shift in the national mood, the attention of policymakers is captured by a particular topic, or a specific event/crisis occurs. Typically, these policy windows do not remain open very long, since the changes that can open a window can just as easily close it (e.g., a proposed policy fails and so momentum slows, the event/crisis passes, people in key positions change).
Alignment of the three streams of policymaking has, in a sense, already been realized in bullying prevention. This is evidenced by the number of states that have successfully passed anti-bullying legislation. Bullying has been identified as a public health issue by individual states and national agencies, policy alternatives are available (the majority of which address bullying at the school level), and the political climate is amenable to such changes. However, the task now is to strengthen existing policies by:
1) informing state policies using state-specific evidence; 2) summarizing and synthesizing the policy implications of empirically based studies on bullying; and 3) facilitating the translation of these two forms of evidence into policymaking decisions so that the resulting policies are both evidence-based and specific to a state’s local context.

**Framework of Dissertation Study**

This dissertation research addressed the three action steps above, with each step addressing one of Kingdon’s three streams. By considering these steps together in three complementary studies, this dissertation research begins to unfold the issue of translating evidence to practice, and align the three streams of policymaking to better address bullying prevention at the policy level.

The conceptual model that follows is a visual representation of the three studies of this dissertation research. As stated previously, Kingdon’s three streams of policymaking – “the problem” in Study #1 (green box), “the policies” in Study #2 (purple box), and “the politics” (orange box) – will be examined and applied to the context of bullying prevention policymaking in Hawai‘i. The final four boxes (in blue) represent events that would follow the three streams processes – implementation of policies and evaluation of
policy impact – that may be addressed in future studies subsequent to this dissertation research.

**Conceptual Model:** Translating evidence to policy to address bullying and youth violence among youth in Hawai‘i: Aligning the “three streams” of policymaking

**Figure 1.2. Conceptual model for this dissertation study.**

The following research questions and aims were addressed:

**Study #1 – The Problem – Prevalence and Correlates of Youth Violence and Bullying among High School Students in Hawai‘i**

This study addressed the first of Kingdon’s “three streams” of policymaking – the problem. Kingdon (2011) suggests three primary mechanisms by which policymakers obtain information to determine that an issue is worth consideration: 1) data indicators, 2) focusing events and crises, and 3) constituent feedback. This study describes youth
violence and bullying as a public health problem using the Hawai‘i YRBS as a data indicator.

- Research Question #1: What is the extent and context of bullying and violence among youth in Hawai‘i?
- Aims
  - Aim #1: Determine the scope of youth violence and bullying among high school youth in Hawai‘i, and how they differ by ethnicity, gender, and grade; and
  - Aim #2: Identify risk and protective factors associated with youth violence and bullying behaviors among high school youth in Hawai‘i.

Study #2 – The Policies – Examining the Content, Process, and Outcomes of Bullying and Youth Violence Prevention Policies

This study addressed Kingdon’s second stream of policymaking – the policies (or policy alternatives). Kingdon (2011) discusses the misconception that public policy can be understood solely in terms of politics, that is, with concepts such as power, influence, pressure, and strategy. Instead, the content of the ideas created in various policy communities are integral components of policy decision-making in and around government. This study reviewed the scientific literature and examined implications and recommendations that have resulted from empirical evaluations of bullying and youth violence policies.
• Research Question #2: What are the evidence-based policy recommendations for bullying and youth violence prevention?

• Method: Systematic literature review.

• Aim: Summarize and synthesize recommendations from evaluations of bullying and youth violence policies, using the scientific literature.

Study #3 – The Politics – Perspectives on the Process of Evidence-Based Policymaking in the Context of Bullying Prevention

This study utilized Kingdon’s (2011) third stream of the policymaking process – politics and the political process – to examine a multitude of factors that can influence the political stream. To take the three-streams alignment one step further, this study revisited Kingdon’s first two streams – problems and policies – and examined them as inputs into the political process.

• Research Question #3: What factors affect the experiences of constituents and legislators in the policymaking process, with respect to decision-making?

• Method: Qualitative methods, including key informant interviews and case study of bullying prevention legislation within the State of Hawai‘i policymaking process.

• Aim: To examine factors that influence the process of translating public health evidence to policymaking, and contrast the perspectives of organizational professionals and legislators, using the experience of the State of Hawai‘i.
CHAPTER 2

PREVALENCE AND CORRELATES OF YOUTH VIOLENCE AND BULLYING AMONG HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN HAWAI‘I

Abstract

Youth violence and bullying are serious public health issues. More detailed information on risk and protective factors for youth violence and bullying can help inform program and policy interventions. This study examined ethnic, gender, and grade differences of the ten youth violence and bullying behaviors included in the 2011 Hawai‘i High School Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS). Overall, 49.7% of students \((n = 4,329;\) weighted frequency = 44,251) indicated they had engaged in at least one of the ten violence behaviors. In general, boys reported a higher prevalence of carrying weapons and fighting, and girls reported a higher prevalence of being victimized. Other Asians (excluding Japanese and Filipinos) consistently had the lowest prevalences, while Mixed Non-Hawaiians, Other Pacific Islanders, and those in the “other” ethnic group category tended to have the highest. However, significant interaction effects indicated a more complex relationship. In addition, factor analysis was performed to examine the underlying constructs of the ten bullying and youth violence behaviors. The violence items and factors were correlated with other risk-protective behaviors in order to determine possible associations. Findings highlight the (1) importance of considering the different contexts of violent behavior, including gender and grade level; and (2) potential
for achieving greater impact on overall youth well-being by linking violence prevention
with interventions for other risk behaviors such as suicidality and substance abuse. These
findings not only provide a clearer landscape of youth violence and bullying in Hawai‘i,
but also add context to youth experiences to better inform program and policy design and
implementation.
Introduction

Youth Violence and Bullying

Youth violence is a concerning public health problem. Bullying is a form of youth violence, and one that can result in physical injury, social and emotional distress, and even death (CDC, 2011). Attention has been given to this issue both at the national (e.g., Shepherd, 2011) and local (e.g., Vorsino, 2011) levels. Bullying has been defined in different ways, but the three main commonalities among definitions of bullying include: (1) aggressive behavior, 2) a pattern over time, and 3) an imbalance of power and/or strength. According to the National Youth Violence Prevention Resource Center (NYVPRC), approximately 30% of youth in the US are involved in bullying, as either a perpetrator, a victim, or both (NYVPRC, 2007).

A variety of risk and protective factors associated with bullying have been posited in the scientific literature. Being victimized by bullying has been associated with increased risk of mental health issues, including suicidality (Meltzer, Vostanis, Ford, Bebbington, & Dennis, 2011). Substance use has also been demonstrated as a risk factor for bullying among both middle and high school students (Goebert, Else, Matsu, Chung-Do, & Chang, 2010; Radliff, Wheaton, Robinson, & Morris, 2012). Social support, including school engagement and positive adult role models, has been offered as a strong protective factor (Seeley, Tombari, Bennett, & Dunkle 2011). Examining associated risk and protective factors for youth violence and bullying can increase our understanding of who is at risk, as well ways to shape programs and policies to reduce risk and strengthen protections.
Youth violence is experienced disproportionately by subgroups within the U.S. adolescent population. Studies have reported African Americans, Native Americans, and Hispanics at highest risk, and European Americans and Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders (AAPIs) at lowest risk (Lauritsen, 2003; Snyder & Sickmund, 1999; Snyder & Sickmund, 2006; U.S. DHHS, 2001). However, the field lacks studies that further disaggregate ethnicity when examining youth. These types of investigations are critical, since significant differences exist among AAPI adolescents. For example, Hishinuma and colleagues (2005) reported that youth of Hawaiian ancestry showed a 3.8-fold higher rate of misconduct, compared to Japanese youth. In another study, Filipino, Samoan, and Hawaiian adolescents reported higher levels of dating emotional-psychological abuse than Japanese youth (Choi-Misailidis, Hishinuma, Nishimura, & Chesney-Lind, 2008).

**The Youth Risk Behavior Survey**

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC’s) Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) is a widely cited and commonly referenced data source for examining youth issues in public health. The survey was first administered nationally in the spring of 1990, and serves to heighten awareness of specific behaviors among youth that cause significant health problems (Kolbe, Kann, & Collins, 1993). More importantly, the YRBS serves as a tool to see whether different groups are more “at-risk” than others, as well as to determine whether there are changes in risk over time. The YRBS monitors six major categories of health risk behaviors, including youth violence (Eaton et al., 2008).

Currently, the YRBS is the only nationally representative survey that directly asks youth about their perception of and experiences with youth violence (e.g., fighting,
violence involving weapons, feeling unsafe at school). However, questions relating to bullying have only been included in recent years. Prior to 2009, the question, “During the past 30 days, on how many days did you not go to school because you felt you would be unsafe at school or on your way to or from school?” was used as a proxy to assess students’ perception of bullying and harassment. Beginning with the 2009 survey, a more direct question, “In the past 12 months, have you ever been bullied on school property?” was added to the national survey.

In Hawai‘i, as in other states, available data on youth violence and bullying are limited and thus there is a strong reliance on local findings from the YRBS. Administration of the YRBS is a joint effort among the Hawai‘i State Department of Education, the Hawai‘i State Department of Health, and the University of Hawai‘i. Hawai‘i’s high schools have participated in the YRBS since 1991, with middle schools joining in 1997 (Saka, 2008). The State of Hawai‘i is an ideal environment to conduct rigorous, public health research, particularly because of its diverse population. Based on Census 2010, the total population of 1.36 million is ethnically diverse with no majority: Native Hawaiians (32%, including those of mixed ancestry), Japanese (14%), Caucasians (25%), Filipino (15%), Chinese (4%) and people of other Asian and Pacific Islander populations (11%, excluding those of more than one race) (Hawai‘i State Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism, 2011). Native Hawaiians are the indigenous people of the islands. Being an island state with a relatively large Honolulu metropolis on the island of O‘ahu, Hawai‘i also offers urban, suburban, and remote rural residences/geographies.
The Importance of Data in Programming and Policymaking

Data indicators, which include any source of systematically gathered information, are essential for informed decision-making around program and policy planning. Kingdon (2011) comments that indicators are not typically used to determine if an issue is in fact a problem, but rather to determine the magnitude and assess changes in the problem. However, due to limited resources and capacity to conduct data management and analyses, publically available data on youth violence and bullying are typically presented as single-item prevalences. It is important to determine not only the overall prevalence of these behaviors, but also to examine them against demographic information such as ethnicity, gender, and grade, particularly when ethnic groups are disaggregated further than is done conventionally.

Also, to better inform decision-making with regards to interventions and policy, it is necessary to ascertain not only the extent of the problem, but also associated factors that can be acted upon. Given its diversity of topics, the YRBS can be used as a tool to identify other health behaviors that may be associated with increases or decreased risk of youth violence/bullying attitudes and behaviors. In addition, the use of factor analysis of multiple items within a survey such as the YRBS can benefit our understanding of youth violence and bullying, as well as their relationships with other risk and protective behaviors.

Purpose of This Study

This study used Hawai‘i YRBS data to describe youth violence and bullying as a public health problem, as well as to add context to youth experiences. The research
question was: “What is the extent and context of bullying and violence among youth in Hawai‘i?” The study’s specific aims included:

1) Determine the scope of youth violence and bullying among high school youth in Hawai‘i, and how they differ by ethnicity, gender, and grade; and

2) Identify risk and protective factors associated with youth violence and bullying behaviors among high school youth in Hawai‘i.

Methods

Study Sample

Data from the 2011 Hawai‘i YRBS were analyzed. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was obtained from the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. Since 2001, the Hawai‘i YRBS has been administered to participating public high school students in odd-numbered years. All students participate voluntarily after written parental consent is obtained, and surveys are self-administered by a school-level proctor (Saka, 2008). Survey procedures ensure anonymity of student participants.

With respect to ethnicity, the Hawai‘i YRBS allows participants to select all applicable responses to the question, “What is your race?” Any student which marked “Native Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian” was classified as Native Hawaiian. Next, any non-Native Hawaiian student which marked more than one response was classified as Mixed Non-Hawaiian. Finally, the remaining participants were classified according to their response – Japanese, White, Other Pacific Islander, Other Asian, and other (comprised of American Indian/Alaska Natives, Black/African Americans, and Hispanic/Latinos, which were clustered together due to small sample sizes).
Measures

The 2011 Hawai‘i YRBS contained ten questions related to youth violence and bullying. If the respondent had engaged in the behavior described, they were asked either to specify the number of occasions (Items 1 through 6), or simply indicate “yes” (Items 7 through 10).

1) During the past 30 days, on how many days did you carry a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club? [Response choices – 0 days, 1 day, 2 or 3 days, 4 or 5 days, 6 or more days]

2) During the past 30 days, on how many days did you carry a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property? [Response choices – 0 days, 1 day, 2 or 3 days, 4 or 5 days, 6 or more days]

3) During the past 30 days, on how many days did you not go to school because you felt you would be unsafe at school or on your way to or from school? [Response choices – 0 days, 1 day, 2 or 3 days, 4 or 5 days, 6 or more days]

4) During the past 12 months, how many times has someone threatened or injured you with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property? [Response choices – 0 times, 1 time, 2 or 3 times, 4 or 5 times, 6 or 7 times, 8 or 9 times, 10 or 11 times, 12 or more times]

5) During the past 12 months, how many times were you in a physical fight? [Response choices – 0 times, 1 time, 2 or 3 times, 4 or 5 times, 6 or 7 times, 8 or 9 times, 10 or 11 times, 12 or more times]
6) During the past 12 months, how many times were you in a physical fight on school property? [Response choices – 0 times, 1 time, 2 or 3 times, 4 or 5 times, 6 or 7 times, 8 or 9 times, 10 or 11 times, 12 or more times]

7) During the past 12 months, have you ever been bullied on school property? [Response choices – yes or no]

8) During the past 12 months, have you ever been electronically bullied? [Response choices – yes or no]

9) During the past 12 months, did your boyfriend or girlfriend ever hit, slap, or physically hurt you on purpose? [Response choices – yes or no]

10) Have you ever been physically forced to have sexual intercourse when you did not want to? [Response choices – yes or no]

From these responses, an additional variable called “Any violence” was calculated as follows: “0” = none of the ten items were endorsed, and “1” = at least one item was endorsed.

Table 2.1 lists the items of the other risk-protective health behaviors that were examined in relation to the youth violence behaviors. Items are listed by health behavior category: 1) mental health status, 2) substance use, and 3) social support/role models. Response options were similar to those of the violence items above.
### Table 2.1. Risk-protective behaviors examined in relation to youth violence behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Indicator</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Risk</td>
<td>During the past 12 months, did you ever feel so sad or hopeless almost every day for two weeks or more in a row that you stopped doing some usual activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the past 12 months, did you ever seriously consider attempting suicide?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the past 12 months, did you make a plan about how you would attempt suicide?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the past 12 months, how many times did you actually attempt suicide?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarettes - past 30 days</td>
<td>During the past 30 days, on how many days did you smoke cigarettes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol - past 30 days</td>
<td>During the past 30 days, on how many days did you have at least one drink of alcohol?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana - past 30 days</td>
<td>During the past 30 days, how many times did you use marijuana?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine - lifetime use</td>
<td>During your life, how many times have you used any form of cocaine, including powder, crack, or freebase?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meth - lifetime use</td>
<td>During your life, how many times have you used methamphetamines (also called speed, crystal, crank, or ice)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecstasy - lifetime use</td>
<td>During your life, how many times have you used ecstasy (also called MDMA)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhalants - lifetime use</td>
<td>During your life, how many times have you sniffed glue, breathed the contents of aerosol spray cans, or inhaled any paints or sprays to get high?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptions - lifetime use</td>
<td>During the past 30 days, how many times have you taken a prescription drug such as OxyContin, Vicodin, tranquilizers, Valium, Xanax, and Ritalin without a doctor's prescription?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.1. (Continued)  Risk-protective behaviors examined in relation to youth violence behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Indicator</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Support/Role Models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusted adult - out of school</td>
<td>Outside of school, is there an adult you can talk to about things that are important to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusted adult - in school</td>
<td>Is there at least one teacher or other adult in this school that you can talk to if you have a problem?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future outlook</td>
<td>How likely is it that you will complete a post high school program such as a vocational training program, military service, community college, or 4-year college?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analyses

The majority of data cleaning and analyses were conducted using the SAS statistical package (Version 9.2). Statistical weights were used to increase representativeness of results. A two-stage, stratified random sampling procedure is conducted to produce the sample of students whose responses appear in the final datasets (Saka, 2008).

First, prevalences and 95% confidence intervals were computed for the ten items and “any violence.” To calculate prevalence, responses were re-coded as follows: “0 times” and “0 days” were re-coded as “0,” and non-zero responses were re-coded as “1.” Logistic regressions were performed to determine overall differences between or among the prevalences as a function of demographic variables. When the overall test was statistically significant, bivariate logistic regressions determined pair-wise differences. Given the large sample size, number of tests and comparisons, and number of items examined, alpha was set at <.0001 and the maximum coefficient of determination ($R^2$, i.e., variability of dependent variable accounted for by independent variable) needed to be greater than .01. The alpha value was confirmed as appropriate via Bonferroni correction (i.e., .05 divided by the number of tests conducted in the study), which is a method to counteract the issue of multiple comparisons. In addition, post-hoc power analysis (Cohen, 1988) confirmed that statistical power was not compromised by the stringent alpha level (power $\approx 1.00$ with effect size = .90), due to the large sample size.

Next, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to determine the underlying factor structure of the bullying and youth violence items. The software
MPlus (Version 7; Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2010) was used, given the availability of its multi-group-comparison feature and the capability to address the issue of missing scores which generally can weaken the overall sample size and increase bias in the sample. An item was deemed adequate for assignment to a particular factor with a factor loading of .40 or greater.

Means, 95% confidence intervals, and sample sizes of the factor scores were determined by ethnicity, sex, and grade. Because response choices varied among items, responses were dichotomized in order to calculate factor scores. Multiple linear regressions were performed to determine whether there were significant overall differences by ethnicity, sex, grade, and for every two- and three-way interaction (i.e., ethnicity by sex, ethnicity by grade, sex by grade, ethnicity by sex by grade) for each violence factor score and the overall mean. As above, alpha was set at <.0001 and the maximum $R^2$ (variance accounted) needed to be greater than .01.

Finally, linear regressions were performed to determine whether there were significant associations between the youth violence and bullying items and the risk-protective behaviors (from Table 2.1). Again, alpha was set at < .0001. Odds ratios were calculated for significant associations.

**Results**

**Sample Description**

Table 2.2 presents the sample description by ethnicity, sex, grade level, and age. The total sample size was 4,329 adolescents (weighted frequency = 44,251), but 969 were excluded from this analysis because they did not report ethnicity ($n = 101$ or 2.3%), sex
(n = 17 or 0.4%), grade (n = 54 or 1.2%), and/or age (n = 6 or 0.1%). The final sample included more girls than boys, and more 9th graders than other grades, but these differences were not statistically significant. The mean age of participants was 15.8 years. According to Eaton et al. (2008), the YRBS study sample is representative of high school students in the participating jurisdictions.

The study sample’s ethnic breakdown reflects the State’s diversity. Ethnic groups, from largest to smallest, included: Native Hawaiian (31.5%), Filipino (30.4%), Whites (16.1%), Other Asians (6.1%), Japanese (5.1%), Other Pacific Islanders (4.0%), Mixed Non-Hawaiians (3.6%), and other ethnicities (3.2%). The study sample was also examined at the subgroup (“interaction”) level. Overall, the Filipino and “Other” groups had more boys, whereas all other groups had more girls. The other interactions (ethnicity by grade, sex by grade) were not statistically significant.
# TABLE 2.2. Description of sample by ethnicity, sex, grade, and age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Weighted Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Weighted Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>5,022</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>6,451</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>11,547</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>6,487</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>5,483</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>11,970</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2,322</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>3,370</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2,731</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>6,107</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Weighted Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td>22,408</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>21,656</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2.2. (Continued) Description of sample by ethnicity, sex, grade, and age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Weighted Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>12,710</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Grade</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>11,159</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Grade</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>10,296</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Grade</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>9,616</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>44,251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m (in years)</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: Frequency Weighted Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Weighted Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,329</td>
<td>44,251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


bPercentage of entire sample.


dGrade: $\chi^2 [3, N = 44,251] = 47.7, p = .3873.$

Interactions:

- Ethnicity x Grade: $\chi^2 [21, N = 44,251] = 67.8, p = .3328.$
- Sex x Grade: $\chi^2 [3, N = 44,251] = 1.5, p = .9490.$
**Individual Violence Items**

Table 2.3 presents prevalences and 95% confidence intervals of the ten individual items and for “any violence” by ethnicity, sex, and grade. Overall, 49.7% of youths reported some indication of violence based on at least one of the ten situations. The item with the highest prevalence was Item 5 (“During the past 12 months, how many times were you in a physical fight?”) at 22.3%, closely followed by Item 7 (“During the past 12 months, have you ever been bullied on school property?”) at 20.3%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Carry weapon</th>
<th>Carry weapon in school</th>
<th>Felt unsafe</th>
<th>Threatened with weapon</th>
<th>Fight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6,081</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>9,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43,767</td>
<td>43,668</td>
<td>43,808</td>
<td>44,205</td>
<td>43,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>13.6-14.2</td>
<td>4.1-4.4</td>
<td>6.3-6.8</td>
<td>6.1-6.6</td>
<td>21.9-22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>3.4%</th>
<th>6.2%</th>
<th>8.1%</th>
<th>18.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino (FIL)</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>2,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,424</td>
<td>11,418</td>
<td>11,430</td>
<td>11,535</td>
<td>11,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>11.4-12.6</td>
<td>3.1-3.8</td>
<td>5.8-6.7</td>
<td>7.7-8.7</td>
<td>18.2-19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian (HAWN)</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>3,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,865</td>
<td>11,842</td>
<td>11,888</td>
<td>11,947</td>
<td>11,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>14.7-16.0</td>
<td>3.6-4.3</td>
<td>6.5-7.4</td>
<td>4.7-5.5</td>
<td>29.3-31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese (JPN)</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>1,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>9.4-12.2</td>
<td>2.7-4.4</td>
<td>1.4-2.7</td>
<td>2.7-4.3</td>
<td>11.1-14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (WH)</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>1,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,998</td>
<td>5,935</td>
<td>5,991</td>
<td>6,107</td>
<td>6,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>17.3-19.3</td>
<td>5.6-6.8</td>
<td>7.3-8.6</td>
<td>6.2-7.5</td>
<td>23.0-25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander (OPI)</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>13.0-16.5</td>
<td>7.7-10.6</td>
<td>13.5-17.1</td>
<td>6.9-9.6</td>
<td>29.0-33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian (OAN)</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>2,322</td>
<td>2,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>3.9-5.7</td>
<td>0.8-1.7</td>
<td>2.7-4.1</td>
<td>2.6-4.0</td>
<td>5.3-7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - not mixed (OTH)</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>18.3-22.9</td>
<td>6.9-10.0</td>
<td>6.7-9.8</td>
<td>11.3-15.1</td>
<td>25.3-30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Non-Hawaiian (MNH)</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>1,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>13.1-16.8</td>
<td>3.0-5.1</td>
<td>11.7-15.4</td>
<td>8.1-11.2</td>
<td>22.5-27.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2.3%</th>
<th>6.2%</th>
<th>6.2%</th>
<th>7.9%</th>
<th>27.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>3,828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,204</td>
<td>22,128</td>
<td>22,148</td>
<td>22,404</td>
<td>22,163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>7.4-8.1</td>
<td>2.1-2.5</td>
<td>6.4-7.1</td>
<td>4.4-5.0</td>
<td>16.8-17.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4,306</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>5,834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,413</td>
<td>21,387</td>
<td>21,504</td>
<td>21,617</td>
<td>21,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>19.6-20.7</td>
<td>5.8-6.5</td>
<td>5.9-6.6</td>
<td>7.6-8.3</td>
<td>26.9-28.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2.3. (Continued)  Weighted prevalence of individual violence items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Fight in school</th>
<th>Bullied in school</th>
<th>Cyberbullied</th>
<th>Dating violence</th>
<th>Sexual assault</th>
<th>Any violence&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% 8.1%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3,494</td>
<td>8,937</td>
<td>6,572</td>
<td>3,731</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td>21,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42,888</td>
<td>44,063</td>
<td>44,043</td>
<td>43,780</td>
<td>43,767</td>
<td>44,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>7.9-8.4</td>
<td>19.9-20.7</td>
<td>14.6-15.3</td>
<td>8.3-8.8</td>
<td>6.8-7.3</td>
<td>49.2-50.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethnicity<sup>b</sup>**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>20.4%</th>
<th>14.1%</th>
<th>9.4%</th>
<th>8.0%</th>
<th>53.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Filipino (FIL)</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2357</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,138</td>
<td>11,127</td>
<td>11,134</td>
<td>11,402</td>
<td>11,407</td>
<td>11,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>11,000-11,276</td>
<td>11,081-11,167</td>
<td>11,059-11,187</td>
<td>11,333-11,474</td>
<td>11,364-11,440</td>
<td>11,407-11,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese (JPN)</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>1,700-1,940</td>
<td>1,838-1,928</td>
<td>1,897-1,937</td>
<td>1,894-1,924</td>
<td>1,895-1,925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White (WH)</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>1,700-1,940</td>
<td>1,838-1,928</td>
<td>1,897-1,937</td>
<td>1,894-1,924</td>
<td>1,895-1,925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other - not mixed (OTH)</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>1,300-1,526</td>
<td>1,388-1,508</td>
<td>1,388-1,508</td>
<td>1,371-1,491</td>
<td>1,372-1,492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Asian (OAN)</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>1,300-1,526</td>
<td>1,388-1,508</td>
<td>1,388-1,508</td>
<td>1,371-1,491</td>
<td>1,372-1,492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>20.6%</th>
<th>18.8%</th>
<th>9.0%</th>
<th>9.8%</th>
<th>47.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>4,607</td>
<td>4,214</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>2,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,813</td>
<td>22,363</td>
<td>22,381</td>
<td>22,226</td>
<td>22,209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>12.0-12.1</td>
<td>12.5-12.6</td>
<td>12.6-12.7</td>
<td>12.6-12.7</td>
<td>12.6-12.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>4,312</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,940</td>
<td>21,575</td>
<td>21,539</td>
<td>21,410</td>
<td>21,458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>12.0-12.1</td>
<td>12.5-12.6</td>
<td>12.6-12.7</td>
<td>12.6-12.7</td>
<td>12.6-12.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2.3. (Continued) Weighted prevalence of individual violence items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carry weapon</td>
<td>Carry weapon in school</td>
<td>Felt unsafe</td>
<td>Threatened with weapon</td>
<td>Fight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>3,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,637</td>
<td>12,632</td>
<td>12,660</td>
<td>12,703</td>
<td>12,496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>16.1-17.4</td>
<td>5.2-6.0</td>
<td>8.3-9.3</td>
<td>8.6-9.6</td>
<td>25.1-26.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>2,618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,056</td>
<td>11,002</td>
<td>11,013</td>
<td>11,146</td>
<td>11,057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>9.7-10.8</td>
<td>2.3-2.9</td>
<td>4.7-5.5</td>
<td>5.2-6.1</td>
<td>22.9-24.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,010</td>
<td>10,081</td>
<td>10,198</td>
<td>10,295</td>
<td>10,067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>11.3-12.5</td>
<td>3.6-4.3</td>
<td>5.5-6.4</td>
<td>5.6-6.3</td>
<td>16.8-18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>1,955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,512</td>
<td>9,490</td>
<td>9,495</td>
<td>9,594</td>
<td>9,475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>15.2-16.7</td>
<td>3.9-4.7</td>
<td>5.4-6.3</td>
<td>5.0-5.9</td>
<td>19.8-21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Any violence (AV) was defined as individuals who reported violence for any of the 10 violence items.

*b* Statistically significant differences among ethnicities ($p < .0001$ and $R^2 \geq .01$):

- AV: OAN < JPN < FIL < HAWN, WH, OPI, OTH, MNH
- Item 1: OAN < MNH, OPI, FIL, JPN < HAWN < OTH, WH
- Item 2: OAN < FIL, JPN, HAON, MNH < WH < OTH, OPI
- Item 3: JPN, OAN < WH < FIL, HAON, OTH < MNH, OPI
- Item 4: WH < OAN, JPN < FIL, OTH < OPI, MNH < OTH
- Item 5: OAN < JPN < FIL < WH, MNH, OTH < HAON, OPI
- Item 6: OAN, JPN < FIL, MNH < WH, OTH < HAON, OPI
- Item 7: OAN, JPN, OPI < MNH, HAON, FIL < OTH, NH
- Item 8: OAN < OTH, WH, HAON < JPN, FIL, OTH < MNH
- Item 9: OAN, OPI < FIL, JPN, WH, HAON, MNH < OTH
- Item 10: JPN, OAN, FIL, OTH < HAON, OPI < WH, MNH

*c* Statistically significant differences between males and females: ($p < .0001$ and $R^2 \geq .01$): Items 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, and AV

*d* Statistically significant differences among grades: ($p < .0001$ and $R^2 \geq .01$): all Items, including AV

Statistically significant interactions ($p < .0001$ and $R^2 \geq .01$) were as follows:

- Ethnicity x Sex - Items 2, 3, and 8
- Ethnicity x Grade - Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, and 10
- Ethnicity x Sex x Grade - Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and AV
### TABLE 2.3. (Continued) Weighted prevalence of individual violence items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>Any violence&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>3,635</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>7,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,347</td>
<td>12,682</td>
<td>12,693</td>
<td>12,580</td>
<td>12,621</td>
<td>12,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>10.5-11.6</td>
<td>27.9-29.5</td>
<td>16.4-17.7</td>
<td>7.2-8.2</td>
<td>5.7-6.6</td>
<td>55.9-27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>5,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,911</td>
<td>11,142</td>
<td>11,139</td>
<td>11,097</td>
<td>11,111</td>
<td>11,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>7.4-8.4</td>
<td>19.3-20.8</td>
<td>14.7-16.0</td>
<td>6.0-6.9</td>
<td>5.5-6.4</td>
<td>47.4-49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,468</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>4,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,906</td>
<td>10,236</td>
<td>10,269</td>
<td>10,212</td>
<td>10,193</td>
<td>10,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>5.6-6.5</td>
<td>13.7-15.0</td>
<td>11.8-13.1</td>
<td>8.0-9.1</td>
<td>7.1-8.2</td>
<td>41.3-43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>4,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,296</td>
<td>9,574</td>
<td>9,521</td>
<td>9,459</td>
<td>9,447</td>
<td>9,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>5.8-6.8</td>
<td>15.0-16.4</td>
<td>13.4-14.8</td>
<td>10.6-11.8</td>
<td>8.5-9.7</td>
<td>47.7-49.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main effect of ethnicity was statistically significant for all outcomes. Pairwise comparisons revealed Other Pacific Islanders having the highest prevalences for four questions – Items 2 (carry weapon at school), 3 (felt unsafe), 5 (fighting), and 6 (fighting at school). The “Other” ethnic group was highest for three questions – Items 1 (carry weapon), 4 (threatened with weapon), and 9 (dating violence). Mixed Non-Hawaiians were highest for two questions – Items 8 (cyber-bullying), 10 (sexual assault) – as well as “any violence.” Whites were highest for one question – Item 8 (bullying). The remaining significant differences between ethnic groups are summarized in Table 2.3.

In terms of sex, boys reported higher prevalences of violence for five of the items (carrying weapons, carrying weapons at school, threatened with weapon, fighting, fighting at school) and for “any violence,” and girls reported higher prevalences for the remaining five items (felt unsafe, bullied in school, cyber-bullying, dating violence, sexual assault). Sex differences were statistically significant for Items 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, and any violence. When looking across grades, all items and “any violence” showed significant differences. Ninth graders consistently had the highest prevalences, except for Items 9 (dating violence) and 10 (sexual assault), which were highest for 12th graders. Tenth graders had the lowest prevalences for five of the items, and 11th graders had the lowest prevalence for the other five items and “any violence.”

Finally, the ethnicity by sex interaction effect was significant for Items 2 (carry weapon at school), 3 (feeling unsafe), and 8 (cyber-bullying). In other words, the differing violence prevalences among ethnic groups for these three items are dependent
upon a student’s sex. Other significant interaction effects included: 1) ethnicity by grade for Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, and 10; and 2) ethnicity by sex by grade for Items 1 through 8, and “any violence.”

Violence Factors

Exploratory factor analysis on the first random half of the sample \( (n = 2,165) \). Items 1 and 5 were not included in the factor analysis (the non-school versions of “carry weapon” and “fighting”), to eliminate items which introduced skip patterns. Results indicated a three-factor solution:

- **Factor 1 (“Youth Violence”**) = four items
  - Item 1 (carrying weapon) – 0.64 standardized factor loading
  - Item 2 (carrying weapon in school) – 0.60
  - Item 3 (felt unsafe) – 0.70
  - Item 4 (threatened with weapon) – 0.48

- **Factor 2 (“Bullying”)** = two items
  - Item 7 (bullying) – 0.72
  - Item 8 (cyber-bullying) – 0.79

- **Factor 3 (“Dating/Sexual Violence”)** = two items
  - Item 9 (dating violence) – 0.91
  - Item 10 (sexual assault) – 0.52

Cronbach alpha values for Factors 1-3 (.51, .57, .43, respectively) were adequate when taking into consideration the small number of items per factor. In addition, the chi-square test of model fit indicated appropriate goodness-of-fit (GFI). Confirmatory analysis for
the three-factor solution was conducted, using the remaining random half of the sample. A factor invariance test confirmed the determined factor structure was invariant across ethnic groups. 

Composite scores were computed as follows: Factor 1 (“Youth Violence”) was the mean of Items 1, 2, 3, and 4; Factor 2 (“Bullying”) was the mean of Items 7 and 8; Factor 3 (“Dating/Sexual Violence”) was the mean of Items 9 and 10; and overall score was the mean of Factors 1-3. Because response choices varied among items, responses were dichotomized in order to calculate factor scores.

Table 2.4 presents the means, 95% confidence intervals of the means, and weighted n sizes for each of the three factor scores and overall mean by sex, year, and ethnicity. The mean of Factor 1 (“Youth Violence”) of .066 indicates that on average, approximately 26% of respondents affirmed they had engaged in one of the four general youth violence behaviors. Looking at the other factors, 35% engaged in one of the two behaviors of Factor 2 (“Bullying”), and 16% engaged in one of two behaviors of Factor 3 (“Dating/Sexual Violence”).
TABLE 2.4. Weighted means of three factors by ethnicity, sex, and grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Weights</th>
<th>Factor 1a</th>
<th>Factor 2b</th>
<th>Factor 3b</th>
<th>Mean of All Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44,251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>.060 -.072</td>
<td>.160 -.192</td>
<td>.068 -.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicityb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino (FIL)</td>
<td>11,547</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>.046 -.069</td>
<td>.151 -.219</td>
<td>.047 -.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian (HAWN)</td>
<td>11,970</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese (JPN)</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>.017 -.044</td>
<td>.116 -.219</td>
<td>.037 -.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (WH)</td>
<td>6,107</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>.066 -.099</td>
<td>.158 -.207</td>
<td>.077 -.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander (OPI)</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>.094 -.157</td>
<td>.122 -.229</td>
<td>.048 -.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian (OAN)</td>
<td>2,322</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>.007 -.055</td>
<td>.092 -.165</td>
<td>.032 -.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - not mixed (OTH)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>.084 -.142</td>
<td>.115 -.221</td>
<td>.095 -.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Non-Hawaiian (MNH)</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>.062 -.103</td>
<td>.154 -.268</td>
<td>.058 -.149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2.4. (Continued) Weighted means of three factors by ethnicity, sex, and grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sum of Weights</th>
<th>Factor 1 (^a)</th>
<th>Factor 2 (^a)</th>
<th>Factor 3 (^a)</th>
<th>Mean of All Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22,408</td>
<td>Mean .052</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI .044 - .059</td>
<td>.174 - .220</td>
<td>.078 - .110</td>
<td>.102 - .128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21,656</td>
<td>Mean .078</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI .068 - .089</td>
<td>.139 - .171</td>
<td>.049 - .073</td>
<td>.089 - .110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade(^c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>12,710</td>
<td>Mean .087</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI .074 - .101</td>
<td>.207 - .251</td>
<td>.054 - .087</td>
<td>.116 - .143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>11,159</td>
<td>Mean .055</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI .045 - .065</td>
<td>.155 - .199</td>
<td>.051 - .073</td>
<td>.088 - .109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>10,296</td>
<td>Mean .053</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI .044 - .062</td>
<td>.112 - .158</td>
<td>.057 - .104</td>
<td>.075 - .107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>9,616</td>
<td>Mean .057</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI .049 - .066</td>
<td>.127 - .170</td>
<td>.084 - .118</td>
<td>.091 - .117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Cronbach alpha: Factor 1 = .51; Factor 2 = .57; Factor 3 = .43.

\(^b\)Ethnicity difference was statistically significant (\(p < .0001\) and \(R^2 \geq .01\)) for Factor 1 [WH, OPI > JPN, OAN]

\(^c\)Grade difference was statistically significant (\(p < .0001\) and \(R^2 \geq .01\)) for Factor 2 [9th Graders > 11th and 12th Graders]

Statistically significant interactions (\(p < .0001\) and \(R^2 \geq .01\)) were as follows:

Ethnicity x Grade, Factor 1
As with the individual items, boys self-reported higher means for Factor 1 (Youth Violence), and girls showed higher means for Factors 2 (Bullying), 3 (Dating/Sexual Violence), and the overall mean. However, none of the sex differences were statistically significant ($p < .0001$ and $R^2 \geq .01$). With respect to grade, 9th graders had the highest mean for Factors 1 (Youth Violence), 2 (Bullying), and the overall mean, and 12th graders showed the highest mean for Factor 3 (Dating/Sexual Violence). The 9th grade mean was significantly higher than that of the 11th and 12th graders for Factor 2 (Bullying).

Ethnicity was a statistically significant main effect for Factor 1 (Youth Violence). As with the individual prevalences, Other Pacific Islanders showed the highest means for Factor 1 (Youth Violence), Mixed Non-Hawaiians were highest for Factor 2 (Bullying), and the “Other” group was highest for Factor 3 (Dating/Sexual Violence) and the overall mean. For all four factors, the “Other Asian” group showed the lowest means compared to the other groups.

All two-way interactions (i.e., ethnicity by sex, ethnicity by grade, sex by grade) were examined. The ethnicity by grade interaction was statistically significant ($p < .0001$ and $R^2 \geq .01$) for Factor 1 (Youth Violence). In other words, the differing violence rates among ethnic groups for this factor are dependent upon both a student’s grade level. The three-way interaction (i.e., ethnicity by sex by grade) was not significant.

**Risk-Protective Factors**

Finally, linear regressions were conducted to examine associations between the three violence factors and the risk-protective factors (see Table 2.5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1 Youth Violence</th>
<th>Factor 2 Bullying</th>
<th>Factor 3 Dating/Sexual Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carry weapon at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>4.7-13.9</td>
<td>1.7-5.0</td>
<td>3.4-12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>43,404</td>
<td>43,564</td>
<td>43,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt unsafe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>11.2-22.7</td>
<td>3.4-6.6</td>
<td>3.2-8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>43,803</td>
<td>43,565</td>
<td>43,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened with weapon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>3.8-8.8</td>
<td>4.1-9.2</td>
<td>3.2-7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>42,868</td>
<td>44,010</td>
<td>44,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>2.4-4.4</td>
<td>1.8-3.4</td>
<td>3.2-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>42,851</td>
<td>42,794</td>
<td>42,535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Youth Violence and Bullying**

**Factor 1**

- Youth Violence
  - Odds ratio: 8.1
  - 95% CI: 4.7-13.9
  - p: < .0001
  - Association: Positive
  - Sum of weights: 43,404

- Bullying
  - Odds ratio: 10.8
  - 95% CI: 6.8-16.7
  - p: < .0001
  - Association: Positive
  - Sum of weights: 43,660

- Dating/Sexual Violence
  - Odds ratio: 5.9
  - 95% CI: 3.1-11.6
  - p: < .0001
  - Association: Positive
  - Sum of weights: 42,461

**Factor 2**

- Youth Violence
  - Odds ratio: 2.9
  - 95% CI: 1.7-5.0
  - p: < .0001
  - Association: Positive
  - Sum of weights: 43,564

- Bullying
  - Odds ratio: 3.8
  - 95% CI: 2.3-6.2
  - p: < .0001
  - Association: Positive
  - Sum of weights: 43,552

- Dating/Sexual Violence
  - Odds ratio: 6.5
  - 95% CI: 3.4-12.5
  - p: < .0001
  - Association: Positive
  - Sum of weights: 43,316

**Factor 3**

- Youth Violence
  - Odds ratio: 5.7
  - 95% CI: 3.1-10.5
  - p: < .0001
  - Association: Positive
  - Sum of weights: 43,308

- Bullying
  - Odds ratio: 5.1
  - 95% CI: 3.2-8.0
  - p: < .0001
  - Association: Positive
  - Sum of weights: 43,379

- Dating/Sexual Violence
  - Odds ratio: 12.5
  - 95% CI: 4.0-7.8
  - p: < .0001
  - Association: Positive
  - Sum of weights: 43,379
TABLE 2.5. (Continued). Associations between violence and other behavior categories (non-significant items are shaded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Violence</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>Dating/Sexual Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carry weapon at school</td>
<td>Felt unsafe</td>
<td>Threatened with weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied in school</td>
<td>Odds ratio 95% CI</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>6.3-11.9</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association Sum of weights</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber-bullied</td>
<td>Odds ratio 95% CI</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>1.8-5.0</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association Sum of weights</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating violence</td>
<td>Odds ratio 95% CI</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>Odds ratio 95% CI</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2.5. (Continued). Associations between violence and other behavior categories (non-significant items are shaded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carry weapon at school</td>
<td>Felt unsafe</td>
<td>Threatened with weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental Health Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>1.5-5.4</td>
<td>3.7-7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>42,691</td>
<td>42,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suicide ideation</td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>3.0-8.1</td>
<td>3.2-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>43,463</td>
<td>43,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suicide plan</td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>2.8-8.0</td>
<td>3.3-7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>43,426</td>
<td>43,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suicide attempt</td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>5.4-17.5</td>
<td>4.3-12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>36,724</td>
<td>36,761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2.5. (Continued). Associations between violence and other behavior categories (non-significant items are shaded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1 Youth Violence</th>
<th>Factor 2 Bullying</th>
<th>Factor 3 Dating/Sexual Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carry weapon at school</td>
<td>Felt unsafe</td>
<td>Threatened with weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarettes - past 30 days</td>
<td>Odds ratio 8.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI 5.1-14.1</td>
<td>2.1-5.3</td>
<td>1.6-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>40,948</td>
<td>40,983</td>
<td>41,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol - past 30 days</td>
<td>Odds ratio 3.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI 2.3-5.7</td>
<td>1.7-3.4</td>
<td>1.3-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>40,812</td>
<td>40,885</td>
<td>41,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana - past 30 days</td>
<td>Odds ratio 5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI 3.0-8.0</td>
<td>2.0-4.4</td>
<td>2.1-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>42,520</td>
<td>42,532</td>
<td>42,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine - lifetime use</td>
<td>Odds ratio 13.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI 8.9-20.0</td>
<td>5.4-10.3</td>
<td>3.2-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>43,214</td>
<td>43,343</td>
<td>43,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Factor 1 Youth Violence</td>
<td>Factor 2 Bullying</td>
<td>Factor 3 Dating/Sexual Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carry weapon at school</td>
<td>Felt unsafe</td>
<td>Threatened with weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meth - lifetime use</td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>9.9-38.5</td>
<td>8.5-20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>43,262</td>
<td>43,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecstasy - lifetime use</td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>5.9-13.2</td>
<td>3.4-7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>43,132</td>
<td>43,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhalants - lifetime use</td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>4.3-10.9</td>
<td>3.3-7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>42,951</td>
<td>43,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptions - lifetime use</td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>3.7-9.2</td>
<td>1.7-4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>42,882</td>
<td>42,976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2.5. (Continued). Associations between violence and other behavior categories (non-significant items are shaded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carry weapon at school</td>
<td>Felt unsafe</td>
<td>Threatened with weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support/Role Models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusted adult - out of school</td>
<td><strong>Odds ratio</strong></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>1.5-5.2</td>
<td>1.9-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>37,938</td>
<td>38,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusted adult - in school</td>
<td><strong>Odds ratio</strong></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>0.9-2.6</td>
<td>1.2-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>36,401</td>
<td>36,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future outlook</td>
<td><strong>Odds ratio</strong></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>3.1-7.4</td>
<td>3.3-7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of weights</td>
<td>37,436</td>
<td>37,563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Youth violence and bullying. All youth violence and bullying items were significantly associated with one another ($p < .0001$).

Mental health risk. With regards to mental health risks, all violence items were significantly associated.

Substance use. All youth violence and dating/sexual violence items were significantly associated with all substance use behaviors examined. Being bullied was associated with “harder” drug use – cocaine, methamphetamines, ecstasy, inhalants and prescriptions. Being cyber-bullied was associated with all substances except for cigarettes.

Social support/role models. Having a trusted adult outside of school was protective ($p < .0001$) against all youth violence items, being bullied, and dating violence. Having a trusted adult in school was protective ($p < .0001$) against feeling unsafe, being threatened with a weapon, and fighting in school. Having a positive future outlook was protective ($p < .0001$) against all violence items, except being bullied and cyber-bullied.

Discussion

This study was the first to examine youth violence and bullying using the Hawai‘i High School Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) over three dimensions – ethnicity, sex, and grade. In addition, examination of other risk-protective behaviors shed some light on the context around youth violence and bullying, and provided supplementary information that can better inform programming and policymaking aimed at preventing these behaviors. Overall, 49.7% of the youth responded to at least one indicator of violence. This means that almost half of the sample carried a weapon, was victimized,
was in a fight, or was physically/sexually abused within the respective time frame (i.e., past 30 days vs. past year).

**Youth Violence, Bullying, and Sex**

In general, boys reported higher prevalences and rates of carrying weapons and fighting, whereas girls reported more victimization (including incidents of dating violence and sexual assault). There are a number of considerations which may factor into this trend. As in this study, Scheithauer, Hayer, Petermann, and Jugert (2006) found that sex significantly predicts bullying victimization, although the authors cautioned that perhaps girls are more likely to reveal such victimization than boys. Bennett, Farrington, and Huesmann (2005) suggested that girls have lower rates of offending because they acquire social cognitive skills earlier in life than boys do, and because they have better pro-social skills. Thus, the way we intervene and prevent youth violence and bullying may differ between boys and girls. For example, programs the incorporate anger management and promote nonviolent approaches to conflict may be more appropriate for boys than girls (Guerra, Tolan, & Hammond, 1994).

However, Meichenbaum’s (2006) review of adolescent aggression points out that while boys are committing more violent acts, girls are entering the juvenile justice system at a younger age and higher rate. To bring perspective to this trend, Meichenbaum emphasizes the strong correlation between victimization and perpetration; that is, the rate of female offenders may be rising given that often times their violent acts are a result of being victims themselves. Therefore, interventions that are preventative, and promote early development of positive skills such as communication, self-esteem, and decision-
making, may be impactful for both boys and girls. For example, the Life Skills Training (LST) program includes modules such as: “The Value of Good Health,” “Decision-Making for Health,” “Risk-Taking and Substance Abuse,” “Managing Stress, Anger, and Other Emotions,” “Family Communications,” and “Healthy Relationships” (Botvin, Griffin, & Nichols, 2006).

**Youth Violence, Bullying, and Grade Level**

Ninth graders consistently showed higher prevalence of youth violence and bullying, except for dating violence and sexual assault, which were highest in 12th graders. Scheithauer, Hayer, Petermann, and Jugert’s (2006) study similarly found that grade level significantly predicted self-reported bullying and impaired psychosocial well-being of students at school. Thus, there is also something to be said about targeting interventions by grade level. Studies have highlighted how challenging it can be for youth to transition from elementary to middle school, and then from middle to high school, due to factors such as change in the student-teacher relationship, peer group, self-perception, and self-esteem (Alspaugh, 1998). Thus, it may be worth considering specific programming for 9th graders to assist with this transition year. For example, one high school in Hawai‘i has institutionalized a freshman-only orientation day to help incoming 9th graders acclimate to the campus (Umemoto et al., 2009). It would also be important to push further upstream and initiate interventions at the elementary and middle school ages. If youth can be exposed to preventative interventions early on, this can impact bullying by changing normative beliefs about the acceptability of bullying, while also
increasing trust and support among peers within the school setting (Williams & Guerra, 2007).

With respect to dating violence and sexual assault, it is not surprising that 12th graders were found to be at higher risk, given that they are likely dating more frequently than 9th graders. As with bullying, the use of technology to perpetrate dating/sexual violence has been increasing (e.g., using technology to monitor a partner’s activities or whereabouts), thus complicating prevention and intervention (David-Ferdon & Feldman, 2007). Efforts that can promote education, particularly among 11th and 12th grade girls, would be beneficial. For example, a curriculum addressing the intersection of intimate partner violence and substance abuse was developed at the University of Hawai‘i, and was designed to be implemented in variety of settings (Baker & Helm, 2011). These types of initiatives are important, given that adolescents may not be aware of the signs of an unhealthy dating relationship or the dangers that come with social media.

**Youth Violence, Bullying, and Socio-cultural Issues**

When examining ethnicity, Other Asians (excluding Japanese and Filipinos) consistently had the lowest prevalences and rates, while Mixed Non-Hawaiians, Other Pacific Islanders, and those in the “other” ethnic group category tended to have the highest. Thus, it is critical to explicate root causes for youth violence and bullying, as knowledge of determinants will greatly impact prevention interventions and policy to eliminate disparities. Attention should be given to interventions taking into account socio-cultural factors related to youth violence. For example, the same high school mentioned above also has institutionalized a semester-long ethnic studies course.
requirement to teach students about racism, discrimination, and tolerance among groups (Umemoto et al., 2009). Also of concern is that indigenous populations have greater exposure to violence than other ethnic groups, and this necessitates further targeted research. In Hawai‘i, attention also is being placed on the growing number of Pacific Islander immigrant groups, particularly the Micronesian population, which has suffered traumatic events including the use of their homeland for nuclear testing by the U.S. (Palafox et al., 2011).

This study also confirmed the utility of disaggregating youth risk behavior data by ethnicity, especially beyond the traditional categories used in surveillance research. A study using the national YRBS found that Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (AAPIs) suffer disproportionately from youth violence, with Pacific Islanders having among the highest rates among 6 non-mixed races in the US (Sugimoto-Matsuda, Hishinuma, & Chang, 2013). More youth violence research is needed on this under-researched population, as the AAPI population is the fastest-growing in the U.S. based on Census 1980 to 2000, and is projected to be 41 million by 2050 (Barringer, Gardner, & Levin, 1993; Day, 2010).

In addition, research is needed to further disaggregate within the AAPI populations. Independent studies have alluded that subgroups under these ethnic umbrellas may not show the same trends, and therefore may not respond to the same types of interventions. For example, a study in California found Cambodian, Lao/Mien, and Vietnamese youth had higher self-reported rates of serious and family/partner violence than Chinese adolescents (Le & Wallen, 2006). Also, the Mixed Non-Hawaiian
group self-reported relatively high levels on several measures. Individuals of mixed ancestry compose the fastest growing demographic group (Associated Press, 2009). A study of over 2,000 youth in Washington State found that multi-racial adolescents reported higher rates of problem behaviors, compared to mono-racial youth (Choi, Harachi, Gillmore, & Catalano, 2006). However, there have also been studies finding differential risk-protective results dependent upon the combination of mixed ethnicity (Hishinuma et al., 2005), as well as others demonstrating no significant differences (Danko et al., 1997).

It is important to elucidate the socio-cultural determinants that may act as risk and protective factors for the various groups. In addition, this study revealed the need to examine the interaction of ethnicity, sex, and grade level. While findings show overall trends when examining each of these dimensions alone, closer inspection found that the different sub-groups of youth have different experiences with weapon carrying and fighting when considering all three dimensions simultaneously. These findings suggest that males and females may have different experiences, roles, and expectations placed upon them as a function of ethnicity or culture, as well as a difference in the effect of age and development through their high school years.

**Risk and Protective Factors**

These analyses highlighted a number of important correlates of youth violence and bullying for consideration in programming and policymaking. This study, along with numerous others in the literature, has affirmed the strong association between youth violence and mental health. In fact, it has been recommended that suicide prevention and
intervention be included as an essential component of any comprehensive bullying prevention effort (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010). In addition, the significant association of youth violence with substance abuse adds more weight to the importance of a multi-pronged approach to reduce youth risk behaviors. Instead of addressing these issues as separate and isolated problems, it is necessary to design complex and integrated interventions that address multiple domains of functioning (Borduin et al., 1995).

In addition, this study emphasized the importance of finding protective factors, such as social supports and role models, to more effectively prevent youth violence and bullying. Studies are demonstrating that enhancing protective factors can be more impactful in preventing youth risk behaviors (and consume less effort and resources), than reducing risk factors, which often times can prove to be a monumental task. For example, a longitudinal study on adolescent health found substantial reductions in youth violence rates when protective factors were present (e.g., positive adult mentorship), even with significant risk factors involved (Resnick, Ireland, & Borowsky, 2004). A study conducted with youth in Hawai‘i found that students with high levels of connectedness to their school were less likely to condone violent behaviors (Chung-Do, 2011). This type of disconnection from positive influences has also been shown to be a significant risk for youth mental health issues. Caring and connectedness with adults outside of the family are particularly important for youth from homes that may not be a strong source of nurturance and support (Resnick, Harris, & Blum, 1993). Thus, systems must be put into place to facilitate youth connectedness with some type of positive entity – whether it be
at home, school, a club/extra-curricular group, a community organization – to reduce risk for engaging in violent behaviors.

**Implications for Practice and Policy**

Overall, this study supports a more comprehensive approach to measuring and preventing youth violence and bullying. An integrated youth violence surveillance system must monitor multiple parameters including violence outcomes, indicators, risk-protectors, and attitudes/perceptions (Sugimoto-Matsuda et al., 2012). It is certainly evident that the picture of bullying and youth violence is fragmented and incomplete. In addition, bullying is likely underreported, often due to normative and social forces that may discourage victims and witnesses from “tattling” (Scheidlinger, 2003). This study supports an ecological approach, guided by these analyses and other sources of data, with regards to monitoring, programming, and policymaking. Given the significant association of youth violence with mental health, substance use, and risky sexual behaviors, there may also be power in coupling youth violence prevention with interventions aimed at other behaviors.

The importance of addressing youth violence and bullying in school settings should also be highlighted, since many of the behaviors examined occur on school property. Schools in general are ideal locations for youth programs and interventions (Cortina et al., 2008). Housing an intervention within a school increases access for all students, thereby promoting equity for all. The school also possesses the already-existing infrastructure of the physical grounds and trained personnel. However, supporting policies and system changes also are needed to help institutionalize programs and
maintain youth violence and bullying prevention as a major priority. Samara and Smith (2008) found that whole school policies can be very effective when combined with supportive efforts, such as playground/common area redesign and classroom curricula. Aligning and coordinating all of these types of efforts can set an overall tone that such behaviors will not be tolerated.

**Limitations**

The limitations of this study are similar to those affecting other epidemiologic studies with youth. First, the YRBS is a cross-sectional survey, and due to the changes in youth violence and bullying items across surveys multiple years of data were not examined. Second, the data were self-reported and subject to respondent bias. Therefore, the YRBS only measured youth perceptions, and did not gather data on the actual number of bullying incidents that occurred. The advantage, however, of self-reported data is that such data were less susceptible to under-reporting of youth violence when compared to official records, such as arrests and emergency room visits. Third, the Hawai‘i YRBS was only administered in public schools, and therefore did not capture data from private school students, as well as youth who were out of school (e.g. absent, suspended, drop-outs). Therefore, the prevalences that will be reported may be under-estimates of risk behaviors.

Finally, the context of youth violence and bullying incidents cannot be ascertained through the YRBS questions. For example, it is unknown whether boys are carrying weapons and engaging in fights solely as perpetrators, or if they are perhaps defending themselves and thus are also victims. In addition, this study also does not take into
account the complex experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning (LGBTQ) youth. Much research and publicity has recently been focused on this subgroup of youth, showing a heightened risk for bullying and victimization (Berlan, Corliss, Field, Goodman, & Austin, 2010). More research is needed to examine the context of these situations to better inform programming and policymaking.

Conclusion

The main purpose of this study was to use quantitative research methods to ascertain the scope and risk-protective factors of youth violence and bullying in Hawai‘i, by conducting secondary data analysis on Hawai‘i YRBS data. Bullying and youth violence prevalences and construct means confirmed the severity of this public health issue in Hawai‘i. In addition, disparities in bullying and youth violence by ethnicity, gender, and grade were elucidated. Comparison of youth violence and bullying with associated health behaviors has provided more contextual guidance of these situations, which may help to better inform interventions and policymaking. Youth violence and bullying prevention efforts may potentially be coupled with interventions for other behaviors. For example, the prevention of substance use may not only help to prevent bullying and youth violence, but also other public health issues such as suicidality.
CHAPTER 3

EXAMINING THE CONTENT, PROCESS, AND OUTCOMES OF

BULLYING AND YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION POLICIES

Abstract

Youth violence and bullying are serious public health issues. The complex nature of these topics requires a comprehensive and multi-faceted approach. Policy is an important component of such an approach, but is often a secondary product, and is rarely evaluated when implemented. The purpose of this study is to systematically review the scientific literature, and synthesize recommendations that have resulted from empirical evaluations focused on bullying and youth violence policies. A total of 22 policies were found, which were classified by their level of origination (country/national, state/provincial, or school). Approximately half of the policy evaluations focused on implementation and short-term outcomes. The most common policy strategy was to delegate the responsibility for bullying/youth violence prevention policymaking to the district or school level, but effectiveness of such strategies was contingent upon levels of funding, resources, and leadership support. Other key findings included: 1) the importance of collaboration and inclusiveness during policy design, implementation, and evaluation; 2) the need for evaluation to be integrated throughout the full policymaking process; and 3) the need to shift policies toward more preventative and comprehensive approaches. It is
recommended that these types of empirical findings cycle back into the policymaking process, in order to support a true translational and iterative process.
**Introduction**

*Youth Violence and Bullying*

Youth violence is a serious public health issue throughout the US and the world. Addressing youth violence is not only critical for the physical safety of our youth, but also for the improvement of their academic performance and social-emotional well-being (Chung-Do, J., 2011; Wegner, Garcia-Santiago, Nishimura, & Hishinuma, 2010).

Bullying is a sub-form of youth violence, and is characterized by some type of attack with the intention to cause harm, a real or perceived imbalance of power, and repeated attacks over time (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2011). Bullying has added layers of complexity that further complicate identification, intervention, and prevention of youth violence. Bullying behavior has been associated with other forms of antisocial behavior, such as vandalism, shoplifting, skipping and dropping out of school, fighting, and substance use (Hawai‘i State Department of Health [HSDOH], 2010).

The complex nature of bullying and youth violence dictates a comprehensive approach that integrates complementary interventions within an ecological context (Thornton et al., 2002; World Health Organization, 2002). The social ecological model is a framework that can guide an integrated approach, and one that has been applied to youth violence prevention (Goebert et al., 2010). Using this framework, interventions are organized to address the micro-systems the individual interacts with, the meso-system (linkages between micro-system domains), the exo-system (institutional regulations that shape relationships between individuals and micro-systems), and the macro-system context of cultural history and social/political influences (Bronfenbrenner, 1979;
McLeroy, Bibeau, Steckler, & Glanz, 1988). This model is particularly appropriate for addressing youth violence prevention in minority populations, as research has supported the inclusion of family and community in public health interventions with minority groups to increase intervention effectiveness (Brach & Fraserirector, 2000).

**Prevention Through Policy**

Policy level intervention is an important component of a comprehensive public health approach, but is often overlooked, a secondary product, or missing completely (Limbos et al., 2007; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services [DHHS], 2001). Policy may be defined as legislative (laws or ordinances), regulatory (created by government agencies), or organizational (created within an agency or organization) (CDC, 2010b). Policies are made as a result of a critical mass of individuals – citizens, leaders, elected officials – being persuaded that something needs to be done about a particular problem (Birkland, 2001). They attempt to guide, direct, and control human actions, and provide an organizing structure for individual and collective behavior changes in order to improve public welfare.

Policymakers at the local, state, and national levels have turned their attention toward the design and implementation of bullying prevention laws and policies as a result of public concerns about youth safety, particularly in school settings. Proponents feel that having an anti-bullying law or policy can be a strong symbol that such behavior is not to be tolerated. Lack of official school policies may inadvertently communicate that bullying is acceptable, or at least tolerated (Dake, Price, & Telljohann, 2003; Orpinas & Horne, 2006). Past studies have demonstrated that, without a clear policy, students may
fear that nothing will happen if they are bullied, or that talking to teachers/staff will actually make the problem worse (Glover, Gough, Johnson, & Cartwright, 2000).

In the US, state-level legislation has thus far been the most prominent vehicle for setting minimum policy standards or announcing new initiatives to reduce bullying behavior (Temkin, 2007). Many of these laws mandate the creation of district- or school-level policies. However, the resulting policies vary widely depending on location, local context and culture, existing legal pressures, and stakeholders involved (Smith-Canty, 2010). Also, policy strategies have historically focused on punitive measures and sanctions for the bully. Over time, some policymakers and practitioners have realized that this approach may actually exacerbate the problem in the long run, though this philosophical evolution is still very slow-going for the broader field (Glover, Gough, Johnson, & Cartwright, 2000).

**Translating Research to Policy**

Translational research is the process by which new research knowledge is connected with the individuals or populations they are intended for (Woolf, 2008). The process aims to: 1) maximize and accelerate the continuum from efficacy, to effectiveness, diffusion/dissemination, implementation, and sustainability; and 2) enhance the impact of interventions (Palinkas & Soydan, 2011). Translational research has its origins in biomedical research, where efforts to bring promising new drugs/treatments to market have been heightened (i.e., “bench to bedside”). The translational process has since expanded to other disciplines, including public health. However, studies have shown that the application of empirical/evidence-based
information to interventions is still lacking and inefficient. For example, Hoagwood and Olin (2002) found that only 10% of publicly funded child welfare, mental health, and juvenile justice systems have incorporated evidence-based practices. The Institute of Medicine (2001) found it takes an average of 20 years for data and research to move from bench to beside.

The translational research process is even farther-removed from the design and implementation of policies, both in practice and in the scientific literature. In addition, after policies are implemented, there is a lack of monitoring and evaluation, application of empirical techniques to policy evaluation, and translation of evaluation findings back into the design and implementation phases. The broader field of evaluation has an extensive literature that provides theories and practical examples on how to assess outcomes of programs and interventions. However, little documentation exists on how traditional evaluation approaches can be applied to the measurement of advocacy and policy work (Guthrie, Louie, David, & Crystal-Foster, 2005). Consequently, there are no agreed-upon techniques on how to assess policies, and no standardized outcome categories. The result is limited knowledge on what constitutes effective policy, potentially inappropriate fiscal investments and appropriations, and misinformation regarding which types of outcomes are realistic for policy interventions (Reisman, Gienapp, & Stachowiak, 2007).

With respect to youth violence, a few high-profile policies have been described and evaluated, but these focus on secondary or tertiary prevention approaches such as punitive sanctions for offenders, or reducing youth access to firearms and ammunition.
For example, Boston’s “Operation Ceasefire” (Braga, Kennedy, Waring, & Piehl, 2001) focused on reducing youth gun violence, and was evaluated through tracking of Boston’s youth homicide rates. Less is known about the effectiveness of policies promoting primary prevention approaches, such as tolerance and skills-building for youth and violence prevention curriculum design for adults.

Specific to bullying, the majority of empirical research has focused on the different types, causes, and impacts of bullying. There is a dearth of research on anti-bullying legislation and policy. This can likely be attributed to the fact that prior to 1990 there was no state or national legislation or mandate on record (Smith-Canty, 2010). In addition, the limited evaluation research primarily focuses on process outcomes. While implementation of new policy and fidelity of implementation are certainly important to monitor, solely focusing on these phases of the policymaking process assumes the original policy was well-designed, evidence-informed, and effective.

**An Evidence-Based Policy Cycle**

Policies should be viewed as interventions that must be planned and evaluated like any other, with efforts in place to monitor inputs, progress, outcomes, and unintended consequences. Kingdon’s (2011) landmark work on agenda setting and policy formation can help to organize the “front-end” design and passage components of the policy cycle. Kingdon’s “three streams” framework suggests three concurrent processes of policy formation: 1) problems emerge as a result of a crisis/event or changes in some type of data indicator; 2) policy proposals/alternatives develop as a result of gradual accumulation of knowledge and perspectives on the specific problem; and 3)
political events occur that may influence the overall climate, such as changes of administration or swings in public opinion (Kingdon, 2011). Policy action occurs when the three separate streams of the process become aligned; that is, a problem is recognized, a solution is developed and becomes available in the community, and political change occurs that facilitates policy change and reduces barriers to change.

The “back end” of the policy process receives much less attention. Often times, policymakers and advocates alike expend much energy and resources on crafting and adopting policies, but do not conduct the necessary follow-up and monitoring of the intended outcomes. In addition, such evaluation is rarely cyclical, even though an iterative monitoring process is recommended by many seminal evaluation models. For example, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC’s) Framework for Program Evaluation is a cyclical process that provides a systematic way to improve and account for public health actions (CDC, 1999). Similarly, the Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality [AHRQ], 2011) suggests a continuous process where goals are developed, an action plan is created, indicators are developed to monitor progress, iterations are tested and refined, and the process of improvement is operationalized for sustainability.

This study proposes a connection and integration of Kingdon’s “front-end” policymaking process, with “back-end” monitoring and evaluation components as suggested by the above-mentioned frameworks (see Figure 3.1). In this model, the full policy process spans from design (both content and the design process), passage/adoption of the policy, implementation, monitoring of short-term outcomes, monitoring of long-
term outcomes, and the opportunity for outcomes to cycle back and inform redesign if necessary.

Figure 3.1. Conceptual model of iterative policy process.

To make an impact on bullying and youth violence from a systems and policy perspective, public health evidence must be generated, policies must be grounded in the evidence through a translational process, interventions must be implemented as designed, evaluation findings must be directed back into policy design, and lessons learned must be disseminated broadly. Thus, in addition to bridging the gap between research and policymaking, the process as a whole must evolve away from a traditionally linear perspective. Instead, the policymaking process must be viewed as cyclical and iterative, where events and outcomes that occur after implementation feed back into the process and are allowed to inform necessary amendments.
Purpose of This Study

This study addresses the research question, “What are the evidence-based policy recommendations for bullying and youth violence prevention?” Using the scientific literature, lessons learned and recommendations that have resulted from research studies which evaluated policies and laws related to preventing bullying and youth violence were examined. The iterative policymaking model (see Figure 3.1) was used to guide analysis of the literature and organization of study findings.

Methods

Procedures

This study employed a systematic literature review methodology to synthesize recommendations that have resulted from empirical evaluations focused on bullying and youth violence policies. Four academic databases – PsycInfo (American Psychological Association – journal articles, books, book chapters, dissertations), Pubmed (National Institutes of Health – journal articles), Sociological Abstracts (ProQuest LLC – journal articles, dissertations), and Google Scholar (journal articles, books, book chapters, dissertations, reports) – were searched using all possible combinations of the following sets of keywords: 1) “bully*”; 2) “adolescen*” or “youth”; and 3) “policy” (an asterisk was added as a wildcard character so that all versions of the words would be returned in the searches). Given the expansiveness of the Google Scholar database, “policy evaluation” was utilized instead of “policy” to increase specificity of the returned items. Books, book chapters, reports, and dissertations were included given that these are
common sources for case studies of policies. All items generated from the four databases were entered into a spreadsheet, and duplicate items were noted.

After omitting duplicate items, documents were systematically excluded using three series of criteria. Primary exclusion was conducted by review of citation only, using the following criteria:

1. Items printed in languages other than English.
2. Miscellaneous items such as editorials, commentaries, book reviews, and catalogs.

Secondary exclusion was conducted after review of article abstracts, using the following criteria:

1. Items unrelated to youth safety, health, or wellbeing.
2. Literature/topical reviews.
3. Program descriptions and evaluations with no policy component.
4. Quantitative and qualitative studies (e.g., surveys, secondary data analyses) with no policy component.

Tertiary exclusion was conducted after review of each document in its entirety, using the following criteria:

1. Policies not specific to bullying or youth violence prevention.
2. Policies exclusively aimed at high risk youth populations (e.g., among youth already incarcerated).
3. Policy descriptions that were not accompanied by some type of evaluation study.
All remaining articles focused on the evaluation of a bullying or youth violence prevention policy. Policies were categorized according to their level of origin and implementation – 1) Country-wide level, 2) State/province level, or 3) School level.

**Analyses**

Figure 3.2 overviews the primary and secondary exclusion process. A total of 750 items were retrieved. After removal of 250 duplicate items, 500 documents remained for further examination. 60 items were removed during primary exclusion, and 370 items were removed during secondary exclusion. This left 70 articles that described a policy related to youth safety, health, and/or wellbeing.
Figure 3.2. Stepwise illustration of items retrieved, and application of primary and secondary exclusion criteria.
Figure 3.3 outlines the tertiary exclusion process, as well as the final categorization of articles. Based on tertiary exclusion criteria, 33 articles were excluded as the policies described were not specific to bullying or youth violence prevention, 10 were excluded because the policy description was unaccompanied by an evaluation component, and three were policies aimed solely at high risk youth (e.g., among youth already incarcerated). This left 24 articles evaluating bullying or youth violence prevention policies.
Figure 3.3. Illustration of tertiary exclusion process, and subdivision of remaining articles.
Upon further examination, it was discerned that the 24 articles represented 22 unique bullying or youth violence prevention policies. The 22 polices were categorized according to the level at which they originated and were implemented (see Figure 3.3 above). Twelve articles described and evaluated ten national policy evaluations, eight articles described state-level policy evaluations, and the remaining four articles described school-level policy evaluations.

**Results**

*Overview of Policies*

Table 3.1 presents the 22 policies found in this literature search, summarized by the level at which they originated and were implemented. The results are also separated to show US versus international policies, as well as peer-reviewed documents versus dissertations. Ten of the 23 policies were country-wide, but interestingly, none of these were in the US. Seven of the ten policies in the US originated at the state level. Of those ten, six were studied and disseminated via dissertation documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country-Wide Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Reviewed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7 (9 documents)</td>
<td>7 (9 documents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>10 (12 documents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State/Province Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Reviewed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Reviewed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>10 (10 documents)</td>
<td>12 (14 documents)</td>
<td>22 (24 documents)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2 presents the 22 policies summarized by the type of action implemented (categories adapted from U.S. Department of Education, 2010). The majority of policies (nine of 22) delegated the responsibility of bullying/youth violence prevention to districts and/or individual schools. Three policies created state-wide or school-wide policies. Two documents summarized meta-analyses of state-level policies. The remainder of policies created national frameworks or networks, regulated media, or increased security measures and sanctions.

Table 3.2. *Mapping of actions which were mandated by the policies evaluated in this systematic literature review.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delegated Authority</th>
<th>Created Common Framework</th>
<th>Created Network</th>
<th>Media Management</th>
<th>Created Programs</th>
<th>Meta-Analyses</th>
<th>Increased Security/Sanctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country-Wide Policies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province Policies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, Table 3.3 presents the 22 policies summarized by the phase of the policy process evaluated. As discussed earlier (an illustrated in Figure 3.1), there are multiple components of the policy cycle, including design, passage, implementation, and impact. The majority of studies examined policy implementation (12 documents) and short-term outcomes (13 documents). Seven studies examined long-term outcomes; that is, actual measures of bullying and/or youth violence behaviors. Five documents examined policy design for contents, and two articles examined process. No studies were found that examined the process of passing/adopting policies.
Table 3.3. Mapping of policy phases which were evaluated in the studies found in this systematic literature review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Design – Content</th>
<th>Design – Process</th>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Outcomes – Short Term</th>
<th>Outcomes – Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country-Wide Policies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province Policies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Policies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Country-Wide Policies

Table 3.4 presents the ten country-wide polices and accompanying evaluation studies. This means that the policy was designed and passed at a national level; however implementation may take place at the state/province, county, or school level depending on the mandate(s) specified. Table 3.4 lists the name of each policy (sorted alphabetically), year established, location (i.e., country, state), brief description, and evaluation methodologies and findings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Policy (Year Established)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evaluation Type &amp; Purpose</th>
<th>Evaluation Methodology</th>
<th>Evaluation Finding</th>
<th>Article Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Anti-Bullying Policies (various)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Country-wide mandate to develop school board violence prevention policies</td>
<td>Design – input To review school board violence prevention policies</td>
<td>1) Document review of policies (n=116)</td>
<td>1) Suspensions/expulsions were most common intervention, versus addressing root causes of violence 2) Recommend integration with other related policies; also include a community component since causes of violence often outside of school purview</td>
<td>Day et al., 1995 and Day et al., 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Don’t Suffer in Silence (1996)</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Federally-funded bullying prevention toolkit disseminated to schools nationwide (stemmed from the Sheffield Project – see below)</td>
<td>Implementation To examine long-term sustainability of bullying prevention efforts</td>
<td>1) Surveys of schools in 1996 (n=109) and 2002 (n=148)</td>
<td>1) Most schools moved from general discipline policy to specific anti-bullying policy 2) Most interventions were rated as “moderately” useful</td>
<td>Samara et al., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. National Safe Schools Framework (2003)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Framework endorsed by all Australian ministers of education – included recommendations for school programs, policies, and awareness efforts</td>
<td>Implementation, short- &amp; long-term outcomes To evaluate implementation and effect of national campaign</td>
<td>1) Teacher surveys (n=453); 2) Student surveys via the Australian Covert Bullying Prevalence Study (ACBPS) (n=7,418), comparing data from 1999 to 2007</td>
<td>1) Teacher implementation was low, and teachers requested additional training on the framework; 2) Moderate decline in risky behavior was noted</td>
<td>Cross et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Networks Against School Shootings Project (NETWASS) (2009)</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Network created to increase preventative measures against school violence</td>
<td>Implementation &amp; short-term outcomes To examine program implementation, from teachers’ perspectives</td>
<td>1) Survey of teachers (n=81) before training, and then six to nine months later</td>
<td>1) Teachers’ confidence increased in identifying at risk youth; 2) Teachers’ “acceptance” of reintegrating at risk youth increased</td>
<td>Leuschner et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4. (Continued) Summary of the 10 country-wide bullying/youth violence policies and evaluations found in this systematic literature review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Policy (Year Established)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evaluation Type &amp; Purpose</th>
<th>Evaluation Methodology</th>
<th>Evaluation Finding</th>
<th>Article Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Norwegian Manifesto Against Bullying (2002)</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>National effort to provide violence prevention programs and tools to schools</td>
<td>Implementation, short- &amp; long-term outcomes To evaluate implementation and effect of national campaign</td>
<td>1) Survey of schools (n=37) to inventory activities; 2) Survey of students at three time points (2001, n=5,191; 2004, n=3,727; 2008, n=1,173)</td>
<td>1) Implementation of activities dwindled over time; 2) Factors affecting implementation included leadership support, teacher training/capacity, competing priorities; 3) Reports of bullies and victims decreased initially, but later increased again</td>
<td>Roland, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Promoting Relationships and Eliminating Violence (PREVNet) (2007)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Nationally mandated creation of network to promote education and training, evaluation, prevention and intervention, and policy/advocacy</td>
<td>Short-term outcomes To evaluate indicators of network growth and progress</td>
<td>1) Document review of annual reports from 2006 to 2009</td>
<td>1) Increase in network membership and number of activities; 2) Increase in member capacity (&quot;knowledge mobilization resources&quot;)</td>
<td>Pepler et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Safer Social Networking Principles (2008)</td>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>National program launched to encourage industry stakeholders to self-regulate the issue of online safety</td>
<td>Short-term outcomes To evaluate the effectiveness of self-regulation policy</td>
<td>1) Case study of policy, including cost-benefit analysis (n=1); 2) Key informant interviews with industry stakeholders</td>
<td>1) When looking solely at cost, self-regulation was more efficient; 2) Recommends both self-regulation and formal legislation; 3) Recommends collaborative model, and actively including industry stakeholders in online safety issues</td>
<td>Droste, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4. (Continued) Summary of the 10 country-wide bullying/youth violence policies and evaluations found in this systematic literature review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Policy (Year Established)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evaluation Type &amp; Purpose</th>
<th>Evaluation Methodology</th>
<th>Evaluation Finding</th>
<th>Article Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Sheffield Project (1991)</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Government-funded large-scale replication of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program</td>
<td>Implementation, short- &amp; long-term outcomes: To examine implementation process and subsequent progress</td>
<td>Eslea article: 1) Interviews with school administrators (n=11); 2) Surveys of students (n=657)</td>
<td>Smith article: 1) Most schools had continued policy development; 2) Male bullying had decreased, but not among females; 3) No improvement was seen in students’ comfort level in reporting bullying</td>
<td>Eslea et al., 1998 and Smith et al., 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 South African Schools Act 84 (1996)</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Established school governing bodies, and mandated responsibility of ensuring student discipline and safety to those bodies</td>
<td>Design – input &amp; process To examine policy development process, and the legal principles incorporated into content</td>
<td>1) Document review of policies (n=4); 2) Interviews with design stakeholders (n=18)</td>
<td>1) Policies were not in alignment with legal principals; 2) Stakeholder involvement in design process is important; 3) The issue of bullying was still not recognized as a problem by all stakeholders</td>
<td>Mollo, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4. (Continued) Summary of the 10 country-wide bullying/youth violence policies and evaluations found in this systematic literature review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Policy (Year Established)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evaluation Type &amp; Purpose</th>
<th>Evaluation Methodology</th>
<th>Evaluation Finding</th>
<th>Article Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Sweden Media Regulation Policies (various)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Sweden has passed several stringent laws which regulate media violence and industry targeting of youth</td>
<td>Long-term outcomes To compare youth violence rates in Sweden and Canada</td>
<td>1) Analysis of national government crime statistics; 2) Analysis of self-report data from the Health Behavior in School Aged Children Survey (administered by the World Health Organization)</td>
<td>1) Sweden shows lower youth crime rates; 2) An association between media consumption and aggression is demonstrated</td>
<td>Hiebert, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the ten country-wide policies, the most common type of policy entailed delegating the responsibility of developing bullying prevention policies or initiatives to the school or district level. Four countries – Canada, Norway, South Africa, and the United Kingdom – took this route.

In Canada, school boards have been mandated to develop policies to reduce the prevalence and incidence of school violence. Day, Golench, and MacDougall (1995 report; 1997 journal article) describe their evaluation of Canadian school boards’ responses to this country-wide mandate. After reviewing the content of 116 board policies, three major findings emerged: 1) the majority of policies were relying on suspensions and expulsions as interventions, and not addressing the root causes of violence; 2) the new policies were not integrated with other related existing policies; and 3) the new policies lacked a community focus, which is important given that violence often stems from issues outside of school.

Norway’s Manifesto Against Bullying occurred in two major waves – 2002 to 2004, and 2004 to 2008 – both of which were supported by government funding (Roland, 2011). Activities focused on the provision of violence prevention programming and tools to all schools. Roland (2011) describes the evaluation of implementation, short-term, and long-term outcomes of this national campaign. School surveys (n=37) found dwindling implementation over time, influenced by factors such as leadership support, teacher training/capacity, and competing priorities/initiatives. Student surveys at three times points (2001, 2004, and 2008) reported initial decreases in bullying and victimization rates, but subsequent increases despite the launch of the second Manifesto.
Mollo (2009) discusses the South African Schools Act 84, passed in 1996 to establish school governing bodies and task them with the responsibility of ensuring student discipline and safety. Mollo’s (2009) evaluation utilized document review and key informant interviews to study four resulting policies. Document review revealed that none of the policies were in alignment with legal principals, which Mollo argues is important so that legislative policies complement subordinate policies (e.g., district-level, school-level) and can help to provide additional protections for victims. Interviews highlighted the importance of not only involving stakeholders in policy design, but also making the effort to increase stakeholders’ basic awareness of the problem being addressed.

Finally, the United Kingdom’s Sheffield Project (see Eslea & Smith, 1998; and Smith, Sharp, Eslea, & Thompson, 2004) began as a large-scale replication of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program funded by the Department for Education. Two studies found in this literature review examined implementation and outcomes of this project. With respect to implementation, Eslea and Smith (1998) found the majority of schools continued policy development efforts after funding ended. However, Smith and colleagues (2004) found greater variation in sustainability among schools. As expected, schools that had invested more time and resources in sustainability showed better short- and long-term outcomes. In addition, both studies conducted student surveys, and both reported a decrease in bullying among males but not females. In 1996 (updated version released in 2002), based on evaluation results from the Sheffield Project, the “Don’t Suffer in Silence” toolkit was developed and disseminated to schools. Samara and Smith
(2008) evaluated the implementation of these toolkits, and found that most schools had rated the toolkit “moderately useful” and implemented a stand-alone anti-bullying policy.

Three of the country-wide policies – in Australia, Canada, and Germany – created national frameworks or networks to combat bullying and youth violence.

Australia’s National Safe Schools Framework was endorsed by all ministers of education in 2003, and provided comprehensive recommendations to schools on programs, policies, and awareness activities (Cross et al., 2011). Using teacher and student surveys, Cross and colleagues (2011) evaluated the implementation and outcomes after the framework was disseminated country-wide. Teachers felt they were lacking training on use of the framework, and thus implementation rates were poor. A moderate decline in student self-reported risky behavior was noted.

Pepler and Craig (2011) describe Canada’s “PREVNet” (Promoting Relationships and Eliminating Violence Network), which was created to break down silos among the agencies and organizations working on bullying and violence prevention. Through document review of PREVNet annual reports, Pepler and Craig’s (2011) evaluation found an increase in network members, activities, and capacity.

Finally, Germany’s efforts are described in an article by Leuschner and colleagues (2011). Creation of the Networks Against School Shootings (NETWASS) was informed by a previous project, the Berlin Leaking Project, which affirmed the feasibility of identifying “leaking behavior” (i.e., any warning signs a student may exhibit prior to engaging in violent behavior) as a violence prevention measure. NETWASS provided teachers with awareness and training on the early identification of youth that may be at
risk for violence. Leuschner et al.’s (2011) survey of teachers demonstrated an increase in teachers’ confidence to identify at-risk youth, as well as their acceptance of reintegrating identified youth back into their classrooms.

The final two national policies – in the European Union (EU) and Sweden – address youth safety through the monitoring and management of media and technology.

The EU began its Safer Internet Program in the 1990s as a response to increasing concerns regarding youth safety in the context of technology and the internet (Droste, 2010). In lieu of formal legislation to regulate the industry, the government allowed stakeholders and organizations to regulate themselves, and thus absorb the responsibilities of internet safety. Subsequently, in 2008, the Safer Social Networking Principles were launched by the stakeholder group. Droste (2010) examined policy impact through a cost-benefit analysis, as well as key informant interviews with industry stakeholders. Although it was found that self-regulation was less costly, Droste recommended the presence of both formal legislation and self-regulation, and use of a collaborative model between lawmakers and industry stakeholders.

In comparison to the EU, Sweden has a long history of strict government regulation of all media outlets including television, radio, and advertising. Hiebert’s (2010) study compares Sweden’s approach to Canada’s, where government regulation of technology is much less aggressive. The evaluation, using objective data from national crime statistics and self-report data from the Health Behavior in School-Aged Children Survey, demonstrated lower crime rates in Sweden and a clear association between youth delinquency and media consumption.
State/Province Policies

Table 3.5 lists the eight policies originating at the state/province level. This means that the policy was designed and passed at a state/provincial level; however, implementation may be delegated to counties or schools. Table 3.5 lists the name of each policy (sorted alphabetically), year established, location (i.e., state, province), brief description, and evaluation methodologies and findings.
Table 3.5. Summary of the eight state/province bullying/youth violence policies and evaluations found in this systematic literature review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Policy (Year Established)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evaluation Type &amp; Purpose</th>
<th>Evaluation Methodology</th>
<th>Evaluation Finding</th>
<th>Article Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 State-Level Anti-Bullying Legislation (various)</td>
<td>US – various</td>
<td>Existing anti-bullying legislation, as of 2003</td>
<td>Design – input To review existing state-level anti-bullying legislation</td>
<td>1) Document review of policies (n=15)</td>
<td>1) Laws which were written with care and aligned with research were more impactful; 2) Recommend including precise definitions, collaboration, and support for both the victim and bully</td>
<td>Limber et al., 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 State-Level Anti-Bullying Legislation (various)</td>
<td>US – various</td>
<td>Existing anti-bullying legislation, as of 2008</td>
<td>Design – input To review existing state-level anti-bullying legislation</td>
<td>1) Document review of policies (n=35) using Anti-Bullying Public Health Policy Criteria Index</td>
<td>1) Only 16 state policies incorporated comprehensive public health anti-bullying principles</td>
<td>Srabstein et al., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Illinois Public Act 93-0260 (2001)</td>
<td>US – Illinois</td>
<td>Mandated school districts to create policies to address bullying</td>
<td>Design – process &amp; implementation To examine district-level policies, and administrators’ perspectives of those policies</td>
<td>1) Document review of policies (n=52); 2) Surveys of administrators (n=35)</td>
<td>1) Policies meshed the definition of bullying with harassment; 2) Lack of partnership with stakeholders in various settings; 3) Lack of genuine support from administration 4) Lack of acknowledgement of link between academics and social emotional issues</td>
<td>Macleod, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Post-Virginia Tech Policy Recommendations (2007)</td>
<td>US – Texas</td>
<td>Two policy recommendation reports commissioned by government officials</td>
<td>Implementation &amp; short-term outcomes To examine the adoption and implementation of recommendations</td>
<td>1) Review of school websites (n=32); 2) Case studies of select schools (n=2)</td>
<td>1) Large variation when comparing universities versus colleges; 2) Lack of awareness of policies among both campus police and students/staff</td>
<td>DeLaTorre, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5. (Continued) Summary of the eight state/province bullying/youth violence policies and evaluations found in this systematic literature review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Policy (Year Established)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evaluation Type &amp; Purpose</th>
<th>Evaluation Methodology</th>
<th>Evaluation Finding</th>
<th>Article Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Safe Schools Act (1990)</td>
<td>Canada – Ontario</td>
<td>A “zero tolerance” policy which mandated suspensions and expulsions for defined behaviors</td>
<td>Implementation, short- &amp; long-term outcomes To examine sexual minority students’ perspectives of the policy</td>
<td>1) Key informant interviews at 10 high schools</td>
<td>1) Students did not feel any safer; 2) Policy design should be grounded in the experiences of those who will be affected; 3) Culture and norms that cannot be controlled be law can influence policy implementation.</td>
<td>Short, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 South Carolina Anti-Bullying Legislation (2006)</td>
<td>US – South Carolina</td>
<td>Mandated school districts to create policies to address bullying</td>
<td>Implementation &amp; short-term outcomes To evaluate policy implementation and administrators’ perceptions</td>
<td>1) Document review of policies (n=24); 2) Surveys of administrators (n=24)</td>
<td>1) Successful schools included parent-teacher collaboration, continuing education, investigation procedures; 2) A weakness of all policies was lack of collaboration with community stakeholders</td>
<td>Smith-Canty, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Stand Up for All Student Act (2008)</td>
<td>US – Florida</td>
<td>Mandated school districts to create policies to address bullying</td>
<td>Design – process &amp; implementation To compare state- and district-level policies</td>
<td>1) Document review of policy (n=1)</td>
<td>1) Districts had little say in development of state legislation; 2) Policies require some flexibility to allow administrators discretion in interpretation (otherwise liability issues may arise); 3) Anti-bullying policies require continuous review as the issue evolves</td>
<td>Richman, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5. (Continued) Summary of the eight state/province bullying/youth violence policies and evaluations found in this systematic literature review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Policy (Year Established)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evaluation Type &amp; Purpose</th>
<th>Evaluation Methodology</th>
<th>Evaluation Finding</th>
<th>Article Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Center for School Safety (1999)</td>
<td>US – Virginia</td>
<td>Legislatively created to train school resource officers (SROs)</td>
<td>Implementation &amp; short-term outcomes To examine the growth of the SRO program, as well as officer perspectives</td>
<td>1) Process evaluation of program growth and progress; 2) Survey of SROs (n=300)</td>
<td>1) Currently all Virginia secondary schools have an SRO when school is in session; 2) No national standards exist for SRO training; 3) SROs feel their biggest challenge is garnering cooperation from school staff</td>
<td>Clark, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again, the most common policy technique was to delegate responsibility to the school or district level. Five states/provinces – Florida, Illinois, South Carolina, Texas, and Ontario (Canada) – took this route.

Richman (2010) evaluated Florida’s “Stand Up for All Student Act” of 2008 by comparing one district’s policy to the state level legislation. After examining the district’s design and implementation processes, Richman’s (2010) major conclusions were: 1) collaborate with district-level partners when designing state-level legislation; 2) afford school and district administrators some flexibility in interpretation, to increase ownership and reduce liability (e.g., when policy directives are too detailed/restrictive); and 3) require continuous review of all policies as related issues evolve (e.g., the use of technology in bullying).

Macleod (2008) evaluated district-level policies which resulted from Illinois’ Public Act 93-0260 of 2001. Document analysis of 52 policies found that bullying was defined in a variety of ways (often times confused with harassment), and a lack of partnership/collaboration within and outside of schools. In addition, surveys of school administrators found lack of: 1) genuine support for bullying prevention; 2) understanding of the link between academics and social emotional wellbeing; and 3) use of data to inform policies and decision-making.

Smith-Canty’s (2011) evaluation of South Carolina’s Anti-Bullying Legislation of 2006 also employed both document analysis and administrator surveys. Evaluation findings emphasized the importance of parent-teacher collaboration, continuing education opportunities for teachers/staff, and engagement with the larger community.
Ontario’s Safe Schools Act of 1990 also delegated policy implementation to school districts, and also required a zero tolerance approach, which mandated suspensions and expulsions for defined behaviors. Short’s (2009) study evaluated sexual minority students’ perspectives of policy impacts. Interviews revealed that these students did not feel any safer on campus, and thus two major conclusions were put forth: 1) the policy design process should include those who will be affected by its implementation; and 2) there are always culture/norms that cannot be controlled by policy, but must be considered in policy development and implementation.

After the tragic school shooting at Virginia Tech, the governor’s office in Texas focused its mandate on university and college campuses. Two government-commissioned reports, with post-Virginia Tech policy recommendations, were implemented by all higher education campuses. DeLaTorre’s (2011) study found much variation in implementation, with the largest disparity seen when comparing universities and community colleges. In addition, there was a lack of awareness of the new policies and procedures among campus police, staff, and students.

One state – Virginia – legislatively created a program to support bullying prevention efforts.

In 1999, Virginia’s legislature funded the creation of the Virginia Center for School Safety as a training program for school resource officers (SROs). This was done in response to public pressure to station law enforcement officers at school campuses. However, Virginia’s legislature found that traditional officers were not equipped to manage and police the school environment. Clark (2011) examined the growth of the
SRO program, and surveyed officers that had been trained. At the time of Clark’s
evaluation, all Virginia secondary schools were assigned an SRO, yet a weakness was
that no national training standards existed. When surveyed, SROs expressed their biggest
challenge was lack of cooperation from school administrators and staff.

Finally, two articles conducted overall reviews of state level anti-bullying
legislation in the US.

Limber and Small’s (2003) article reviewed the 15 state laws that had been passed
by 2003. This meta-analysis found that laws which were written with care (versus rushed
or patched together), and those aligned with empirical research and data, were more
impactful. In addition, Limber and Small offered several key recommendations for anti-
bullying policies, such as inclusion of precise definitions, collaboration in design and
implementation, and support for both victims and perpetrators.

By 2007, 35 state-level anti-bullying laws had been passed. Srabstein, Berkman,
and Pyntikova’s (2008) meta-analysis of these laws using a public health lens.
Evaluation was conducted using the Anti-Bullying Public Health Policy Criteria Index,
which was created for the study based on public health research and evidence. Based on
index scores, Srabstein and colleagues (2008) found that only 16 of the 35 policies
incorporated public health anti-bullying principles.

**School Policies**

Table 3.6 includes the four policies originating at the school level. In addition to
country-wide and state-level mandates, schools have taken it upon themselves to adopt
additional whole-school policies and strategies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Policy (Year Established)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evaluation Type &amp; Purpose</th>
<th>Evaluation Methodology</th>
<th>Evaluation Finding</th>
<th>Article Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Locker-less School Facility Adaptation (various)</td>
<td>US – Texas</td>
<td>Schools have been constructed or renovated to eliminate lockers from hallways, in order to create quieter and safer environments</td>
<td>Short- &amp; long-term outcomes To compare locker-less to traditional schools</td>
<td>1) Document review of school expenditures; 2) Survey of faculty members</td>
<td>1) A cost-benefit exists in both construction and locker repairs/replacement; 2) Faculty feel schools are more secure due to reductions in contraband, violence, and theft; hallways are also easier to monitor</td>
<td>Bartosh, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Restorative Whole-School Approach (RWSA) (2003)</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>School-wide approach which emphasizes victim support and empowerment, bully reintegration and social inclusion, and school safety and harmony</td>
<td>Long-term outcomes To examine RWSA schools against comparison schools</td>
<td>1) Survey of students at four schools (n=1,480)</td>
<td>1) RWSA school students demonstrated reduced bullying and increased empathetic attitudes and self-esteem</td>
<td>Wong et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Visible Security Measures (various)</td>
<td>US – various</td>
<td>After Columbine shooting, schools responded with use of visible security measures (e.g., school resource officers, surveillance cameras)</td>
<td>Implementation &amp; short-term outcomes To examine staff and student perceptions of visible security measures</td>
<td>1) Quantitative analysis of data from the School Crime Supplement of the National Crime Victimization Survey</td>
<td>1) SROs received high marks from principals and students, but no association with decreased violence; 2) Unintended consequence of such measures could be the creation of a negative school environment</td>
<td>Addington, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Zero Tolerance Policies (various)</td>
<td>US – Virginia</td>
<td>Schools have implemented zero tolerance policies to reduce violent incidents, particularly those involving weapons</td>
<td>Short-term outcomes To examine the effect of zero tolerance policies on school climate and student help-seeking</td>
<td>1) Surveys from the Virginia High School Safety Study, conducted with students (n=7,431), teachers (n=2,353), and principals (n=289)</td>
<td>1) Zero tolerance policies were associated with negative school climate; 2) Supportive school climates are associated with student help-seeking behaviors</td>
<td>Eliot, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schools and policymakers in Texas began looking toward a locker-less school facility (Bartosh, 2006). Supporters felt that construction of schools without lockers, or removing them from existing schools, would promote a quieter, cleaner, safer, and more organized environment. Bartosh’s (2006) study found that faculty members do feel more secure in these environments, given the reduction in contraband, violence, and theft. Administrators also found locker-less environments easier to monitor.

Four schools in Hong Kong adopted a restorative whole-school approach (RWSA), which emphasized bully and victim support and empowerment, bullying reintegration and social inclusion, and school safety and harmony. Wong, Cheng, Ngan, and Ma (2011) evaluated the effectiveness of RWSA programs using student surveys at both experimental and comparison schools. The study found a reduction in bullying behavior at RWSA schools in comparison to non-RWSA schools, as well as an increase in empathetic attitudes and self-esteem.

After the Columbine school shooting in 1999, schools have increased the use of visible security measures (e.g., school resource officers, surveillance cameras) as part of their violence prevention strategies. Addington (2009) studied the use and effect of such measures at various schools in the US. While school resource officers received high marks from staff and students, no association was found between their presence and rates of bullying and violence. In addition, Addington notes that the creation of a negative and punitive school environment could be an unintended consequence of these types of security measures.
Finally, Eliot (2009) discussed the use of zero tolerance policies in Virginia schools; that is, policies that impose automatic punishments for any violation of a school rule. Originally implemented in the 1980s as part of drug enforcement and prevention, schools have implemented such policies to reduce violent incidents, particularly those involving weapons (Eliot, 2009). Eliot’s (2009) evaluation examined short-term outcomes using student, teacher, and administrator surveys. It was found that zero tolerance policies are associated with negative school climates, which may be detrimental to a school’s goal of promoting an environment where students feel comfortable seeking help from adults.

**Discussion**

While policy level interventions for bullying and youth violence prevention have been growing, efforts to connect this wave of momentum with empirical research have been slow to develop. This study was the first not only to systematically review the literature for existing bullying and youth violence prevention polices, but also to synthesize findings and recommendations from published policy evaluations. The scientific literature abounds with studies of bullying and related prevention programs, but empirical analyses and evaluations of policies are much more limited. Therefore, this study aims to promote the translation of empirical research findings to inform what ideally should be an iterative policymaking process.

**Policies That Delegate**

Nine of the policies found in this literature review (four country-wide and five state-level) delegated the responsibility of developing and implementing anti-bullying
policies to districts or schools. Success of these policies varied widely, with the most important predictor of policy impact being the amount of support provided. Limber and Small (2003) recommend allocating the appropriate funding to support implementation of effective and comprehensive bullying prevention efforts. In addition to funding the intervention, however, there is frequently lack of funding for training of those who will implement the activities. Studies have shown that school-level policies may not lead to meaningful impacts when teachers/staff are not properly trained on how to integrate anti-bullying messages into their classes/activities, as well as how to intervene when bullying is observed (Yoon, Bauman, Choi, & Hutchinson, 2011). Training must also be comprehensive, and include not only teachers, but also administrators, aides, support staff, bus drivers, crossing guards, community program workers/organizers, etc. (Cohn & Canter, 2013).

Successful policies were also associated with support from leadership, spanning from government leaders to board members and principals. All stakeholders need to hear and see genuine support and consistent messaging that bullying prevention is a priority and will not be tolerated. For example, this was critical with Norway’s Manifesto Against Bullying which was publically supported by the country’s Monarchy and Prime Minister (Roland, 2011). However, leaders who receive these mandates (e.g., principals) are unlikely to support an initiative that they themselves are not fully invested in (Vernberg & Gamm, 2003). Thus, in addition to educating all stakeholders of the mandate, other critical pieces include: 1) educating stakeholders on the issues, so that all perceive bullying and youth violence as serious problems; 2) including
strategies/guidelines for adoption and implementation; and 3) acknowledging programs and activities that already exist at the school level. Without these components, those receiving any policy mandate will find it difficult to gain ownership of the initiative, let alone implement the policy effectively.

**Policies That Promote Collaboration**

Three of the country-wide policies found in this literature review (Australia’s National Safe Schools Framework, Germany’s NETWASS, and Canada’s PREVNet) created new violence prevention networks and campaigns. These large-scale networks and campaigns can help to coordinate not only the individuals and organizations working in bullying prevention, but also the messages that are being disseminated to schools, youth, and the public (CDC, 2010). There have been a number of national movements in the US specific to bullying prevention. For example, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2012) has developed “Stop Bullying Now,” a website dedicated to the widespread dissemination of bullying prevention information and resources. Prominent organizations, such as the American Medical Association (see American Medical Association, 2012) and the American Academy of Pediatrics (see Committee on Injury, Violence, and Poison Prevention, 2009), have developed practice guidelines so that practitioners can become more active in the detection and treatment of bullying and associated behaviors. Even President Barack Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama publicly displayed their commitment to the issue through a White House conference on bullying prevention, and more recently released prevention guidelines (Shepherd, 2011). However, while bullying is clearly prominent on the US national agenda, efforts have not
culminated in a nationwide policy or mandate. In effect, the US has declared bullying and youth violence an important issue, but has left the choice of prioritization and strategy to individual states and schools.

In addition to the three country-wide examples discussed above, collaboration was emphasized by 14 other evaluations in this review. Collaboration is critical for youth violence prevention, given that historically the responsibility is either fragmented amongst multiple disciplines or falls through the cracks between organizations (Saul et al., 2008). Given the difficulty for any one organization to address this multi-faceted issue, let alone produce societal-level outcomes, multi-disciplinary collaborations can facilitate greater action. Collaborations can be highly beneficial and produce outputs and outcomes that address youth violence at the societal level of the social ecological model (Sugimoto-Matsuda & Braun, in press).

In school-based settings, parents must be considered key stakeholders to include in bullying prevention. Several studies reviewed also emphasize the need for teachers and staff to be viewed as stakeholders in both policy design and implementation. For example, Cross et al.’s (2011) evaluation of Australia’s National Safe Schools Network found that insufficient teacher involvement and training had led to poor implementation. Finally, community partnerships and resources must also be leveraged, and the task of creating a comprehensive approach to bullying prevention should engage stakeholders beyond school campuses. Smith-Canty’s (2010) review of South Carolina school policies found this to be a weakness even with the most successful policies. Youth spend only one-fourth to one-third of their day in school, and are otherwise at extra-curricular
activities, spending time with their peers, or at home with their families. The diversity of stakeholders that must be engaged in bullying prevention should mirror the various levels of the social ecological model (Srabstein et al., 2008).

**Policies That Prevent, Versus Policies that Punish**

Five policies (two state-level and three school-level) supported or created new bullying/violence prevention programs. Texas’ locker-less school facility adaptation (Bartosh, 2006) and Hong Kong’s restorative whole school approach (Wong et al., 2011) describe preventative measures that schools have taken to address youth violence. However, the remaining three policies (visible security measures, zero tolerance policies, and Virginia’s Center for School Safety) tackle the problem from a more punitive angle. This is commonplace in the field of bullying and youth violence, given that policies are often enacted or changed because of an event or trend which forces organizations to respond (Stader, 2006). In fact, some have coined the term “Columbine Effect,” which refers to how high-profile incidents of school violence can change the way the public thinks about school safety and security (Kupchik & Ellis, 2008; Stanely, Juhnke, & Purkey, 2004). This immense fear can serve as a potent motivator for implementation of violence prevention policies, despite studies showing that resulting policies are often times punitive in nature and rarely effective. By allowing policies to be constructed and implemented solely out of impulse and emotion may temporarily increase control of youth behavior, but may inadvertently overlook the core issues, erode school and learning communities, and marginalize victims and perpetrators (Muschert & Peguero, 2010). The culture shift, from solely punitive responses to one that emphasizes safe and positive
school-community climates, has been occurring slowly, but continued education among practitioners is needed.

In fact, all policies reviewed in this study provided recommendations that reinforce the importance of the social ecological model and a comprehensive approach. Effective policies incorporate key public health concepts including a clear definition of bullying, recognition of the link between safety and health, prohibition of bullying behavior, and the creation of a public health infrastructure (Srabstein, Berkman, & Pyntikova, 2008). However, any anti-bullying policy must be part of a larger ecological approach that addresses bullying from multiple levels. One of the most internationally-recognized approaches is the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP). The main program setting is the school, with school staff members as the primary individuals responsible for implementation, but the program also includes whole-school and community components (Olweus, Limber, & Mihalic, 1999). The major limitations of this program, however, are the specificity of the topic (only bullying addressed, versus inclusion of topic such as tolerance, help-seeking, resilience, etc.), and cost (curriculum and training can total several thousand dollars), which impact sustainability. Therefore, a multi-level approach is needed, but in combination with the previous recommendations – collaboration, a unified message, adequate resources, leadership support – all of which is supported by a sustainability plan.

**Evaluating Bullying and Youth Violence Prevention Policies**

In addition to the importance of including policy in a comprehensive approach, there needs to be consistent monitoring, evaluation, and revisiting of those policies. In
this study, while it was encouraging that 22 innovative policies were found, there is clearly a lack of evaluation and data-driven action in the policy literature. Examination of all phases of the process – inputs, design process, passage/adoptions, implementation, short-term outcomes, and long-term outcomes – benefits not only the success and impact of any given policy, but can also offer valuable information for other public health issues. Policymaking does not end with the passage of legislation and the implementation of programs authorized by the new law. The next questions are whether the initiative achieved its objectives, what the effects were, whether any further policy changes are needed, and how the broader societal context is affected (i.e., unintended consequences) (Flick, 2010). Sound policy evaluation can answer these questions.

In addition, the task of infusing data and feedback into the policymaking process must be continuous and longitudinal. Issues and problems evolve, public opinion sways, agency responsibilities change, and previous policies may become inapplicable or outdates. For example, cyber-bullying has become an added layer of complexity in bullying and youth violence prevention. Thus far, programs and policies have struggled to come up novel means to educate and police the responsible use of technology (Goebert, Else, Matsu, Chung-Do, & Chang, 2010). The United Kingdom’s Sheffield Project (Eslea & Smith, 1998; Smith, Sharp, Eslea, & Thompson, 2004), and subsequent “Don’t Suffer in Silence” initiative (Samara & Smith, 2008), are models for the extended commitment necessary to build a large-scale initiative, disseminate it widely, track progress over time, evaluate it rigorously, and evolve program strategies based on resulting data and changing contexts. This ongoing and iterative process must continue
to be examined to improve its effectiveness and efficiency, in order to truly apply translational techniques to policymaking.

**Limitations**

The limitations of this study are typical of those that rely on searching existing databases and scientific literature. While a variety of search terms were employed to gather a comprehensive list of articles, additional search terms and databases could have been explored. However, given that PubMed, PsycInfo, and Sociological Abstracts are the most utilized databases for youth violence research, the use of these three resources as well as the fairly extensive combination of search terms were deemed appropriate. In addition, books, book chapters, dissertations, and reports that may not appear in peer-reviewed journals were allowed via PsycInfo, Sociological Abstracts, and Google Scholar.

Secondly, initial exclusion of articles was determined by citation and/or abstract only. It may be that the description or evaluation of a policy was buried in an article. Therefore it is possible that if all articles were reviewed in full-text, additional items may have been included in this paper. Additional information could have been garnered, for example, by visiting national/state government websites to ascertain if any of their bullying prevention had been evaluated but have not yet been published. This relates to the larger issue earlier discussed, in that policy interventions are not commonly published in literature and reports, and that there is a general scarcity of policy evaluation studies.
**Conclusion**

The main purpose of this study was to conduct a systematic literature review to ascertain policy implications and recommendations of empirical research studies relating to bullying among youth. While governments and leadership agencies have answered the call of adopting bullying and youth violence prevention policies, a gap remains between the processes of empirical research/evaluation and policymaking. To rectify this issue, translational techniques need to be applied to all phases of the policy process: design, adoption, implementation, and monitoring/evaluation. More importantly, this process should be cyclical and iterative, such that research and evaluation findings are allowed to input back into the policy process to produce truly data-informed policies that are optimally efficient and impactful.
CHAPTER 4
PERSPECTIVES ON EVIDENCE-BASED POLICYMAKING
IN THE CONTEXT OF BULLYING PREVENTION

Abstract
Bullying has been recognized as a serious public health issue both nationally and internationally. Policies at the organizational and legislative levels have become a popular mechanism attempted to prevent these behaviors. However, bullying prevention policymaking has been separated from the research and evidence that emerge from related empirical studies. The purpose of this study was to explore factors that affect the application of different forms of data, evidence, and information in the policymaking process. In particular, legislation related to bullying prevention in the State of Hawai‘i was explored as a case study. The topic was examined using document review (testimony relating to Hawai‘i’s bullying prevention bill) and stakeholder interviews with organizational professionals and state legislators. Results indicated diverse views with regards to the accessibility of policymakers and the policymaking process, as well as the framing of bullying as an issue and the state of bullying prevention policymaking in Hawai‘i. Findings suggest that more research and evaluation are needed that are geared towards eliciting more details regarding evidence use in policymaking decisions. In addition, collaboration emerged as an important component of the policymaking process, which should engage stakeholders in meaningful and strategic ways to ensure strength in numbers and to bolster social and political capital around an issue.
**Introduction**

**Bullying as a Public Health Issue**

Bullying is recognized as a major public health problem that can have profound negative effects on adolescents, including physical injury, social and emotional distress, and even death (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2011). It has been estimated that 30% of US adolescents are involved in bullying incidents as perpetrators, victims, or both (Hamburger, Basile, & Vivolo, 2011). Among these, approximately 13% report being a bully, 11% report being a victim of bullying, and 6% report being both a bully and a victim (Nansel, Overpeck, & Pilla, 2001). Bullying behavior has been associated with other forms of antisocial behavior such as vandalism, shoplifting, skipping and dropping out of school, fighting, and drug and alcohol use (Hawai‘i State Department of Health [HSDOH], 2010). There is also evidence indicating that adolescents who participate in bullying, as bullies and/or victims, are more prone to physical illness (Due, Holstein, & Lynch, 2005; Srabstein, McCarter, & Shao, 2006). Without intervention, bullying can escalate to more severe forms of violence and physical harm (Olweus, 2011).

Although bullying itself is not a novel problem in schools, the attention focused on this topic has increased from approximately 300 media citations in 1996, to over 1,000 in 2008 (Snyder, 2010). Also, the volume of peer-reviewed research articles focusing on different aspects of bullying has increased from 0 in 1990, to over 300 in 2007, according to the American Psychological Association’s (APA’s) “Psycinfo” database (Snyder, 2010). Healthy People 2020 includes a new objective calling for the reduction of
bullying among adolescents, in addition to reductions in physical assaults, physical fighting, and weapon (gun, knife, club) carrying on school property (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services [DHHS], 2010). With the advent of technological advances, especially mobile communication (e.g., cell phones) and social networking (e.g., Facebook), cyber-bullying has also become a large part of the issue (David-Ferdon & Hertz, 2007).

There are varying definitions, some conservative and some more liberal, on what exactly constitutes bullying. The HSDOH (2010) defines bullying as a variety of negative physical (hitting, kicking, spitting, pushing, taking personal belongings), verbal (taunting, malicious teasing, name calling, making threats), and psychological acts (spreading rumors, manipulating social relationships, or engaging in social exclusion, extortion, or intimidation) carried out repeatedly over time. It involves a real or perceived imbalance of power, with the more powerful child or group attacking those who are less powerful (CDC, 2011). Adults and youth often think only of physical strength and stature when considering how an imbalance of power can occur, but other factors such as social status, knowledge (intellectual/academic, or knowledge about the other person that is a “secret”), and socioeconomic status should be considered (Olweus, Limber, & Mihalic, 1999). Other government, research, and academic organizations, both in Hawai‘i and on a national level, have attempted to define bullying. Across all of these agencies, there are three commonalities among definitions: 1) aggressive behavior, 2) a pattern over time, and 3) an imbalance of power and/or strength.
Prevention of Bullying Through Policy

Bullying prevention through policy, both at the organizational and legislative levels, has been increasing over the last two decades. This is evidenced by the number of states and countries that have passed bullying prevention laws. In 1999, no states in the US had any laws specific to school bullying. By 2007, 35 states had passed such laws, and there are currently 49 states with bullying prevention legislation (U.S. DHHS, 2013). Policies aimed at schools have also caught the attention of policymakers, given the pervasiveness of the problem on school campuses. In general, there is agreement among educators and policymakers on the importance of having an effective, school-wide, anti-bullying policy (House of Commons, 2007). Samara and Smith (2008) found that whole school policies, such as mandatory training for staff and students, can be effective when combined with supportive efforts like classroom curricula and playground/common area redesign. Experts in policymaking have recommended that a daunting task such as school safety should not be left up to individual schools or districts, but instead should be standardized for the whole state (Srabstein, Berkman, & Pyntikova, 2008). Having these types of polices signifies that the school, its administration, and its teachers are serious and dedicated to deal with and reduce bullying (Smith, Smith, Osborn, & Samara, 2008).

The urgency to address bullying has often focused on the need for strict and punitive bullying prevention policies and laws (Srabstein, Berkman, & Pyntikova, 2008). Typically this urgency does not come from legislators, but from schools, parents, and the general public. This intensifying focus has been attributed to factors such as high-profile school violence events, a number of highly visible suicides among youth that were linked
to bullying in media reports, and the expansion of empirical evidence describing the severe and long-term consequences of bullying behavior (Stuart-Cassel, Bell, & Springer, 2011). For example, the popularity of policies that mandate immediate and incontestable sanctions such as suspension (i.e., zero tolerance policies) as a mechanism for bringing a swift and definitive solution to bullying has increased in schools. Research has shown that properly administered zero tolerance policies can be effective, but only in combination with other preventative efforts and a comprehensive approach to improve school culture (Stader, 2006). Solely relying on a zero tolerance policy can create more problems than solutions, and can also result in a negative school climate where students may feel hesitant to seek help from adults.

Legislation to address bullying is an important part of a comprehensive and multi-faceted solution. Unfortunately, such policies are frequently separate from the research and evidence that emerge from empirical studies. Over the past several decades, the importance of “evidence-based” strategies has been growing. It has been recommended that public health evidence should always be incorporated in the selection and implementation of programs, policies, and evaluation plans (Brownson, Gurney & Land, 1999; Srabstein, Berkman, & Pyntikova, 2008). However, challenges remain that impede translational research and actions, particularly in youth violence prevention. One of the largest challenges that remain is how to efficiently and effectively translate public health evidence not only to individual- and community-level interventions, but also societal-level interventions such as public policy (Sugimoto-Matsuda & Braun, 2013).
Bullying Prevention Policy in Hawai‘i

Hawai‘i is the only state in the US with a single education system (U.S. Department of Education, 2013), and hence the potential to implement broad and sweeping change across all school districts. Hawai‘i Administrative Rules’ Chapter 19 govern all disciplinary actions that may take place in the school setting, and define offenses and guidelines for school administrators when encountering an incident. Offenses are classified as A, B, C, or D (HSDOE, 2009). Class A offenses are most serious, and include actions such as assault, burglary, possession of weapons, possession of illicit drugs, and sexual offenses Class B offenses are those such as disorderly conduct, gambling, harassment, and trespassing. Class C offenses include insubordination, class cutting, smoking, and leaving campus without permission. Finally, Class D offenses include possession of “contraband” items, and breaking school rules such as the dress code. At the beginning of the 2009-2010 school year, the Hawai‘i State Department of Education (HSDOE) took steps to create a system-wide anti-bullying policy through revisions of Chapter 19. In past versions of the policy, “harassment” was very loosely defined. There was no mention of any type of bullying, and no policy or guideline for when administrators identified such behaviors. However, explicit definitions for harassment, bullying, and even cyber-bullying were included in the revision. Bullying and cyber-bullying were also added to the list of Class B offenses (HSDOE, 2009).

At the legislative level, the “Keiki (Hawaiian word for ‘youth’) Caucus” has made bullying one of its top priorities. The Caucus is Co-Chaired by Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland, Chair of the Senate Committee on Human Services, and Representative John
Mizuno, former Chair of the House Committee on Human Services (currently Vice Speaker of the House). In addition to monthly networking and data-sharing meetings, the Caucus sponsors an annual Youth Summit where youth and adults are invited to hear from state leaders on various issues, meet in small workgroups to discuss those issues, and then vote on the Caucus’s policy priorities for the coming legislative session. For the last decade, a bill to prevent bullying has been introduced by this Caucus each year.

In July 2011, for the first time since introducing legislation regarding bullying prevention, House Bill (HB) 688 was passed and signed into law by Governor Neil Abercrombie. Now known as Act 214, this piece of legislation required the HSDOE to heighten its collective response to bullying and cyber-bullying, as well as to monitor school-level bullying prevention programs. As a result, in September 2011, the HSDOE unveiled “Peaceful Schools,” a campaign to address not only bullying and cyber-bullying, but also the safety and well-being of public school students as a whole. The campaign includes training for educators, heightened efforts to identify and assist youth involved in bullying, and increased prevention to stop bullying before it starts (Vorsino, 2011). However, the original form of Act 214 included more detailed and comprehensive measures regarding training for school staff, reporting of bullying incidents, and monitoring of implementation and outcomes. Thus, there has also been activity during the 2012 and 2013 (current) Legislative Sessions aimed at enhancing the content of Act 214.
Purpose of This Study

This study addressed the research question, “What factors affect the experiences of constituents and legislators in the policymaking process, with respect to decision-making?” Qualitative methodologies were employed in order to examine factors that mediate the translation of public health evidence to policymaking, from the perspectives of organizational professionals and legislators. In addition, a case study methodology was applied to examine the development and eventual passage of a bullying prevention bill (i.e., Act 214) during the 2011 Hawai‘i Legislative Session. Findings were informed by the analysis of testimony and transcripts of stakeholder interviews involved in advocacy, bullying prevention legislation, or both. The commonalities and disparities between how organizational professionals versus policymakers perceive the decision-making process were examined.

Methods

Study Approach and Design

The epistemological approach of this study drew on the key tenets of standpoint theory. Sprague (2010) describes this theory as follows: “Standpoint theory is not the spontaneous thinking of a person or category of people. Rather, it is the combination of resources available within a specific context from which an understanding might be constructed (p. 85).” Thus, even when a single event occurs, it is theoretically impossible for one individual to experience it in exactly the same manner as another. This theory fits well, because stakeholders in the legislative process represented a variety of positions within the social hierarchy, from high-level professionals (legislators and agency
managers) to coalition and community members. Unlike relativism, where there is no power dynamic considered, standpoint theory acknowledges an individual’s position in the socially constructed hierarchy (Sprague, 2010). This study also took a phenomenological approach, which examines the meaning of events through the lens of the people closest to the situation (Bogdan & Biklen, 2010). There was no pre-assumption of meaning, and as such, the goal was to see the series of events from the participant perspective.

Two major qualitative designs were applied to this study. In order to gather perceptions of the overall policy and decision-making processes, key stakeholder interviews were conducted with individuals involved in advocacy, bullying prevention legislation, or both. In addition, a case study methodology examined the events that have occurred around a specific anti-bullying law in Hawai‘i (i.e., the passage of Act 214). In lieu of asking about frequency or causal relationships, as in quantitative studies, the case study method examines the “how” and “why” (Yin, 2009). The overall goal is to learn about a complex event through extensive description and contextual analysis (Stake, 1997). The method allows the researcher to make direct observations and collect data in a natural setting, instead of relying on derived data such as test scores and responses to questionnaires (Bromley, 1986).

Data Sources and Measures

Public record. The first data source for this study included all pieces of testimony to inform the specific case study of House Bill (HB) 688 – a total of 109 documents. Five legislative committees convened hearings for the bill from February through April

**Interviews.** The second source of data for this study were qualitative key informant interviews with organizational professionals involved in policymaking/advocacy around youth violence, as well as policymakers in the Hawai‘i State Legislature. The main purpose was to gather in-depth information on the use of public health evidence in policymaking, from those directly involved in the process. In addition, participants were asked to provide their insight on the motivating factors that have affected bullying prevention legislation, including the eventual passage of House Bill 688.

A semi-structured interview guide was used to facilitate the interviews (see Appendices B and C). The goals were to ascertain the participants’ current use of public health data and evidence with respect to policymaking/advocacy activities, as well as their opinions on how the other group perceives the influence of data on policymaking. Questions were divided into three major topics. First, participants were asked to briefly provide general information about their professional role(s) and their organization. Second, participants were asked to discuss their thoughts on evidence/data, the generation of data for policymaking decisions, and how those data are shared with and utilized by legislators. Participants were asked to comment on two different types of evidence – 1) “hard data” such as agency reports and research/evaluation findings, and 2) “public data” such as testimony, public opinion surveys, phone calls, and emails. Finally, participants
were asked to reflect on bullying prevention policymaking in Hawai‘i, using Act 214 as a specific case example.

**Procedures**

*Public record.* Testimony were downloaded from the Hawai‘i State Legislature website. Each piece of testimony was read in its entirety, and contents were categorized and organized in a spreadsheet under the following categories: 1) How was the problem presented or framed; 2) How did people know this to be true/what evidence was presented; 3) Why did they support/not support the bill; and 4) Comments about specific portions of the bill. Within each of the categories, statements were clustered into themes so that common responses could be tallied.

*Interviews.* Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was obtained from the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. Organizational professionals recruited were: 1) those who submitted testimony relating to Act 214, and/or 2) leaders of statewide bullying prevention or advocacy organizations/taskforces. Legislators recruited were chairs or vice-chairs of committees which had reviewed Act 214 during the 2011 Legislative Session. In addition, all participants were given the opportunity to recommend other organizations/individuals for interview.

All participants were adults (i.e., 18 years of age or older). Although it was thought that the risks for participating in the qualitative interviews were small, a series of steps and protocols were followed to minimize risk. Informed consent was sought for all participants prior to any data collection. Interested participants received an explanation of the study purpose and requirements. If still interested after receiving an explanation of
the study, the participant was given an opportunity to have any inquiries answered about the study. When the data collection protocol was described to study participants, it was made clear that participation was entirely voluntary and that they may end their participation at any time without penalty.

All interviews were conducted in a private room and audio-recorded (with permission). Interviews were transcribed using code numbers, and data were separated by group (i.e., organizational or legislative). Recorded information was destroyed after transcriptions were completed.

Analysis

For both testimony and interview data, pattern-matching and explanation-building were the two types of analytic techniques used (Yin, 1998; Yin, 2009). Pattern matching aligns with the purpose of this study, given that a specific research question has been pre-determined. The second strategy, explanation building, also needed to be employed for this study to allow for the emergence of themes and patterns outside of the pre-determined theories. This left room for analysis of any other key themes that were discussed during the interviews, in addition to the pre-determined constructs. The use of both pattern-matching and explanation-building strategies parallels Stake’s (1997) strategies of selective coding (systematically coding with respect to a core concept) and open coding (considering data in minute detail while developing initial categories).

After each interview, the facilitator also generated field notes based on initial thoughts and reflections. Once the interviews were transcribed, the researcher identified and coded for emerging themes within the pre-existing categories set by the interview
questions. After codes were established, related quotes from the interview transcripts that best exemplified the themes were added. The facilitator’s field notes, as well as the use of thick descriptions for analysis and reporting, helped to ensure validity. In addition, member-checking was employed after all interviews were completed. This was done by presenting one organizational professionals and one legislator a summary of the findings for their respective group, in order to further refine themes and explanations.

Results

Sample Description

Public record. Document review was conducted to support the case study portion of this study. All submitted testimony relating to House Bill 688 (Twenty-Sixth Legislature, State of Hawai‘i, 2011) was examined to build more context around the arguments and evidence relating to the anti-bullying bill. A total of 109 pieces of testimony were examined, 101 submitted by adults, and eight submitted by youth. Of the adult testimonies, 66 were submitted by individuals in their professional capacities, 7 were submitted by parents of children who had experienced bullying, and 28 were submitted by community members.

Interviews. A total of 21 individuals were interviewed for this study – 11 organizational professionals, and 10 state legislators (senators and house members). All participants were adults (18 years or older). Fourteen organizational professionals were approached for interview, 11 of whom responded and agreed to participate in this study (two did not respond, and one declined). Of the 11 who participated, eight were female and three were male. Six were affiliated with state agencies/departments, and five
represented community-based organizations and non-profit agencies. Twelve state legislators were approached for interview, 10 of whom responded and agreed to participate in this study (one did not respond, and one declined). Of the ten who participated, two were female and eight were male. Five were senators, and five were house members.

**Types of Evidence Accessed and Offered to Legislators**

*Public record.* With respect to the type of evidence used in the 109 testimony documents, there was a clear dichotomy regarding the type of data cited. Quantitative data and statistics were relied solely upon by 64 out of 66 professional organizations/individuals to support their testimony. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC’s) Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) was the most common quantitative data source cited. Also, the Hawai‘i State Department of Education’s (HSDOE’s) School Quality Survey (SQS) was cited in three pieces of testimony, two of which were submitted by youth. The other two professional organizations provided a mix of quantitative data and personal quotes/stories of parents or youth. In contrast, all seven parents relied upon personal stories to convey their primary message. Among the 28 documents submitted by community members, two cited quantitative data sources, two cited stories from the media, and one included a personal story.

Of the 109 documents reviewed, only eight were submitted by youth. As mentioned above, two cited the HSDOE’s SQS as a specific data source. Three discussed a link to other risk behaviors, such as suicidality, but did not provide a specific source.
All eight youth cited a personal story, or experiences of other students at their school, to support their arguments about the bill.

Interviews. Agency and social service interviewees discussed a variety of data sources they have accessed when engaging in the advocacy process. With regards to quantitative research data, the most common data source mentioned was again the CDC’s YRBS. Participants also discussed the use of data sources from other national agencies, such as the U.S. Department of Education, the Suicide Prevention Resource Center (SPRC; given the link between bullying and suicidality/mental health), and the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN; given the increased risk of bullying among sexual minority youth). Local agency data were also mentioned, such as the Hawai‘i State Department of Health (HSDOH) and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA). However, several interviewees commented that quantitative evaluation data were lacking with regards to programming. There were specific concerns regarding the lack of data available to strengthen locally grown programs, and thus potentially labeling them as evidence-based.

With regards to qualitative forms of data, participants described a variety of examples where practitioner feedback and personal stories were used to support related research data. For example, one interviewee from a social service agency emphasized the importance of connecting the organization’s quantitative testimony with personal stories of victims and other community members that have been affected by a particular issue. She acknowledged the hesitation of victims to tell their stories, and the often intimidating nature of the testimony process, and thus discussed the role her organization plays in
meeting with these individuals, helping them prepare and frame their testimony, educating them about the process and the particular bill that is being debated, and of course accompanying them to the Capitol to physically testify. When speaking about a past advocacy effort, another interviewee from a state agency confirmed the importance of such collaboration:

“That was more of a community mobilization effort than it was a state agency effort…this one was more, what you call grassroots. And it became more well-received in the legislature, because a lot of people from the community came out. And the legislators like to see different faces, not the same old face…and that was something that was huge within the county to have constituents actually come out…a lot of effort went into pairs of individuals going into the council members’ offices explaining the data and also asking them if they would be likely to support or likely to oppose…giving [policymakers] a map of the state or their island, and showing how their district is in comparison to the rest…we went with somebody that can say, ‘Hey, check this out,’ and have more of those point blank conversations.”

With regards to bullying specifically, a number of organizational interviewees emphasized the importance of having youth involved in the advocacy process. One participant who works directly with youth indicated that she considered youth personal testimonies more reliable than self-report surveys. Several discussed recent efforts they been involved with to engage more youth in the policymaking process. One participant was working with students at a local high school on advocacy around anti-bullying
policy, and examining such policies in other states. Another participant praised the effectiveness of the annual Children and Youth Summit, organized by Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland and Representative John Mizuno. This yearly day-long event invites youth to brainstorm policy topic areas that are eventually written into bills that are introduced into the following legislative session.

**Perspectives on Use of Evidence for Decision-Making**

All of the organizational interviewees emphasized the importance of educating lawmakers on the importance of data-driven decision-making. Some felt that quantitative data were sorely lack in policymaking, and expressed a tone of frustration with this issue. However, others had tried to see the decision-making process from a legislator’s point of view:

“There’s no doubt that public opinion is important. And I think especially here in Hawai‘i, because our legislative districts are small and it’s really common to have very close elections…so our legislators are unusually open to public input. You call your legislator up and express an opinion and they listen. You can always get an appointment with your legislator. And that’s because they know that you piss somebody off and they tell their family and friends, and there go your [votes]. So it makes them probably more easily swayed by public opinions than in other parts of the country I suspect.”

During interviews with legislators, participants were asked to comment on their reliance on the two different types of evidence – 1) “hard data” such as agency reports and research/evaluation findings, and 2) “public data” such as testimony, public opinion
surveys, phone calls, and emails. All legislators stated that they use both types of evidence in their policy decisions, and each had a personal philosophy or perspective on how they attempted to strike a balance between the two. One Senator commented that making a decision on any issue comes down to common sense. For both types of evidence, he expects constituents to explain facts and concerns clearly – “Show me so I understand…there’s an immediacy to the consequence if the action is not done with common sense.” Another Senator discussed the balance in terms of mediating between individual rights and societal good:

“Every time we pass a law, it’s really the whole notion of balancing one’s individual right to pursue life, liberty, and happiness. It’s that whole notion, versus the benefit that society gets from having a rule or law. It’s not a real exact science about where do you draw the line. Or how do you draw the line about one’s individual rights versus the collective good of the community. So I think [that’s] the challenge in legislating or setting public policy…the data confirms that there’s an issue. Sometimes it helps us to identify potential root causes. But life is lots of gray…there’s not an explicit cause and effect in most instances, especially when you start talking about human behavior.”

Both organizational and legislative interviewees agreed that collaboration among community stakeholders was one of the most important elements in garnering support for an issue at the legislative level. One House Member commented:

“Those who want [the legislation], have they gone out and done the advocacy? Because that’s their role. If they want the bill, and they want public support, they
need to go out and get people to realize that this is a problem. That’s where we see some of it lacking. Where people come up with great ideas, but they’re not coming up with the community involvement, the community concern, or getting all the linkages. Because a lot of times when they do that, their ideas start to change…like, ‘Oh, I never thought of that’…so what that one idea was after getting more input could be way different. And that’s the process, if people want a bill, should be doing.”

An organizational interviewee also confirmed the importance of community stakeholders coming together and being on the same page before any bill comes before the legislature:

“[We thought] about who might come up against this…and if I could…frame it in the right way, then they’re going to say, ‘We agree, we’re going to testify with you.’ And that’s actually very valuable when it came to the legislature. It was such a complicated bill if it’s just us against them. Then the legislators get really frustrated, because then they’re told two different things, and they’re like, ‘Who do I support?’ And there were times…when the legislators are just like, ‘I’m sick of hearing this…how come you guys didn’t know this before you got here?’”

**Accessibility to Policymakers and the Policymaking Process**

Interviewees were asked for their opinion as to whether the general public had adequate access to the policymaking process in general. From the organizational perspective, interviewees offered mixed opinions and perceptions as to how realistic it is for the average citizen to engage in the process. Several interviewees felt that accessibility was high:
“I think the opportunity is there. I don’t think that the general public is aware of how much opportunity they have…in many places, you can only testify at your legislature if you’re invited to come. Here, not only can anybody testify, they’ve made it really easy to get your testimony in. I think we have the only public access room in the country.”

However, others felt that there was a large gap between the general public and the policymaking process, and that this separation would not be ameliorated simply by raising awareness in the community. One interviewee commented:

“Nobody knows how to do it…the majority of practitioners don’t even know how to do that…they just don’t know what it’s supposed to look like, or what would be acceptable, or…what we’re even allowed to do.”

Similarly, another interviewee stated:

“There’s lots of opportunities. But…I would say it’s for sort of elite. The elite, because most people don’t know about all of those [opportunities]. Starting with they don’t know the importance of policy, they don’t know the importance of a bill, or an administrative rule…then the whole process to get a policy, like a bill, written and passed and enacted. That is like so not in the purview of most people…when we talk about health equity, [people] that should have that opportunity, and like so many other things in society they don’t, because it’s not fair. Because they don’t learn about it, they don’t know about it…nobody’s ever told them. It’s not expected that they will be involved in any policy writing or making or implementation.”
All legislators that were interviewed felt access to the overall process, and physical access to policymakers and the State Capitol, were adequate especially in comparison to other states. However, there were varying opinions as to whether “adequate” was satisfactory to them personally, or whether more needed to be done to connect with their constituents and urge them to make their voices known. On one hand, some felt that the efforts being made by the legislature as a whole was helping to increase public access and engage community members in the process. Examples provided were town meetings, the new user-friendly website (which includes online tracking of bills, notifications of hearings, and an online means by which to submit testimony). As one legislator put it:

“I do believe that the 76 individuals elected as State Representatives or Senators in Hawai‘i are a lot more accessible than most other legislators in other states. I think all of us try to respond and be responsive. I think all of us try to make time available for people who want to engage, more so than I’ve seen in most of other states…I’ve always said it was kind of the genius of the architect to design the peoples’ building…a facility that is so opening and welcoming in general…I know that we work at it all time. I’ve been a big proponent and advocate for using technology to make it easier for people to engage. But the challenge is getting more [people] engaged, and it’s really trying to work through all the different sources and nature of information and then trying to make the best decisions that we can.”
However, others felt that they as individual legislators needed to take further steps to engage constituents and gather feedback on particular issues. Participants discussed different strategies they had used to try to connect with their communities, such as town hall meetings, surveys to gather policy priority topics, newsletters, and Facebook and Twitter accounts. One legislator commented:

“If you want to do it right, it has to be a full-time job…I have a pre-session, mid-session, post-session meetings, I set that up. And I set that up with my support group who are with me in good times, bad times, election year, non-election years…I think there are avenues, we’re very accessible…but I think it’s about letting people know that we’re accessible, and spending time and energy to make ourselves accessible…my first 3 years or 4 years, first meeting I had maybe four people. And that included my aunty, and my mother, and my office manager. The next year I had maybe eight people. The next year we had 15 people. But today when I have community meetings, I get 75 or a 100 people that show up. And then we bring Olelo in, so we re-broadcast it. So we’re trying, we’re trying our best. We’re trying our best to get out there.”

Case Study – Framing the Issue of Bullying

Public record. Each of the testimony documents framed the issue of bullying in a different way. In comparison to the interviews, testimonies highlighted the correlation between bullying and other negative effects more frequently. The link between bullying/safety and academic performance was emphasized in 38 of the 109 pieces of testimony. For example, one community member wrote in her testimony, “While we all
understand DOE must address numerous education priorities, students cannot learn effectively in an environment where they do not feel safe and supported.” Other testimonies cited the connection of bullying with depression, suicidality, and physical health, as well as potential effects on a bullied youth’s family and friends. All of the youth testimonies provided some type of personal story. For example, one high school student wrote,

“I am one of those students. I feel like I can’t be myself in certain classes because students and even teachers say offensive and even threatening comments about certain issues, creating an uncomfortable and unsafe environment for me to learn. The lack of feeling safe does not only affect me academically but socially as well.”

Interviews. In addition to their professional roles and knowledge of bullying-related research, nine of the 11 organizational interviewees had interacted with parents and youth that were victims or witnesses of bullying. She summarized her experiences in the community by saying:

“One of the biggest problems with bullying is the assumption that it’s something we have to live through, something that just has to happen. It’s sort of the natural course of things. And while it may be a very natural form of relating to one another, and creating a pecking order, and sort of social structuring, I don’t think it’s something that the youth have to be experiencing in the way they’re experiencing it. I don’t think it’s benefitting them more than it’s harming them.”
All of the legislators also agreed that bullying is a serious issue. However, there was a variety of perspectives with respect to framing of the issue and envisioning the most appropriate solutions. Some legislators were closely connected to the issue, and felt that action at the legislative level was essential. One legislator stated:

“I still think not everyone is of the same opinion that bullying is a problem. Where there have been reports, we still see administrators basically saying, ‘We don’t want to make it public, otherwise people may not want to come to our school,’ which is not good either. And I think more generally speaking, we haven’t trained our personnel well to address bullying in a positive way, and more so how integrate, with very little expense, ways that will promote peace.”

Other legislators, while still acknowledging the seriousness of the issue, were unsure of the appropriateness of addressing bullying at the legislative level. The most common challenges pointed out were how to legislate human behavior, and how to legislate bullying on school campus when many incidents occur outside of the school purview. As one legislator commented:

“We’ve done cyber-bullying. We’ve done bullying in school. The Department of Education has made stricter policies on bullying. However, I think as we [better] understand bullying and the effects… we need to remember, with bullying it’s so open. It’s not just in schools. We can control kids in schools, but it’s hard to control kids in the community. So, we can do rules in school, but how does that transfer to their community? Then you’ve got law enforcement, you’ve got parent education, and all these things attached to bullying… bullying is such a
pervasive issue. The issue is how do we, with the community, figure out different, additional ways of attacking it.”

Case Study – Act 214 Bullying Prevention Legislation

Finally, there were a variety of perspectives when participants were asked to specifically discuss Act 214. None of the organizational interviewees were satisfied with policymakers’ decisions and the final outcome of the bill. Most felt that despite passage of the bill, the overall effort was a failure since the resulting legislation disregarded all of the originally suggested content (many of the interviewees had themselves contributed to the bill design process). For example, one interviewee commented,

“It’s not substantive. It’s pretty benign, actually. The Board of Education has direct oversight of the Department of Education. It doesn’t have any time constraints. It doesn’t tell you exactly what kind of reporting…it’s kind of non-threatening to anybody. I believe it’s a bullying law, removing Hawai‘i from the last few states who didn’t pass a law. But that’s about it.”

However, one social service professional felt that although there was still work to be done, she would not label Act 214 as a failure:

“I rep [Act 214] all the time, despite its flaws…as soon as we started doing trainings this school year in August and September, I had questions like ‘Is this illegal?’ And being able to finally say yes…that actually changes things for people. Parents are stepping up saying, ‘What? It’s illegal?’ Somehow that really shifts the community perception of what’s ok…so giving it this little bit of
‘umph’ and creating a little bit more of a black cloud over it changes the community perception.”

As previously discussed, there were mixed opinions among the legislators as to the outcomes of Act 214, and the general need for anti-bullying legislation. All of the legislators felt that some type of legislation was needed. Several maintained their stance that a comprehensive school-based law was necessary:

“We saw the need to have legislation like this…when the President comes out, and it’s in the newspaper, and it’s on a couple of the news stations, and then they show a YouTube video of someone being just pummeled with punches and kicks, it’s very real. And the lawmakers see that. And then they’ll say, ‘Hey I saw you on the news. Is it really that bad in Hawai‘i? Is it that prevalent?’ And I’ll tell them, ‘Yeah it is. Don’t only look at my article, Google it. See what we have. We have it a lot.’ And this is a national issue. Hawai‘i is not immune to this. We have a large number of cases here, but we just don’t talk about it.”

However, some felt that the existing anti-harassment laws were sufficient and that anything more detailed should be left to individual schools and communities. These perspectives stemmed from legislators’ philosophies on lawmaking:

“I believe when it comes to certain issues like bullying and cyber-bullying, it’s not to say at the legislative level we shouldn’t be getting into the fine details. But, the laws that we create should be at the 30,000 foot level. They’re static. They’re guides. They should be for the most part universal, and good throughout time. They shouldn’t be really specific and detailed. We can set the tone for someone
else to set the detail. That’s for the Board of Education, the Department of Education, even private schools, home schools, others, to set the detail, and for us to hold accountable at this level…[fine details] shouldn’t come from the [legislative] level in my perspective…we need to empower from our level, for them to do what needs to be done to protect students.”

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore the different forms of data and evidence introduced into the policymaking process, and what factors influence both constituent and legislator experiences in utilizing the different types of evidence. Stakeholders on both sides of the translational process were interviewed; that is, organizational practitioners that input data and information into the policymaking process, and state senators and house members that receive the information and wrangle with it to make decisions. Questions were then applied to a specific case study, Act 214 (anti-bullying bill), which offered new perspectives on bullying prevention policy and practice in Hawai‘i.

Data Sources to Support Testimony

With respect to data and information in general, two types were discussed with all interviewees: 1) research and scientific quantitative data, and 2) qualitative data such as testimony and personal stories/experiences. When considering quantitative data in general, the majority of interviewees relied upon both state and federal governmental sources. Specific to bullying, however, available quantitative data was much more limited. While sources such as the YRBS were commonly referenced, these data are primarily used to demonstrate the extent of the problem. However, both organizational
and legislative interviewees expressed the need for more local research and evaluation of existing programs to gain a better understanding of what interventions are effective and cost-beneficial. Thus, there is a need for support at all levels for more frequent and rigorous evaluations of local programs and policies.

Qualitative data was also discussed as an important component of the advocacy process. While participants commented on the benefits of both quantitative and qualitative data sources, there was general agreement that a balance of both was essential. In particular, professionals with expertise in data, research, or evaluation, should partner closely with community members who have experienced the problem first-hand. One example of such a partnership at the federal level is the Center for Disease Control and Prevention’s Academic Centers of Excellence (ACE) on Youth Violence Prevention program. Founded in 2000, the ACEs aim to build scientific infrastructure, promote interdisciplinary research, foster collaboration, and empower communities around youth violence prevention (Vivolo, Matjasko, & Massetti, 2011). The Asian/Pacific Islander Youth Violence Prevention Center in Hawai‘i, founded through the ACE program, has partnered with community and grassroots organizations to educate lawmakers about youth violence and the importance of prevention (Umemoto et al., 2009). Also founded through CDC funding, Urban Networks to Increase Thriving Youth (UNITY) promotes collaboration across the public and private sectors to maximize resources, ensure sustainability, and encourage effectiveness of violence prevention efforts (UNITY, 2008).

Probably of utmost importance was the need for consistency across sources. A number of legislators highlighted the fact that successful advocacy efforts occur when
stakeholders in the community have already come together and worked out major differences and disagreements. This is in alignment with best practices for effective policy engagement that have been posited in the literature: 1) Build presence and goodwill through commitment, credibility, continuity, and consistency (Gold, 2011); and 2) Foster excellent communication through clarity, correctness, conciseness, and credibility (Smith, 2010). The senators and house members would prefer critical arguments to be handled prior to session and heard, and not to be forced themselves to muddle through the various solutions proposed.

Collaboration as an Essential Element

An underlying theme which emerged from discussions of balancing different types of data sources was the critical importance of collaboration. This included not only partnership between researchers and community members in general, but more specifically the formation of a strategic collaboration with key stakeholders invested in a particular topic area. The creation of formalized, multi-disciplinary, and integrated collaboration has been suggested as a valuable tool that can facilitate action and change at the societal level (Sugimoto-Matsuda & Braun, 2013). With respect to youth violence and bullying, it has been recommended that collaborations include representatives of the juvenile justice system, youth-serving agencies, schools, faith-based organizations, health services, child protective services, government, parents, and youth (Guerra, 2003). Formalized coordination is especially critical for youth violence prevention, given that historically the responsibility is either fragmented among multiple disciplines or falls through the cracks between organizations (Saul et al., 2008).
Multiple challenges arise when functioning as a collaborative group. Joint efforts require the sharing of goals, activities, responsibilities, resources, and above all, time (Backer, 2003). Also, the formation of a collaboration may introduce conflicts that did not previously exist, bring about issues of turf/competition, or provide a forum for partners to rehash disagreements from the past. This is exacerbated when an appropriate assessment of the inter-agency environment and climate is not conducted prior to collaboration formation (Backer, 2003). Therefore, even if the group is created in the best interests of all stakeholders, it may not function properly and may not be sustainable. Thus, the presence of an organizing group or entity is of utmost importance. In this study, multiple participants alluded to this. Interviewees provided a variety of examples in which a specific organization, whether it was an office within a state agency or a community/non-profit organization, took on the role of organizing stakeholders around a specific advocacy effort. Whether intentionally or unintentionally, these organizing bodies facilitated the process by explaining the policy process, preparing community members to provide testimony, crafting sample testimony pieces, and serving as a liaison with legislators. In turn, legislators acknowledged many of these groups. Thus, the organizing bodies and their partners saw an increase not only in name recognition, but also trust and credibility with policymakers.

*Beyond Collaboration – Social and Political Capital*

Looking concurrently at the processes of collaboration and policymaking, one might examine what “threshold” of collaboration results in sufficient power or influence to achieve policy change. Although collaboration and partnership was a general theme
from the interviews in this study, the case study of Act 214 indicated that simply having groups and individuals come together to support a cause was not enough to push forward a comprehensive piece of legislation. To help ameliorate challenges to collaboration, Spoth and Greenberg (2011) emphasize the necessity of bi-directional communication and learning in order to achieve both community-level impact and sustainability. Fink (2001) writes about the need for a common agenda, where all stakeholders agree to work together efficiently, effectively, and in the best interests of the youth. From a review of the literature, Foster-Fishman and colleagues (2001) were able to characterize a successful collaboration as one with adequate and well-defined member capacity (skills of individuals), relational capacity (working process of the collaboration), organizational capacity (leadership and resources), and programmatic capacity (objectives and goals). Building capacity at various levels of the social ecology, and sustaining this capacity via societal level components such as policies, helps to maintain the stability and consistency that are important for successful outcomes (Farquhar, Michael, & Wiggins, 2005; Sabol, Coulton & Korbin, 2004). Thus, it is not sufficient to simply bring stakeholders together, or even to form some sort of taskforce or coalition. There must be some kind of meaningful and strategic engagement that ensures the strength in numbers, and builds the political power of the group.

While traditionally associated with economics, business, and labor markets, the notion of “capital” has more recently been applied to a social science context and can be paralleled to the tools and training that enhance productivity (Putnam, 1995). “Social capital” has been described as, “…features of social organization such as networks,
norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit (Putnam, 1995). Multiple studies have confirmed the benefits of social capital, which exists in two forms – bonding (connections of community members with other community members) and bridging (connections with communities, groups, and institutions outside of an individual community) (Carpenter, Daniere, & Takahashi, 2004). For example, lack of social capital has been associated with poor health status and quality of life (Kawachi, Kennedy, Lochner, & Prothrow-Stith, 1997; Kim & Kawachi, 2007). On the other hand, “political capital” has typically been attached to presidents and policymakers (e.g., Dennis, Ridder, & Kunkel, 2006), and the status of entire countries (e.g., Siegel, 2007). However, it has been suggested that social capital can be connected with a community’s level of political engagement. Xu, Perkins, and Chow (2010) found that interpersonal relationships, mutual support, and reciprocity contributed to increased political participation. Thus, more research and exploration is needed on effective collaboration for advocacy, and the ingredients that are essential to converting social into political capital.

**Limitations**

A common limitation with human subjects research is that participants may feel pressured to confirm the opinions of the facilitator, or may not feel comfortable enough to be honest and candid. For this study, the facilitator was trained in interview techniques and was prepared to manage the discussion and allow the format to be free-flowing while also maintaining some structure and achieving the purpose of the interview. Because only one facilitator was present at the interviews, all sessions were audio-taped (unless
permission was not obtained from the participant) and transcribed to ensure important
details are not missed during the discussion.

Also, potential researcher biases and tensions may be applicable to this study.
First of all, the issue of “studying up” versus “studying down” has been considered; that
is, issues may potentially arise in qualitative methods depending on the researcher’s
hierarchical relationship to the participants. Because this study focuses on policy,
individuals at high levels of the social hierarchy (legislators, agency personnel) will be
research participants. Thus, the power dynamic varied by individual, and was very
different from the researcher’s pervious experiences interviewing youth and community
members. In addition, the researcher has considered relationships as an “insider” and
“outsider” with targeted study participants. The researcher of course wears the hat of a
researcher, but is also involved in bullying prevention policy issues in Hawai‘i.
Therefore, a potential tension exists in that the researcher will be an “insider” with some
participants (e.g., other researchers, fellow taskforce members), but will be an “outsider”
with other participants (e.g., legislators).

Next Steps for Anti-Bullying Policy

Based on the findings from this study, several action items can be recommended
as efforts continue to push for comprehensive, data-driven bullying prevention policy.
First of all, if states are to consider policies that are evidence-informed, more work must
be done with respect to data gathering, analysis, and dissemination. While all of the
existing data confirm that bullying is indeed a public health problem, things are less clear
as to causes and solutions (O’Moore, 2005). This is evidenced in the testimony offered
to legislators in support of Act 214. While testifiers clearly felt bullying was a problem and existing policies were not effective, there were no suggestions for specific programs or strategies aside from the need for an anti-bullying law. In addition, evaluation of current efforts must not only be encouraged, but perhaps mandated by institutions and funders. All too often, when economic times are down, evaluation and monitoring are the first activities stripped of funding (Reisman, Gienapp, & Stachowiak, 2007). There must be a culture shift when supporting and funding youth programs, so that evaluation is not seen as an added inconvenience, but instead a necessary component to ensure the program is achieving its desired outcomes and not causing unintentional harm (Flick, 2010). In addition, legislators must be informed and educated on the importance of data and evidence. However, as legislators have stated in this study, such presentations must be boiled down to the most important points and tied to how the proposed policy could affect their own island and community.

In Hawai‘i, evaluation of Act 214 and resulting activities must be instituted. In response to passage of this bill, the Hawai‘i State Department of Education initiated a comprehensive safety and wellness program called “Peaceful Schools.” Launched in September 2011, Peaceful Schools is a campaign to address not only bullying and cyber-bullying, but safety and well-being as a whole (Vorsino, 2011). However, there is no indication as to whether the policy will be evaluated (that is, will the Board of Education truly continue to closely monitor the HSDOE’s implementation of Peaceful Schools), and whether the program will be evaluated (that is, are schools implementing the new guidelines, and how are intermediate and long-term outcomes being changed over time).
The Hawai‘i DOE is a statewide system of over 181,000 students (Saka, 2011), and as such, offers an invaluable opportunity to achieve broad-sweeping impact through educational policies. However, schools and principals maintain a substantial level of autonomy with respect to implementation of policies and programs. Therefore, varied levels of implementation fidelity are expected, and as a result varied levels of student outcome success. Findings from evaluation of Act 214 and Peaceful Schools have the serendipitous potential for creating generalizable knowledge for other school districts in the US. While the inclusion of policy in a comprehensive approach to violence prevention is essential, the policy is only as good as the consistency of implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

Finally, it is clear that more work needs to occur on the ground, in the community. Collaboration and partnerships that are purposeful, strategic, and systematic across sectors, organizations, and communities are essential for youth violence prevention (Umemoto & Hishinuma, 2011). Most importantly for Hawai‘i, efforts to collaborate with the HSDOE must continue. In the midst of addressing such emotional topics such as bullying, problems can lead to frustration, which can then lead to approaching other stakeholders in an adversarial manner. Instead, focus must be put back on the central agenda item – the safety and wellbeing of our youth. Perhaps if such an arrangement can turn out to be impactful in schools, a state level anti-bullying law may not be necessary.

Agency, social service, and community stakeholders may offer support and partnership to the HSDOE as they implement the statewide Peaceful Schools initiative. In turn, stakeholders may organize to hold the BOE and HSDOE accountable for maintaining
implementation momentum. Finally, more organized and coordinated collaboration among all partners would strengthen the momentum of activities. Thus, a bigger system and network of prevention will be supported, thereby having greater impact on bullying as a public health issue.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

Application of Kingdon’s Three Streams Framework

This three-study dissertation aimed to examine the process of translating data and evidence to policymaking relating to youth violence and bullying prevention. Kingdon’s (2011) landmark work on agenda setting and policy formation was found to be an excellent conceptual framework for organizing the three studies and their respective research questions. His “three streams” framework maps out the three concurrent processes of policymaking: 1) problems emerge as a result of a crisis/event or changes in some type of data indicator; 2) policy proposals/alternatives develop as a result of gradual accumulation of knowledge and perspectives on the specific problem; and 3) political events occur that may influence the overall climate, such as changes of administration or swings in public opinion (Kingdon, 2011). Alignment of the three streams of policymaking has, in a sense, already been realized in bullying prevention. This is evidenced by the number of states that have successfully passed anti-bullying legislation. Bullying has been identified as a public health issue by individual states and national agencies, policy alternatives are available (the majority of which address bullying at the school level), and the political climate is amenable to such changes. Organizing these processes on an appropriate model made it possible to examine the various events that contribute to policy-related successes and outcomes. Consistent use of such frameworks may facilitate comparisons of different policies, and thus better inform the existing best practices for bullying and youth violence prevention.
This study also illuminated the importance of connecting policymaking with the subsequent processes of policy implementation and evaluation. The “back end” of the policy process frequently receives much less attention. Often times, policymakers and advocates alike expend much energy and resources on crafting and adopting policies, but do not conduct the necessary follow-up and monitoring of the intended outcomes. In addition, such evaluation is rarely cyclical, even though an iterative monitoring process is recommended by many seminal evaluation models. Thus, the full policy process spans from design (both content and the design process), passage/adoption of the policy, implementation, monitoring of short-term outcomes, monitoring of long-term outcomes, and the opportunity for outcomes to cycle back and inform redesign if necessary. To make an impact on bullying and youth violence from a systems and policy perspective, public health evidence must be generated, policies must be grounded in the evidence through a translational process, interventions must be implemented as designed, evaluation findings must be directed back into policy design, and lessons learned must be disseminated broadly.

Swinging the Pendulum Back Towards Prevention

All three studies included the discussion of punitive versus preventative policies and interventions. Study 2, which reviewed youth violence and bullying prevention policies, noted the so-called “Columbine Effect” which refers to how immense fear can serve as a potent motivator for implementation of punitive policies despite studies showing that such policies and rarely effective (Kupchik & Ellis, 2008; Stanely, Juhnke, & Purkey, 2004). The US is currently experiencing this trend, given the tragic shooting
that took place at Sandy Hook Elementary School in December 2012. New gun control bills are flooding into state legislatures around the country, even in states with historically strong pro-gun advocates (Rudolf & Bindley, 2013). In these instances, underlying issues such as screening and early intervention, lack of mental health services, family discord, and lack of positive social supports, are overshadowed by efforts focusing on the crime or weapon.

Study 1, which examined youth self-report data regarding youth violence and bullying behaviors, reinforced the need for primary prevention, as well as intervention even earlier than is already occurring. Earlier interventions that address root causes such as development of pro-social skills and social-emotional learning can be more impactful, versus simply addressing the manifesting behaviors such as violence and bullying. Findings of a meta-analysis of universal school-based programs aimed at social-emotional wellbeing demonstrated that in addition to improving academic performance, these interventions also enhanced students’ behavioral adjustment in the form of increased pro-social behaviors and reduced conduct and internalizing problems (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011). There are already many programs that help students apply pro-social skills to prevent specific problem behaviors such as substance use, interpersonal violence, bullying, and school failure (Zins & Elias, 2006).

In addition to teaching youth to internalize and practice pro-social skills, there is also the need to increase their tolerance and empathy for each other. Study 1 revealed complex differences by ethnic group, especially when considering how ethnicity interacted with sex and grade level. While program and policy interventions must be
sensitive to socio-cultural differences, it is not always realistic or efficient to create an intervention or policy for every single at-risk group. Therefore, instead of creating individualized policies for each sub-group, supporting education on tolerance, appreciation of differences, and how to accept and appreciate others’ differences may be more impactful and cost-effective. One high school in Hawai‘i, for example, has developed and institutionalized an Ethnic Studies course which promotes improved self-identity, cross-cultural understanding, and tolerance for differences. The goal of the course is to decrease pro-violence attitudes through critical thinking, conflict resolutions, and understanding diversity (Umemoto et al., 2009). Youth may lack positive sources of self-esteem and sense of power, and thus bully more vulnerable students to bolster their own sense of worth and significance. Therefore, policies and interventions must dig deeper and address these latent and underlying influences.

**Translation of Data to Policymaking**

This dissertation study also emphasized the importance of continuing to close the gap between data and practice. There continues to be a wide gap between research and practice in school-based prevention and promotion, just as there is with many clinical interventions for children and adolescents (Weisz, Sandler, Durlak, & Anton, 2005). While Studies 1 and 2 synthesized existing data on bullying prevalence, correlates, and potential policy solutions, they also exposed the need for different types of data sources to help move prevention forward. Study 1 revealed that the picture of bullying is incomplete, and thus poses an added challenge in translating data to practice. Thus, it would be important to connect the available data sources together, including youth self-
reported attitudes and behaviors, and objective data from schools and other youth agencies. Specific to policy, Study 2 emphasized the need for policy evaluation throughout the whole policy cycle – inputs, the design process, passage/adoPTION, implementation, short-term outcomes, and long-term outcomes. Finally Study 3 highlighted the need for evaluation of local programs and policies, so that existing practice can be examined and changed if needed. Study 3 also spoke to policymakers’ desire to see consistency across data sources.

Therefore, it is important to connect all of the available data sources together to paint a more comprehensive picture of the issue of bullying, potential solutions, and remaining gaps. However, it is also just as important to examine discrepancies among sources and see why those might exist. The literature suggests a number of solutions to the challenge of connecting data and evidence to practice. For example, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) is pushing for the expansion of practice-based research, which is grounded in, informed by, and intended to improve practice. Practice-based research occurs in the field, where clinicians connect with patients, trainings connect with audiences, and public health messages connect with communities. Practice-based research may help because it can: 1) identify the problems that arise in daily practice that create the gap between recommended intervention and actual practice; 2) demonstrate whether interventions with proven efficacy are truly effective and sustainable when provided in the real-world setting; and 3) provide the “laboratory” for testing system improvements in interventions to maximize the number of people who benefit from a
scientific discovery (Westfall, Mold, & Fagnan, 2007). This may be the essential link among research discoveries, intervention efficacy, and everyday effectiveness.

**Policy Within a Comprehensive and Coordinated Approach**

The importance of policy in preventing youth violence and bullying has been established and supported through all three dissertation studies. However, the different studies offered additional insights as to factors that may predict the success and impact of a given policy. First, policies cannot be created and implemented in a vacuum, but instead must be supported within a larger infrastructure and system. Policies must be comprehensive with respect to topic, as demonstrated in Study 1. Greater impact may be achieved by connecting youth violence and bullying prevention with interventions that are aimed at other risk behaviors such as suicidality and substance use. Policies must also be comprehensive with respect to location. While effective school-based policy is very important to support youth, a comprehensive approach must also include families and the larger community.

Second, a policy is only as good as the other interventions it is connected and coordinated with. The complex nature of youth violence dictates a comprehensive approach that integrates complementary interventions within an ecological context (Thornton et al., 2002; World Health Organization, 2002). The social ecological model is a framework that can guide an integrated approach, and that has been applied to youth violence prevention (Goebert et al., 2011). This framework drives interventions to address the micro-systems the individual interacts with, the meso-system (linkages among micro-system domains), the exo-system (larger institutional regulations that shape
relationships between individuals and micro-systems), and the macro-system context of cultural history and social/political influences (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; McLeroy, Bibeau, Steckler, & Glanz, 1988). Thus, a policy intervention must be strategically connected and coordinated with activities at all other levels, ensuring that none of the interventions are occurring in a silo.

**Collaboration as a Facilitator of Policy Change**

Finally, all three dissertation studies emphasized the importance of a collaborative approach. However, there are certain hallmarks of meaningful and strategic collaborations that can more effectively facilitate policy change. In Study 2, for example, a number of anti-bullying laws reviewed simply mandated bullying prevention policymaking to individual districts or schools. Once this mandate was handed down, partnership around policy design and implementation varied widely among cases. Evaluations showed that policies were more impactful when a full cadre of stakeholders was involved with all phases of the policy cycle. Study 2 also emphasized the importance of genuine support from leadership. Those who are implementing the policy must feel supported by their upper administrators and boards, versus simply seeing a policy passed “for show” and without adequate resources and commitment. Effective leadership and planning together can promote quality program implementation through ensuring adequate financial, personnel, and administrative support as well as providing professional development and technical assistance (Devaney et al., 2006; Kam, Greenberg, & Walls, 2003).
Study 3, which looked at the process of policymaking, examined the critical point at which collaboration can impact political momentum. Although there were many supporters of Hawai‘i’s anti-bullying law, House Bill 688, this was not enough to tip the scales and pass a more comprehensive bullying prevention law. Thus, there is a point at which collaboration moves from partnership and networking, to a group with established social and political capital. Study 3 also highlighted the importance of partnership between academia/researchers and community members. This specific collaboration was found to be important in supporting the translational research process described above. While researchers can bring the expertise in collecting data and evaluating interventions, community members bring context to the data that can help policymakers apply research data to real world issues.

**Conclusion**

This three-part dissertation study examined the importance, feasibility, and challenges in translating research and data to policymaking. To address a complex and multi-faceted issue such as youth violence, a comprehensive and multi-disciplinary approach must be taken. Best practices in the field of youth violence prevention recommend the use of the social ecological model that dictates action at the individual, interpersonal, organizational/community, and societal levels. In particular, policy changes are important aspects of a comprehensive approach to youth violence prevention, but are often overlooked components, secondary products, or missing completely. Quantitative data were analyzed to provide a broader understanding of bullying as a public health problem in Hawai‘i. The scientific literature was reviewed to elicit
empirical evaluation results of existing youth violence and bullying prevention policies. Qualitative data were collected and analyzed to demystify the process by which data and information are managed through the policymaking process, and to take a closer look at the specific case of Hawai‘i’s current anti-bullying law. Together, these three studies highlighted several key conclusions that will inform future directions for anti-bullying policymaking in Hawai‘i: 1) additional data are needed to paint a more complete picture of bullying in the State, and data sources must be better connected to one another; 2) policies must be comprehensively designed, supported, and targeted; and 3) while partnerships and collaborations exist, progress must be made in strategically organizing and leveraging these collaborations to be more impactful on policy change.
APPENDIX A

2010-2011 HAWA'I HIGH SCHOOL YOUTH RISK BEHAVIOR SURVEY

2010-2011
Hawai‘i High School
Youth Risk Behavior Survey

This survey is about health behavior. It has been developed so you can tell us what you do that may affect your health. The information you give will be used to improve health education for young people like yourself.

DO NOT write your name on this survey. The answers you give will be kept private. No one will know what you write. Answer the questions based on what you really do.

Completing the survey is voluntary. Whether or not you answer the questions will not affect your grade in this class. If you are not comfortable answering a question, just leave it blank.

The questions that ask about your background will be used only to describe the types of students completing this survey. The information will not be used to find out your name. No names will ever be reported.

Make sure to read every question. Fill in the ovals completely. When you are finished, follow the instructions of the person giving you the survey.

Thank you very much for your help.
1. How old are you?
   A. 12 years old or younger
   B. 13 years old
   C. 14 years old
   D. 15 years old
   E. 16 years old
   F. 17 years old
   G. 18 years old or older

2. What is your sex?
   A. Female
   B. Male

3. In what grade are you?
   A. 9th grade
   B. 10th grade
   C. 11th grade
   D. 12th grade
   E. Ungraded or other grade

4. Are you Hispanic or Latino?
   A. Yes
   B. No

5. What is your race? (Select one or more responses.)
   A. American Indian or Alaska Native
   B. Black or African American
   C. Filipino
   D. Japanese
   E. Native Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian
   F. Other Asian
   G. Other Pacific Islander
   H. White

6. How tall are you without your shoes on?
   Directions: Write your height in the shaded blank boxes. Fill in the matching oval below each number.

   Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How much do you weigh without your shoes on?
   Directions: Write your weight in the shaded blank boxes. Fill in the matching oval below each number.

   Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Which one of these groups best describes you? (Select only one response.)
   A. American Indian or Alaska Native
   B. Black or African American
   C. Filipino
   D. Japanese
   E. Native Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian
   F. Other Asian
   G. Other Pacific Islander
   H. White
9. During the past 12 months, how would you describe your grades in school?
   A. Mostly A's
   B. Mostly B's
   C. Mostly C's
   D. Mostly D's
   E. Mostly F's
   F. None of these grades
   G. Not sure

The next question asks about personal safety.

10. When you rode a bicycle during the past 12 months, how often did you wear a helmet?
    A. I did not ride a bicycle during the past 12 months
    B. Never wore a helmet
    C. Rarely wore a helmet
    D. Sometimes wore a helmet
    E. Most of the time wore a helmet
    F. Always wore a helmet

The next 9 questions ask about violence-related behaviors.

11. During the past 30 days, on how many days did you carry a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club?
    A. 0 days
    B. 1 day
    C. 2 or 3 days
    D. 4 or 5 days
    E. 6 or more days

12. During the past 30 days, on how many days did you carry a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property?
    A. 0 days
    B. 1 day
    C. 2 or 3 days
    D. 4 or 5 days
    E. 6 or more days

13. During the past 30 days, on how many days did you not go to school because you felt you would be unsafe at school or on your way to or from school?
    A. 0 days
    B. 1 day
    C. 2 or 3 days
    D. 4 or 5 days
    E. 6 or more days

14. During the past 12 months, how many times has someone threatened or injured you with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property?
    A. 0 times
    B. 1 time
    C. 2 or 3 times
    D. 4 or 5 times
    E. 6 or 7 times
    F. 8 or 9 times
    G. 10 or 11 times
    H. 12 or more times

15. During the past 12 months, how many times were you in a physical fight?
    A. 0 times
    B. 1 time
    C. 2 or 3 times
    D. 4 or 5 times
    E. 6 or 7 times
    F. 8 or 9 times
    G. 10 or 11 times
    H. 12 or more times

16. During the past 12 months, how many times were you in a physical fight on school property?
    A. 0 times
    B. 1 time
    C. 2 or 3 times
    D. 4 or 5 times
    E. 6 or 7 times
    F. 8 or 9 times
    G. 10 or 11 times
    H. 12 or more times

17. During the past 12 months, did you have a boyfriend or girlfriend?
    A. Yes
    B. No

18. During the past 12 months, did your boyfriend or girlfriend ever hit, slap, or physically hurt you on purpose?
    A. Yes
    B. No

19. Have you ever been physically forced to have sexual intercourse when you did not want to?
    A. Yes
    B. No
The next 2 questions ask about bullying. Bullying is when 1 or more students tease, threaten, spread rumors about, hit, shove, or hurt another student over and over again. It is not bullying when 2 students of about the same strength or power argue or fight or tease each other in a friendly way.

20. During the past 12 months, have you ever been bullied on school property?
   A. Yes
   B. No

21. During the past 12 months, have you ever been electronically bullied?
   (Include being bullied through e-mail, chat rooms, instant messaging, Web sites, or texting.)
   A. Yes
   B. No

The next 5 questions ask about sad feelings and attempted suicide. Sometimes people feel so depressed about the future that they may consider attempting suicide, that is, taking some action to end their own life.

22. During the past 12 months, did you ever feel so sad or hopeless almost every day for two weeks or more in a row that you stopped doing some usual activities?
   A. Yes
   B. No

23. During the past 12 months, did you ever seriously consider attempting suicide?
   A. Yes
   B. No

24. During the past 12 months, did you make a plan about how you would attempt suicide?
   A. Yes
   B. No

25. During the past 12 months, how many times did you actually attempt suicide?
   A. 0 times
   B. 1 time
   C. 2 or 3 times
   D. 4 or 5 times
   E. 6 or more times

26. If you attempted suicide during the past 12 months, did any attempt result in an injury, poisoning, or overdose that had to be treated by a doctor or nurse?
   A. I did not attempt suicide during the past 12 months
   B. Yes
   C. No

The next 11 questions ask about tobacco use.

27. Have you ever tried cigarette smoking, even one or two puffs?
   A. Yes
   B. No

28. How old were you when you smoked a whole cigarette for the first time?
   A. I have never smoked a whole cigarette
   B. 8 years old or younger
   C. 9 or 10 years old
   D. 11 or 12 years old
   E. 13 or 14 years old
   F. 15 or 16 years old
   G. 17 years old or older

29. During the past 30 days, on how many days did you smoke cigarettes?
   A. 0 days
   B. 1 or 2 days
   C. 3 to 5 days
   D. 6 to 9 days
   E. 10 to 19 days
   F. 20 to 29 days
   G. All 30 days

30. During the past 30 days, on the days you smoked, how many cigarettes did you smoke per day?
   A. I did not smoke cigarettes during the past 30 days
   B. Less than 1 cigarette per day
   C. 1 cigarette per day
   D. 2 to 5 cigarettes per day
   E. 6 to 10 cigarettes per day
   F. 11 to 20 cigarettes per day
   G. More than 20 cigarettes per day
31. During the past 30 days, how did you usually get your own cigarettes? (Select only one response.)
   A. I did not smoke cigarettes during the past 30 days
   B. I bought them in a store such as a convenience store, supermarket, discount store, or gas station
   C. I bought them from a vending machine
   D. I gave someone else money to buy them for me
   E. I borrowed (or bummed) them from someone else
   F. A person 18 years old or older gave them to me
   G. I took them from a store or family member
   H. I got them some other way

32. During the past 30 days, on how many days did you smoke cigarettes on school property?
   A. 0 days
   B. 1 or 2 days
   C. 3 to 5 days
   D. 6 to 9 days
   E. 10 to 19 days
   F. 20 to 29 days
   G. All 30 days

33. Have you ever smoked cigarettes daily, that is, at least one cigarette every day for 30 days?
   A. Yes
   B. No

34. During the past 12 months, did you ever try to quit smoking cigarettes?
   A. I did not smoke during the past 12 months
   B. Yes
   C. No

35. During the past 30 days, on how many days did you use chewing tobacco, snuff, or dip, such as Redman, Levi Garrett, Beech Nut, Skoal, Skoal Bandits, or Copenhagen?
   A. 0 days
   B. 1 or 2 days
   C. 3 to 5 days
   D. 6 to 9 days
   E. 10 to 19 days
   F. 20 to 29 days
   G. All 30 days

36. During the past 30 days, on how many days did you use chewing tobacco, snuff, or dip on school property?
   A. 0 days
   B. 1 or 2 days
   C. 3 to 5 days
   D. 6 to 9 days
   E. 10 to 19 days
   F. 20 to 29 days
   G. All 30 days

37. During the past 30 days, on how many days did you smoke cigars, cigarillos, or little cigars?
   A. 0 days
   B. 1 or 2 days
   C. 3 to 5 days
   D. 6 to 9 days
   E. 10 to 19 days
   F. 20 to 29 days
   G. All 30 days

The next 7 questions ask about drinking alcohol. This includes drinking beer, wine, wine coolers, and liquor such as rum, gin, vodka, or whiskey. For these questions, drinking alcohol does not include drinking a few sips of wine for religious purposes.

38. How old were you when you had your first drink of alcohol other than a few sips?
   A. I have never had a drink of alcohol other than a few sips
   B. 8 years old or younger
   C. 9 or 10 years old
   D. 11 or 12 years old
   E. 13 or 14 years old
   F. 15 or 16 years old
   G. 17 years old or older

39. During the past 30 days, on how many days did you have at least one drink of alcohol?
   A. 0 days
   B. 1 or 2 days
   C. 3 to 5 days
   D. 6 to 9 days
   E. 10 to 19 days
   F. 20 to 29 days
   G. All 30 days
40. During the past 30 days, on how many days did you have 5 or more drinks of alcohol in a row, that is, within a couple of hours?
   A. 0 days
   B. 1 day
   C. 2 days
   D. 3 to 5 days
   E. 6 to 9 days
   F. 10 to 19 days
   G. 20 or more days

41. During the past 30 days, how did you usually get the alcohol you drank?
   A. I did not drink alcohol during the past 30 days
   B. I bought it in a store such as a liquor store, convenience store, supermarket, discount store, or gas station
   C. I bought it at a restaurant, bar, or club
   D. I bought it at a public event such as a concert or sporting event
   E. I gave someone else money to buy it for me
   F. Someone gave it to me
   G. I took it from a store or family member
   H. I got it some other way

42. During the past 30 days, on how many days did you have at least one drink of alcohol on school property?
   A. 0 days
   B. 1 or 2 days
   C. 3 to 5 days
   D. 6 to 9 days
   E. 10 to 19 days
   F. 20 to 29 days
   G. All 30 days

43. During the past 12 months, how many of your 4 best friends have tried beer, wine, or hard liquor (such as rum, gin, vodka, or whiskey) when their parents did not know about it?
   A. 0
   B. 1
   C. 2
   D. 3
   E. 4
   F. Not sure

44. How wrong do your parents feel it would be for you to drink beer, wine, or hard liquor (such as rum, gin, vodka, or whiskey) regularly?
   A. Very wrong
   B. Wrong
   C. A little bit wrong
   D. Not at all wrong
   E. Not sure

The next 3 questions ask about marijuana use. Marijuana also is called grass, pot or pakaölöö.

45. How old were you when you tried marijuana for the first time?
   A. I have never tried marijuana
   B. 8 years old or younger
   C. 9 or 10 years old
   D. 11 or 12 years old
   E. 13 or 14 years old
   F. 15 or 16 years old
   G. 17 years old or older

46. During the past 30 days, how many times did you use marijuana?
   A. 0 times
   B. 1 or 2 times
   C. 3 to 9 times
   D. 10 to 19 times
   E. 20 to 39 times
   F. 40 or more times

47. During the past 30 days, how many times did you use marijuana on school property?
   A. 0 times
   B. 1 or 2 times
   C. 3 to 9 times
   D. 10 to 19 times
   E. 20 to 39 times
   F. 40 or more times

The next 6 questions ask about other drugs.

48. During your life, how many times have you used any form of cocaine, including powder, crack, or freebase?
   A. 0 times
   B. 1 or 2 times
   C. 3 to 9 times
   D. 10 to 19 times
   E. 20 to 39 times
   F. 40 or more times
49. During your life, how many times have you sniffed glue, breathed the contents of aerosol spray cans, or inhaled any paints or sprays to get high?
   A. 0 times
   B. 1 or 2 times
   C. 3 to 9 times
   D. 10 to 19 times
   E. 20 to 39 times
   F. 40 or more times

50. During your life, how many times have you used methamphetamine (also called speed, crystal, crank, or ice)?
   A. 0 times
   B. 1 or 2 times
   C. 3 to 9 times
   D. 10 to 19 times
   E. 20 to 39 times
   F. 40 or more times

51. During your life, how many times have you used ecstasy (also called MDMA)?
   A. 0 times
   B. 1 or 2 times
   C. 3 to 9 times
   D. 10 to 19 times
   E. 20 to 39 times
   F. 40 or more times

52. During your life, how many times have you taken a prescription drug (such as OxyContin, Percocet, Vicodin, codeine, Adderall, Ritalin, or Xanax) without a doctor's prescription?
   A. 0 times
   B. 1 or 2 times
   C. 3 to 9 times
   D. 10 to 19 times
   E. 20 to 39 times
   F. 40 or more times

53. During the past 12 months, has anyone offered, sold, or given you an illegal drug on school property?
   A. Yes
   B. No

The next 8 questions ask about alcohol and drugs.

54. During the past 30 days, have you been in a vehicle driven by someone, including yourself, who had been using alcohol or other drugs?
   A. Yes
   B. No

55. Do you ever use alcohol or drugs to relax, feel better about yourself, or fit in?
   A. Yes
   B. No

56. Do you ever use alcohol or drugs while you are alone?
   A. Yes
   B. No

57. Do you ever forget things you did while using alcohol or drugs?
   A. Yes
   B. No

58. Do your family or friends ever tell you that you should cut down on your drinking or drug use?
   A. Yes
   B. No

59. Have you ever gotten into trouble while you were using alcohol or drugs?
   A. Yes
   B. No

60. If you thought that your alcohol or drug use was causing you problems, would you seek help from a counselor or doctor?
   A. Yes
   B. No

61. How many adults do you know who got drunk or high during the past 12 months?
   A. 0 adults
   B. 1 adult
   C. 2 adults
   D. 3 adults
   E. 4 adults
   F. 5 or more adults

The next 11 questions ask about sexual behavior.

62. Have you ever had sexual intercourse?
   A. Yes
   B. No

63. How old were you when you had sexual intercourse for the first time?
   A. I have never had sexual intercourse
   B. 11 years old or younger
   C. 12 years old
   D. 13 years old
   E. 14 years old
   F. 15 years old
   G. 16 years old
   H. 17 years old or older
64. During your life, with how many people have you had sexual intercourse?
   A. I have never had sexual intercourse
   B. 1 person
   C. 2 people
   D. 3 people
   E. 4 people
   F. 5 people
   G. 6 or more people

65. During the past 3 months, with how many people did you have sexual intercourse?
   A. I have never had sexual intercourse
   B. I have had sexual intercourse, but not during the past 3 months
   C. 1 person
   D. 2 people
   E. 3 people
   F. 4 people
   G. 5 people
   H. 6 or more people

66. Did you drink alcohol or use drugs before you had sexual intercourse the last time?
   A. I have never had sexual intercourse
   B. Yes
   C. No

67. The last time you had sexual intercourse, did you or your partner use a condom?
   A. I have never had sexual intercourse
   B. Yes
   C. No

68. The last time you had sexual intercourse, what one method did you or your partner use to prevent pregnancy? (Select only one response.)
   A. I have never had sexual intercourse
   B. No method was used to prevent pregnancy
   C. Birth control pills
   D. Condoms
   E. Depo-Provera (or any injectable birth control), Nuva Ring (or any birth control ring), Implanon (or any implant), or any IUD
   F. Withdrawal
   G. Some other method
   H. Not sure

69. Have you ever had oral sex?
   A. Yes
   B. No

70. Have you ever had anal sex?
   A. Yes
   B. No

71. During your life, with whom have you had sexual contact?
   A. I have never had sexual contact
   B. Females
   C. Males
   D. Females and males

72. Which of the following best describes you?
   A. Heterosexual (straight)
   B. Gay or lesbian
   C. Bisexual
   D. Not sure

The next 5 questions ask about body weight.

73. How do you describe your weight?
   A. Very underweight
   B. Slightly underweight
   C. About the right weight
   D. Slightly overweight
   E. Very overweight

74. Which of the following are you trying to do about your weight?
   A. Lose weight
   B. Gain weight
   C. Stay the same weight
   D. I am not trying to do anything about my weight

75. During the past 30 days, did you go without eating for 24 hours or more (also called fasting) to lose weight or to keep from gaining weight?
   A. Yes
   B. No

76. During the past 30 days, did you take any diet pills, powders, or liquids without a doctor's advice to lose weight or to keep from gaining weight? (Do not include meal replacement products such as Slim Fast.)
   A. Yes
   B. No
77. During the past 30 days, did you vomit or take laxatives to lose weight or to keep from gaining weight?
A. Yes
B. No

The next 6 questions ask about food you ate or drank during the past 7 days. Think about all the meals and snacks you had from the time you got up until you went to bed. Be sure to include food you ate at home, at school, at restaurants, or anywhere else.

78. During the past 7 days, how many times did you drink 100% fruit juices such as orange juice, apple juice, or grape juice? (Do not count punch, Kool-Aid, sports drinks, or other fruit-flavored drinks.)
A. I did not drink 100% fruit juice during the past 7 days
B. 1 to 3 times during the past 7 days
C. 4 to 6 times during the past 7 days
D. 1 time per day
E. 2 times per day
F. 3 times per day
G. 4 or more times per day

79. During the past 7 days, how many times did you eat fruit? (Do not count fruit juice.)
A. I did not eat fruit during the past 7 days
B. 1 to 3 times during the past 7 days
C. 4 to 6 times during the past 7 days
D. 1 time per day
E. 2 times per day
F. 3 times per day
G. 4 or more times per day

80. During the past 7 days, how many times did you eat green salad?
A. I did not eat green salad during the past 7 days
B. 1 to 3 times during the past 7 days
C. 4 to 6 times during the past 7 days
D. 1 time per day
E. 2 times per day
F. 3 times per day
G. 4 or more times per day

81. During the past 7 days, how many times did you eat potatoes? (Do not count french fries, fried potatoes, or potato chips.)
A. I did not eat potatoes during the past 7 days
B. 1 to 3 times during the past 7 days
C. 4 to 6 times during the past 7 days
D. 1 time per day
E. 2 times per day
F. 3 times per day
G. 4 or more times per day

82. During the past 7 days, how many times did you eat carrots?
A. I did not eat carrots during the past 7 days
B. 1 to 3 times during the past 7 days
C. 4 to 6 times during the past 7 days
D. 1 time per day
E. 2 times per day
F. 3 times per day
G. 4 or more times per day

83. During the past 7 days, how many times did you eat other vegetables? (Do not count green salad, potatoes, or carrots.)
A. I did not eat other vegetables during the past 7 days
B. 1 to 3 times during the past 7 days
C. 4 to 6 times during the past 7 days
D. 1 time per day
E. 2 times per day
F. 3 times per day
G. 4 or more times per day

84. During the past 7 days, how many times did you drink a can, bottle, or glass of soda or pop, such as Coke, Pepsi, or Sprite? (Do not count diet soda or diet pop.)
A. I did not drink soda or pop during the past 7 days
B. 1 to 3 times during the past 7 days
C. 4 to 6 times during the past 7 days
D. 1 time per day
E. 2 times per day
F. 3 times per day
G. 4 or more times per day
85. During the past 7 days, how many glasses of milk did you drink? (Count the milk you drank in a glass or cup, from a carton, or with cereal. Count the half pint of milk served at school as equal to one glass.)
   A. 0 glasses per day
   B. 1 to 3 glasses per day
   C. 4 to 6 glasses per day
   D. 6 glasses per day
   E. 2 glasses per day
   F. 3 glasses per day
   G. 4 or more glasses per day

86. During the past 7 days, on how many days were you physically active for a total of at least 60 minutes per day? (Add up all the time you spent in any kind of physical activity that increased your heart rate and made you breathe hard some of the time.)
   A. 0 days
   B. 1 day
   C. 2 days
   D. 3 days
   E. 4 days
   F. 5 days
   G. 6 days
   H. 7 days

87. On an average school day, how many hours do you watch TV?
   A. 0 hours per day
   B. Less than 1 hour per day
   C. 1 hour per day
   D. 2 hours per day
   E. 3 hours per day
   F. 4 hours per day
   G. 5 or more hours per day

88. On an average school day, how many hours do you play video or computer games or use a computer for something that is not school work? (Include activities such as Xbox, PlayStation, Nintendo DS, iPod touch, Facebook, and the Internet.)
   A. Less than 1 hour per day
   B. 1 hour per day
   C. 2 hours per day
   D. 3 hours per day
   E. 4 hours per day
   F. 5 or more hours per day

89. In an average week when you are in school, on how many days do you go to physical education (PE) classes?
   A. 0 days
   B. 1 day
   C. 2 days
   D. 3 days
   E. 4 days
   F. 5 days

90. During the past 12 months, on how many sports teams did you play? (Count any teams run by your school or community groups.)
   A. 0 teams
   B. 1 team
   C. 2 teams
   D. 3 or more teams

The next 9 questions ask about other health-related topics.

91. How many tattoos do you have?
   A. 0 tattoos
   B. 1 tattoo
   C. 2 tattoos
   D. 3 or more tattoos

92. How many of these tattoos were done outside of a licensed tattoo shop?
   A. I do not have any tattoos
   B. 0 tattoos
   C. 1 tattoo
   D. 2 tattoos
   E. 3 or more tattoos
   F. Not sure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 93. Have you ever been taught about AIDS or HIV infection in school?    | A. Yes  
B. No  
C. Not sure |
| 94. Has a doctor or nurse ever discussed ways to prevent pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), and AIDS or HIV infection with you? | A. Yes  
B. No  
C. Not sure |
| 95. Have your parents or other adults in your family ever talked with you about what they expect you to do or not to do when it comes to sex? | A. Yes  
B. No  
C. Not sure |
| 96. Is there at least one teacher or other adult in this school that you can talk to if you have a problem? | A. Yes  
B. No  
C. Not sure |
| 97. Outside of school, is there an adult you can talk to about things that are important to you? | A. Yes  
B. No  
C. Not sure |
| 98. During the past 12 months, have you talked with at least one of your parents or another adult in your family about the dangers of tobacco, alcohol, or drug use? | A. Yes  
B. No  
C. Not sure |
| 99. How likely is it that you will complete a post high school program such as a vocational training program, military service, community college, or 4-year college? | A. Definitely will not  
B. Probably will not  
C. Probably will  
D. Definitely will  
E. Not sure |

This is the end of the survey.
Thank you very much for your help.
APPENDIX B
INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR ORGANIZATIONAL PROFESSIONALS

1) Please briefly tell me about:
   a. Yourself (roles, current projects)
   b. Your organization (activities, collaborators)
      i. Policy/advocacy activities
   c. Data
      i. What type(s) of data do/does your organization collect and access?
      ii. In what way(s) does your organization internally utilize data?
          How and to whom does your organization disseminate data to?

2) Data and policy
   a. What are your thoughts on how data/evidence is used in legislative
      decision-making? Is data relied upon too much or too little?
   b. What do you think influences legislators’ use of data/evidence?
   c. Is the community allowed sufficient opportunities to offer information to
      legislators?

3) Bullying prevention – as you know, bullying prevention has been a prominent
   policymaking topic in Hawai‘i. For example, House Bill (HB) 688 was signed
   into law in July 2011, requiring the Department of Education to heighten its
   response to bullying in public schools. Additional efforts have been ongoing
   during the 2012 Legislative Session.
   a. In what capacity are you/your organization involved with anti-bullying
      legislation?
   b. Why do you think HB688 passed, compared to past legislative efforts?
   c. What are your overall thoughts about anti-bullying legislative efforts in
      Hawai‘i?
APPENDIX C
INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR LEGISLATORS/POLICYMAKERS

1) Please briefly tell me about your…
   a. Legislative positions/roles
   b. Legislative and community activities

2) Policymaking and data
   a. In your decision-making, how do you utilize information that is provided by the community? For example – testimony, letters, phone calls, personal visits/meetings, etc.
   b. In your decision-making, how do you utilize data? For example – agency data, reports, expert opinions, etc.
      i. Who do you contact when data/information is needed?
   c. What are your thoughts on how legislators use data/evidence in decision-making?
      i. Is data relied upon too much or too little? What factors influence the use of data/evidence?
      ii. Is the community allowed sufficient opportunities to offer information to legislators?

3) Specific example of anti-bullying policy
   a. As you know, bullying prevention has been a prominent policymaking topic in Hawai‘i.
      i. If applicable, in what capacity are you involved with anti-bullying policy issues?
      ii. What information/data/evidence have you used to support your decision-making?
      iii. Why do you think HB688 passed, compared to past legislative efforts?
APPENDIX D

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM FOR QUALITATIVE STUDY

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH STUDY

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Jeanelle Sugimoto-Matsuda, Dr.P.H. Candidate
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, Department of Public Health Sciences
1441 Kapi‘olani Boulevard, Ala Moana Building, 18th Floor, Honolulu, Hawai‘i, 96814
(808) 945-1517

Project Description: The purpose of this study is to explore the use of different forms of data, evidence, and information in the policymaking process. This topic will be examined from the agency/community perspective, as well as the legislative perspective. In particular, legislation related to bullying prevention, such as House Bill 688, will be explored.

Activities and Time Commitment: You have been selected because of you/your organization’s work in policymaking and/or bullying prevention. You are being asked for your consent to participate in either a one-on-one interview OR focus group on the topics of data/evidence and policymaking. Interviews will take 30 to 60 minutes, whereas focus group will take 60 to 90 minutes. All sessions will be audio-taped and transcribed to ensure accuracy of data and responses.

The researchers may use information from audio-taped sessions in presentations and papers, to show the value of the results. The focus of any presentation/paper would be on the study, and not on any specific person or belief. Researchers will be careful about how data and recordings will be used in order to protect participants, while still presenting key findings from the study. These efforts will let the researchers learn more about the use of data and evidence in the policymaking process, specifically related to bullying prevention.

The researchers may want to contact you over time as the research progresses and new information is learned. By giving your approval to participate in this study, you are also consenting for the evaluation researchers to contact you later to ask for more information. You may decide at that time whether or not to participate.

Benefits and Risks: You may benefit from being part of this study by gaining a better understanding of yourself and learning about evidence-based policymaking around
bullying prevention. The organizations/communities to which you belong may also benefit, should there be any positive, long-lasting effects of the study.

The possible risks of participating in this study will be small and may include some emotional discomfort, such as uncomfortable feelings and loss of privacy.

**Voluntary Participation:** Participating in this study is voluntary. If you are not comfortable answering a question, you can refrain from answering. If at any time in the course of the interview/focus group you feel uncomfortable and want to stop participating, you may do so without any penalty.

**Confidentiality and Privacy:** All information will be kept confidential. Given the small number of participants, it may be possible for some of the information to be linked to your identity, particularly audio recordings. For publication purposes, findings will be reported by group (i.e., agency/community and legislative). Your name, your organization’s name, or any other personally identifying information will not be used. A pseudonym (fake name) will be used in publications. All consent forms will be kept separate from raw data (for example, audio recordings). All documents and recordings will be locked within the Department of Public Health Sciences at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. Only the Principal Investigator and research staff will have access to the information. Additionally, legally authorized agencies, including the University of Hawai‘i Committee on Human Studies, have the right to review research records.

**Questions:** If you have any questions or concerns, or you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions, or have comments or complaints about participating in this study, you may contact the University of Hawai‘i Human Studies Program at:

Human Studies Program, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa  
1960 East-West Road, B-104, Honolulu, Hawai‘i, 96822  
Phone: (808) 956-5007

By signing below, you certify that you have read and understand the above, and that you have been given satisfactory answers to any questions. By signing below, you are agreeing to be part of this study with the understanding that such consent/approval does not take away any of your legal rights, nor does it release the investigators or the institution or any employee or agent thereof from liability for negligence.
Please indicate if you agree to be audio-taped during your participation in this study:

☐ YES, I AGREE to be audio-taped.

☐ NO, I DO NOT AGREE to be audio-taped.

_______________________________________  _____/_____/_____
(print your name)                          (date)

_______________________________________
(signature)

_______________________________________
(mailing address)

_______________________________________       ______________________________
(phone number)                                 (e-mail address)

***** A copy of this form will be provided to you for your future reference. *****
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