Research Summary for the Authoritative School Climate Survey[1]

Dewey Cornell
Updated October 13, 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS Page

[1] Earlier versions of this survey were called the School Climate Bullying Survey.

Research Summary

The purpose of the Authoritative School Climate Survey (ASCS) is to assess school climate and bullying in school settings and help guide school improvement efforts. The ASCS is derived from the School Climate Bullying Survey (SCBS) and contains many of the same items and scales. The survey was renamed because our research has sharpened its focus on authoritative school climate theory. Schools in Virginia have used the survey under the name Virginia Secondary School Climate Survey.

Authoritative school climate theory proposes that both structure and support are needed in order to maintain a safe and orderly school climate conducive to learning (Gregory & Cornell, 2009). Support is conceptualized as warmth and acceptance by teachers and staff whereas structure is defined as strict but fair enforcement of school rules and high academic expectations for students. Although many of our studies focused on disciplinary structure, other work has broadened the concept of structure to include high academic expectations for students. It is theorized that a school with both high structure and high support will have a school climate that best facilitates student learning and development. This document summarizes our research supporting the authoritative school climate model.

There are both student and teacher/staff versions of the ASCS survey. The full version of the student survey is for secondary students in grades 6-12 and a shorter elementary version is intended for students in grades 3-5. Note that our research concerns the secondary school version. We have used a previous elementary version in many schools, but have not published research on it. We have revised the elementary version to more closely parallel the secondary school survey, but it is much shorter. We have also created a parent version of the survey, but research on this instrument has not been completed.

The secondary school ASCS does not take long to complete. In a 2016 high school (grades 9-12) sample of 68,951 students, the median completion time was 11.8 minutes, with 80% of survey participants completing the survey between 7.8 and 21.8 minutes. In a 2017 middle school (grades 6-8) sample, the median completion time was 17.6 minutes, with 80% completed between 11.6 and 29 minutes. Our early research used a paper-and-pencil survey, but we have shifted to online administration. Among the advantages of online administration are that it can present the questions in a more user-friendly format and require that students answer each question to move to the next page.

We periodically revise the survey and update this document. We encourage other researchers and educators to make use of these surveys and would appreciate copies of any articles or reports of their findings.

Authoritative School Climate

Studies have varied widely in how they define and measure school climate. Wang and Degol (2016) posited that school climate includes academic, community, safety, and institutional environment dimensions that "encompass just about every feature of the school environment that impacts cognitive, behavioral, and psychological development" (p. 3). Such a broad definition of

school climate makes it difficult to distinguish school climate from other school characteristics. A more narrow conception is that school climate encompasses the "quality and character of school life" and is "based on patterns of people's experiences of school life and reflects norms, goals, values, interpersonal relationships, teaching and learning practices, and organizational structures" (Cohen, McCabe, Michelli, & Pickeral, 2009, p. 182). This definition limits the scope to social behavior and relationships, but is still quite broad and does not specify what qualities are critical to a positive school climate (Cornell & Mayer, 2010; Thapa, Cohen, Guffey, & Higgins-D'Alessandro, 2013).

The authoritative school climate model provides a conceptual framework for school climate. The authoritative school climate model is derived from work by Baumrind (1968) on authoritative parenting that stimulated a large body of child development research (Larzelere, Morris, & Harrist, 2013). Authoritative school climate theory posits that two key dimensions of school climate are disciplinary structure and student support (Gregory & Cornell, 2009; Gregory, Cornell, Fan, Sheras, Shih, & Huang, 2010). Disciplinary structure refers to the idea that school rules are perceived as strict but fairly enforced. Student support refers to student perceptions that their teachers and other school staff members treat them with respect and want them to be successful (Konold et al., 2014). Although these two dimensions do not encompass all aspects of school climate or constitute a comprehensive theoretical model, there is considerable evidence that they deserve a central role in research on school climate.

Johnson's (2009) review of 25 studies concluded that "schools with less violence tend to have students who are aware of school rules and believe they are fair" and "have positive relationships with their teachers" (p. 451). Several school climate surveys measure these two domains in some capacity (Bear, Gaskins, Blank, & Chen, 2011; Brand, Felner, Shim, Seitsinger, & Dumas, 2003), but authoritative school climate theory gives them special prominence.

Pellerin (2005) found that high schools using authoritative practices had less truancy and fewer dropouts than schools using an authoritarian approach. An analysis of NELS data found that authoritative schools, characterized as both demanding and responsive, had higher levels of student engagement (Gill, Ashton, & Algina, 2004). Lee (2012) found that an authoritative school climate was associated with higher student engagement and reading achievement. Other studies have used a different conceptual framework that suggests the role of authoritative characteristics. Wang and Eccles (2013) investigated how school climate characteristics were associated with different types of student engagement in a sample of 1,157 middle school students. Most notably, "school structure support" (defined as the clarity and consistency of teacher expectations) and "teacher emotional support" (defined as level of care and support from teachers) were associated with behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement.

Overview of Virginia Research

Our research on school climate and bullying began to focus explicitly on authoritative school climate in a study conducted in spring 2007. This study surveyed approximately 7,400 9th grade students and 2,500 teachers in 294 Virginia high schools. We constructed scales to measure disciplinary structure and student support and found that they were associated with less peer victimization (Gregory et al., 2010), lower levels of student aggression toward teachers

(Gregory, Cornell, & Fan, 2012), and lower suspension rates (Gregory, Cornell, & Fan, 2011). These studies demonstrated effects across a large and diverse group of schools, controlling for school demographics of enrollment size, ethnic and racial composition, and percentage of students receiving a free or reduced price meal.

In 2013 we began another statewide survey project. We surveyed students and teachers in grades 7-8 in spring 2013 and students and teachers in grades 9-12 in spring 2014. In spring 2015 we surveyed grades 7-8 again and this time added school staff to the teacher survey. A survey of high school students and teachers/staff is planned for spring 2016.

Using student survey data from the 2013 survey, we conducted multi-level factor analyses to construct improved measures of disciplinary structure student support as key indicators of authoritative school climate and student engagement and prevalence of teasing and bullying at school as two important school climate outcomes (Konold et al., 2014). We used the teacher surveys to conduct a similar set of analyses establishing the improved measures based on teacher reports (Huang et al., 2015). We then conducted a study that integrated student and teacher measures to show their convergent validity and compare their measurement properties (Konold & Cornell, 2015).

We also used the middle school data to build upon our prior work with 9th grade students. We reported that an authoritative school climate is associated with lower levels of prevalence of teasing and bullying (PTB), bullying victimization, and general victimization (Cornell, Shukla, & Konold, 2015), as well as lower levels of student aggression toward teachers (Berg & Cornell, 2016). We have also found that authoritative school climate is associated with lower rates of school suspension (Heilbrun, Cornell, & Konold, under review) and higher levels of student academic engagement, grades, and educational aspirations (Cornell, Shukla, & Konold, 2016).

High school data from spring 2014 demonstrated that the factor structure and measurement properties found in the middle school samples extended to high school grades. One paper reported multi-level factor analyses for high school students (Konold & Cornell, 2015) and another paper reported on their teachers (Huang & Cornell, 2015). We found that an authoritative school climate was associated with lower high school dropout rates (Jia, Konold, & Cornell, 2015) and lower rates of student risk behavior (Cornell & Huang, 2016).

Reliability and Validity

Many users ask for information on the reliability and validity of the Authoritative School Climate Survey. As explained in the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (American Educational Research Association et al., 2014), reliability and validity are not fixed properties of a test and cannot be reduced to a single set of reliability or validity coefficients. Reliability and validity may differ according to the population and validity depends on the purpose of the measurement. An instrument that is reliable and valid for a specific purpose in a particular population may not have the same reliability and validity when used for a different purpose or in a different population. The information in the tables below provide substantial evidence of the reliability and validity of the scales found on the Authoritative School Climate

Survey, but test properties should be reconsidered when any measure is used in new populations and for new purposes.

School climate surveys are most often used to measure qualities of the school as a whole, either to assess changes in the whole school over time or to compare different schools. In these kinds of comparisons, school rather than student is the unit of analysis. However, many school climate surveys have been developed using students as the unit of analysis. This is problematic because a survey might have different properties at the school versus individual student level of analysis. In our work, we have considered both the student and the school levels of analysis in order to ensure they maintain the same properties when used for evaluating these different targets (Bliese, 2000). Although some constructs might only be meaningful on an individual level (e.g., personality) *or* a school level (e.g., racial diversity), many school climate constructs may be useful at both levels. We employed multilevel factor analysis to assess the degree to which survey items are useful for measuring constructs at different levels, and whether the measurement of these constructs is consistent across levels (Muthén, 1991). Examination of school climate constructs on both student and school levels is an important advantage of the Authoritative School Climate survey that distinguishes it from many other instruments. Failure to model distinctions between these levels of measurement can result in a variety of substantive misinterpretations and erroneous conclusions (Dedrick & Greenbaum, 2010; Dyer, Hanges, & Hall, 2005).

Another important concern in evaluating scale reliability and validity is the distinction between an index and a scale. A scale is composed of items that measure a generally homogenous construct in which each item is expected to sample a single domain. Accordingly, scales are expected to have high internal consistency, as measured most often by Cronbach's alpha. However, note that alpha is not a fixed property of a scale and a higher alpha is not always desirable (Streiner, 2003a). Furthermore, some scales are better described as indexes rather than scales because the items are causal indicators of the construct being measured. For example, an index of stressful life events can be composed of many different items (being arrested, car accident, house fire, losing a job, death of a family member) that are not expected to be highly correlated with one another but are all direct indicators of a stressful life event. Alpha levels are not an appropriate measure of the reliability of an index (Streiner, 2003b). For this reason, some of the scales in the Authoritative School Climate Survey are labeled as indexes.

The tables below provide a convenient summary of some of the evidence for the reliability and validity of the student and teacher versions of the Authoritative School Climate Survey. Depending on the intended use of the surveys, there is additional evidence in the published articles summarized later in this document.

Reliability for the Secondary School Student Version of Authoritative School Climate Survey

Scale (number of items)	Cronbach's Alpha: Individual Level	Spearman-Brown Reliability: School Level	Construct Validity Coefficients: Pattern Loadings	Samples	Source
Disciplinary Structure (7)	.77	.70	.47 to .72 student level .77 to .95 school level	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Konold et al., 2014
	.78	.95	.36 to .75 student level .74 to .93 school level	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	Konold & Cornell, 2015
	.76	.95	.28 to .74 student level .87 to .97 school level	85,762 students (grades 6-8) 410 schools	Konold, 2017
Academic Expectations (5)	.72	.86	.48 to .93 student level .65 to .99 school level	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	Konold & Cornell, 2015
	.69	.88	.46 to .94 student level .44 to 1.0 school level	85,762 students (grades 6-8) 410 schools	Konold, 2017
Student Support (8)	.85	.78	.51 to .86 student level .64 to .98 school level	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Konold et al., 2014
	.83	.93	.59 to .88 student level .72 to 1.0 school level	85,762 students (grades 6-8) 410 schools	Konold, 2017
Student Support subscale – Respect for Students (4)	.87	.72	.81 to .87 student level .95 to .98 school level	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Konold et al., 2014
	.87	.90	.85 to .87 student level .95 to .98 school level	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	Konold & Cornell, 2015
	.89	.94	.82 to .88 student level .98 to 1.0 school level	85,762 students (grades 6-8) 410 schools	Konold, 2017
Student Support subscale - Willingness to Seek Help (4)	.69	.61	.58 to .77 student level .67 to .91 school level	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Konold et al., 2014
	.73	.80	.63 to .81 student level .67 to 1.0 school level	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	Konold & Cornell, 2015
	.69	.88	.59 to .79 student level .72 to 1.0 school level	85,762 students (grades 6-8) 410 schools	Konold, 2017
Student Engagement (6)	.77	.87	.40 to .89 student level .02 to 1.0 school level	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Konold et al., 2014
	.77	.94	.59 to .90 student level .42 to .99 school level	85,762 students (grades 6-8) 410 schools	Konold, 2017
Student Engagement subscale – Affective (3)	.85	.87	.77 to .90 student level .97 to 1.0 school level	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Konold et al., 2014
	.89	.95	.84 to .93 student level .97 to 1.0 school level	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	Konold & Cornell, 2015
	.86	.96	.81 to .91 student level .97 to .99 school level	85,762 students (grades 6-8) 410 schools	Konold, 2017

Student Engagement subscale – Cognitive (3)	.66	.96	.54 to .83 student level .05 to 1.6 school level	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Konold et al., 2014
	.71	.73	.68 to .81 student level .35 to .83 school level	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	Konold & Cornell, 2015
	.65	.82	.59 to .82 student level .42 to .90 school level	85,762 students (grades 6-8) 410 schools	Konold, 2017
Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying (PTB) (5)	.79	.88	.69 to .77 student level .81 to .97 school level	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Konold et al., 2014
	.85	.93	.74 to .79 student level .87 to .95 school level	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	Konold & Cornell, 2015
	.83	.96	.70 to .81 student level .80 to .98 school level	85,762 students (grades 6-8) 410 schools	Konold, 2017
Bullying Victimization (5)	.85	-	.75 to .94 student level adjusted for nested data	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Cornell, Shukla, & Konold, 2015
	.83	.95	.85 to .92 student level .76 to 1.00 school level	85,762 students (grades 6-8) 410 schools	Huang, 2017
General Victimization (5)	.76	-	.61 to .94 student level adjusted for nested data	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Cornell, Shukla, & Konold, 2015
	.76	.91	.60 to .86 student level .51 to 1.00 school level	85,762 students (grades 6-8) 410 schools	Huang, 2017
Aggressive Attitudes (6)	.79	-	.58 to .78 student level .82 to .99 school level	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Huang, Cornell, & Konold, 2015
	.79	.96	.65 to .87 student level .84 to 1.00 school level	85,762 students (grades 6-8) 410 schools	Huang, 2017
Positive Values (9)	--	.92	.62 to 1.00	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Huang & Cornell, 2015
Positive Values subscale – Personal Conviction (3)	.81	--	.62 to .80		
Positive Values subscale – Concern for Others (5)	.86	--	.40 to .90		
Positive Values (9)	--	.98	.84 to 1.00 school level	85,762 students (grades 6-8) 410 schools	Huang, 2017
Positive Values subscale – Personal Conviction (3)	.81	--	.75 to .80 student level		
Positive Values subscale – Concern for Others (5)	.86	--	.61 to .81 student level		
Peer Support (4)	.89	.94	.82 to .89 student level .99 to 1.0 school level	85,762 students (grades 6-8) 410 schools	Konold, 2017

Reliability for the Secondary School Teacher/Staff Version of Authoritative School Climate Survey

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha - Individual Level	Spearman-Brown Reliability – School Level k*ICC/(k-1)*ICC+1	Construct Validity Coefficients (Pattern Loadings)	Sample	Source
Disciplinary Structure (9 items)	-	-	No one-factor scale for teachers		
Disciplinary Structure subscale – Fairness (5)	.85	.90	.52 to .89 teacher level .92 to 1 school level	9,099 teachers from 366 middle schools	Huang et al. (2015)
	.83	.92	.63 to .82 teacher level .88 to 1.0 school level	12,808 teachers from 302 high schools	Huang & Cornell (2015)
Disciplinary Structure subscale – Justness (4)	.63	.53	.48 to .79 teacher level .12 to .97 school level	9,099 teachers from 366 middle schools	Huang et al. (2015)
	.65	.70	.66 to .74 teacher level .61 to 1.0 school level	12,808 teachers from 302 high schools	Huang & Cornell (2015)
Student Support (10)	-	.74	.54 to .98 school level	9,099 teachers from 366 middle schools	Huang et al. (2015)
	-	.79	.60 to .96 school level	12,808 teachers from 302 high schools	Huang & Cornell (2015)
Student Support subscale – Respect for Students (4)	.91	-	.90 to .93 teacher level	9,099 teachers from 366 middle schools	Huang et al. (2015)
	.91	-	.92 to .92 teacher level .92 to .94 school level	12,808 teachers from 302 high schools	Huang & Cornell (2015)
Student Support subscale - Willingness to Seek Help (6)	.78	-	.49 to .76 teacher level	9,099 teachers from 366 middle schools	Huang et al. (2015)
	.81	-	.54 to .80 teacher level .60 to .96 school level	12,808 teachers from 302 high schools	Huang & Cornell (2015)
Student Engagement (6)	-	.94	.92 to .99 school level	9,099 teachers from 366 middle schools	Huang et al. (2015)
	-	.94	.76 to 1.00 school level	12,808 teachers from 302 high schools	Huang & Cornell (2015)
Student Engagement subscale – Affective (3)	.82	-	.48 to .93 teacher level	9,099 teachers from 366 middle schools	Huang et al. (2015)
	.74	-	.54 to .93 teacher level .97 to 1.0 school level	12,808 teachers from 302 high schools	Huang & Cornell (2015)

Student Engagement subscale – Cognitive (3)	.83	-	.53 to .91 teacher level	9,099 teachers from 366 middle schools	Huang et al. (2015)
	.81	-	.58 to .89 teacher level .76 to .90 school level	12,808 teachers from 302 high schools	Huang & Cornell (2015)
Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying (PTB) (6)	.82	.79	.69 to .77 teacher level .69 to .96 school level	9,099 teachers from 366 middle schools	Huang et al. (2015)
	.89	.84	.78 to .82 teacher level .81 to 1.0 school level	12,808 teachers from 302 high schools	Huang & Cornell (2015)

Test-Retest Reliability for the Secondary School Teacher/Staff Version of Authoritative School Climate Survey (Huang & Cornell, 2015)

Factor	Test-retest
School Disciplinary Structure scale- Fairness	.80
School Disciplinary Structure scale- Justness	.70
Student Support scale- Respect for Students	.76
Student Support scale- Willingness to Seek Help	.74
Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying scale	.82
Student Engagement scale- Affective	.84
Student Engagement scale- Cognitive	[a]

Note. N = 95 teachers. Test-retest reliabilities estimated using Pearson correlation coefficients. [a]Test-retest not computed as a result of missing retest data on one item.

Validity for the Secondary School Student Version of Authoritative School Climate Survey

Scale	Criterion-related Validity (Path Coefficients, Latent Factor Correlations, or Change in R^2)	Sample	Source
Disciplinary Structure	-.44 student level and -.41 school level with Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying .35 student level and .79 school level with Affective Engagement .20 student level with Cognitive Engagement	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Konold et al., (2014)
	-.48 school level with Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying -.46 school level with Bullying Victimization -.41 school level with General Victimization	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Cornell, Shukla, & Konold, (2015)
	.23 student level and .46 school level with Engagement .09 student level with Self-reported Grades	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Cornell, Shukla, & Konold (2016)
	.23 student level and .26 school level with Engagement .06 student level with Self-reported Grades	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	
	-.45 student level and -.77 school level with Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying .60 student level and .87 school level with Affective Engagement .45 student level and .44 school level with Cognitive Engagement	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	Konold & Cornell, (2015)
Academic Expectations	-.20 student level and -.74 school level with Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying .48 student level and .73 school level with Affective Engagement .53 student level and .77 school level with Cognitive Engagement	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	Konold & Cornell, (2015)
Student Support	-.27 school level with Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying -.23 school level with General Victimization	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Cornell, Shukla, & Konold, (2015)
	.42 student level and .44 school level with Engagement .08 student level and .18 school level with Self-reported Grades .07 student level with Academic Aspirations	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Cornell, Shukla, & Konold (2016)
	.42 student level and .63 school level with Engagement .14 student level and .30 school level with Self-reported Grades .12 student level with Academic Aspirations	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	

Student Support subscale – Respect for Students	.04 student level and -.60 school level with Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying .09 student level and .23 school level with Affective Engagement -.08 student level with Cognitive Engagement	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Konold et al., (2014)
	-.37 student level and -.80 school level with Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying .54 student level and .88 school level with Affective Engagement .41 student level and .53 school level with Cognitive Engagement	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	Konold & Cornell, (2015)
Student Support subscale - Willingness to Seek Help	-.04 student level with Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying .31 student level with Affective Engagement .47 student level and .66 school level with Cognitive engagement	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Konold et al., (2014)
	-.27 student level and -.69 school level with Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying .55 student level and .80 school level with Affective Engagement .52 student level and .73 school level with Cognitive Engagement	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	Konold & Cornell, (2015)
Student Engagement	Student level Structure and Support predicted Engagement with $R^2\Delta = .36$ School level Structure and Support predicted Engagement with $R^2\Delta = .69$	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Cornell, Shukla, & Konold (2016)
	Student level Structure and Support predicted Engagement with $R^2\Delta = .34$ School level Structure and Support predicted Engagement with $R^2\Delta = .72$	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	
Student Engagement subscale – Affective	.35 student level and .79 school level with Disciplinary Structure .09 student level and .23 school level with Respect for Students .31 student level with Willingness to Seek Help	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Konold et al., (2014)
	.60 student level and .87 school level with Disciplinary Structure .54 student level and .88 school level with Respect for Students .55 student level and .80 school level with Willingness to Seek Help .48 student level and .73 school level with Academic Expectations	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	Konold & Cornell, (2015)

Student Engagement subscale - Cognitive	.20 student level with Disciplinary Structure -.08 student level and .47 school level with Respect for Students .47 student level and .66 school level with Willingness to Seek Help	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Konold et al., (2014)
	.45 student level and .44 school level with Disciplinary Structure .41 student level and .53 school level with Respect for Students .53 student level and .77 school level with Academic Expectations .52 student level and .73 school level with Willingness to Seek Help	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	Konold & Cornell, (2015)
Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying (PTB)	-.44 student level and -.41 school level with Disciplinary Structure .04 student level and -.60 school level with Respect for Students -.04 student level with Willingness to Seek Help	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Konold et al., (2014)
	-.45 student level and -.77 school level with Disciplinary Structure -.20 student level and -.74 school level with Academic Expectation -.37 student level and -.80 school level with Respect for Students -.27 student level and -.69 school level with Willingness to Seek Help	48,027 students (grades 9-12), 323 high schools	Konold & Cornell, (2015)
	Student-reported PTB predicted 4 year dropout counts with 1.23 Incident Rate Ratio Teacher-reported PTB predicted 4-year dropout counts with 1.07 Incident Rate Ratio	7082 9th grade students and 2,764 teachers 276 high schools	Cornell et al., (2013)
	School level PTB correlated .352 with bullying victimization, and two measures of student engagement: -.27 with commitment to school, and -.18 with school involvement HLM found PTB associated with commitment to school -.22 at student level and -.18 at school level; school involvement -.06 at school level	7,058 9th graders in 289 high schools	Mehta, Cornell, Fan, & Gregory, (2013)
	School level PTB correlated with short-term suspensions r = .25, teacher reports of gang violence .25, teacher reports of bullying and teasing .30, teacher reports of student help-seeking -.26	7,318 9th grade students in 291 high schools	Bandyopadhyay, Cornell, & Konold, (2009)
	School level Structure and Support predicted PTB with $R^2\Delta$ = .54	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Cornell, Shukla, & Konold, (2015)

Bullying Victimization (BV)	School level Structure and Support predicted BV with $R^2\Delta = .34$	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Cornell, Shukla, & Konold, (2015)
General Victimization (GV)	School level Structure and Support predicted GV with $R^2\Delta = .32$	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Cornell, Shukla, & Konold, (2015)
Aggressive Attitudes	School level odds ratio = 1.23 for bullying others School level $R^2\Delta = .08$ for bully victimization School level R2Δ = .20 for gang activity School level R2Δ = .18 for PTB (student report) School level R2Δ = .07 for PTB (teacher report) School level R2Δ = .09 for teacher report of school safety School level R2Δ = .05 for school suspensions School level R2Δ = .03 for aggressive infractions	39,364 students (grades 7-8) 423 schools	Huang, Cornell, & Konold, (2015)

Validity for the Secondary School Teacher/Staff Version of Authoritative School Climate Survey

See: Huang, F., Cornell, D., Konold, T., Meyer, P., Lacey, A., Nekvasil, E., Heilbrun, A., & Shukla, K. (2015). Multilevel factor structure and concurrent validity of the teacher version of the Authoritative School Climate Survey. *Journal of School Health, 85*, 843-851. doi: 10.1111/josh.12340

Correlations Among Factors Within Schools as Reported by Middle School Teachers (N = 4677)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Structure (Justness factor)							
2	Structure (Fairness factor)	.29						
3	Support (Willingness to Seek Help)	.55	.51					
4	Support (Teacher respect for students)	.46	.40	61				
5	Student aggression toward teachers	-.01	-.40	-.18	-.11			
6	PTB	-.26	-.43	-.44	-.35	-.36		
7	Engagement (Affective)	.26	.52	.43	.38	-.38	-.44	
8	Engagement (Cognitive)	.03	.52	.31	.27	-.37	-.32	.62

Correlations Among Factors Between Schools (N = 183 Middle schools)

		1	2	3	4	5
1	Structure (Justness factor)					
2	Structure (Fairness factor)	.36				
3	Support	.84	.63			
4	Student aggression toward teachers	-.33	-.74	-.67		
5	PTB	-.58	-.75	-.81	.85	
6	Engagement	.54	.58	.69	-.88	-.76

See: Huang, F., & Cornell, D. (2016). Multilevel factor structure, concurrent validity, and test-retest reliability of the high school teacher version of the Authoritative School Climate Survey. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 34*, 3-14. doi: 10.1177/0734282915570278

Correlations Among Factors Within Schools as Reported by High School Teachers (N = 12,808)

		1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Structure (Justness factor)						
2	Structure (Fairness factor)	.36					
3	Support (Willingness to Seek Help)	.49	.54				
4	Support (Teacher respect for students)	.49	.42	.59			
5	PTB	-.30	-.39	-.44	-.33		
6	Engagement (Affective)	.29	.54	.49	.42	-.41	
7	Engagement (Cognitive)	.10	.52	.42	.31	-.31	.67

Correlations Among Factors Between Schools (N = 302 high schools)

		1	2	3	4
1	Structure (Justness factor)				
2	Structure (Fairness factor)	.42			
3	Support	.67	.79		
4	PTB	.79	-.49	-.78	
5	Engagement	.53	.58	.85	-.66

Authoritative School Climate Survey ©
Secondary School Student Version

Items	Item Content
1,2	Student and school name
3-26	School climate items
3-8	Student engagement
9-15	Disciplinary structure
16-19	Student support: Respect for students
20-23	Student support: Willingness to seek help
24-26	Student support, additional items
27-31	Academic expectations
32-36	Prevalence of teasing and bullying
37	Validity screening item
38-41	Perceptions of bullying by teachers/staff
42-47	Aggressive attitudes
48-52	Victim experiences
53-59	Bullying experiences
60-61	Reactions to bullying
62-68	Dating violence index
69-72	Sexual harassment index
73-80	Demographics of gender, grade, school attendance, and race/ethnicity
81	Educational aspirations
82	Parent educational attainment
83	Number of biological or adopted parents in home
84	Validity screening item

2016 Authoritative School Climate Survey

This is a review copy, not for circulation or use. The actual survey is online with formatting for easier reading. Names of scales and the scoring weights in each cell are not used when the survey is administered. This survey includes core scales and some optional supplementary scales. Users can choose the scales that best suit their purposes.

Student Version

Instructions for students:

This survey is being given to students in grades 6-12. The questions will ask how you feel about your school and how students get along with one another and their teachers. We want to know your opinion in order to learn ways to improve your school.

Your individual answers to the survey are anonymous, which means that no one will know how you answered. Student answers will be summarized in a report to the school that will not include anyone's name.

It should take about 15-25 minutes to complete the survey.

What is your code number for taking this survey? Your teacher should have this number for you. Many students will have the same number, so you will not be identified by this number.

_____

1. Are you a student taking this survey?	
	Yes
	No (someone just looking over the survey)

2. What is the name of your school?

Student Engagement Scale

How do you feel about going to this school?	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
3. I like this school.	1	2	3	4
4. I am proud to be a student at this school.	1	2	3	4
5. I feel like I belong at this school.	1	2	3	4
6. I usually finish my homework.	1	2	3	4
7. I want to learn as much as I can at school.	1	2	3	4
8. Getting good grades is very important to me.	1	2	3	4

*The score for this scale is the sum of items 3-8 using the weights 1-4 in the cells above.

School Disciplinary Structure Scale

Thinking about your school, would you agree or disagree with the statements below? Pick the answer that is closest to how you feel.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
9. The school rules are fair.	1	2	3	4
10. The punishment[2] for breaking school rules is the same for all students.	1	2	3	4
11. Students at this school are only punished when they deserve it.	1	2	3	4
12. Students are suspended without a good reason.	1	2	3	4
13. When students are accused of doing something wrong, they get a chance to explain.	1	2	3	4
14. Students are treated fairly regardless of their race or ethnicity.	1	2	3	4
15. The adults at this school are too strict.	1	2	3	4

*The score for this scale is the sum of items 9-15 using the weights 1-4 in the cells above.

Student Support Scale – Respect for Students subscale

Most teachers and other adults at this school …	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
16. …care about all students.	1	2	3	4
17. …want all students to do well.	1	2	3	4
18. …listen to what students have to say.	1	2	3	4
19. …treat students with respect.	1	2	3	4

*The score for this scale is the sum of items 16-19 using the weights 1-4 in the cells above.

Student Support Scale – Willingness to Seek Help subscale

How much do you agree or disagree with these statements?	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
20. There are adults at this school I could talk with if I had a personal problem.	1	2	3	4
21. If I tell a teacher that someone is bullying me, the teacher will do something to help.	1	2	3	4
22. I am comfortable asking my teachers for help with my schoolwork.	1	2	3	4
23. There is at least one teacher or other adult at this school who really wants me to do well.	1	2	3	4

*The score for this scale is the sum of items 20-23 using the weights 1-4 in the cells above. A total Student Support score is obtained by summing the two subscales.

[2] We have reworded "punishment" to "consequences" with no loss of reliability or factor structure.

Additional items not included in Support scale

How much do you agree or disagree with these statements?	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
24. If another student talked about killing someone, I would tell one of the teachers or staff at school.	1	2	3	4
25. If another student brought a gun to school, I would tell one of the teachers or staff at school.	1	2	3	4
26. I feel safe in this school.	1	2	3	4

*These items do not load high enough onto the Support scale but they have important content and are used on an individual basis.

Academic Expectations scale

How much do you agree or disagree with these statements?	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
27. My teachers expect me to work hard.	1	2	3	4
28. My teachers really want me to learn a lot.	1	2	3	4
29. My teachers expect a lot from students.	1	2	3	4
30. My teachers do not really care how much I learn.	1	2	3	4
31. My teachers expect me to attend college.	1	2	3	4

*The score for this scale is the sum of items 27-31 using the weights 1-4 in the cells above.

Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying scale

These questions are about teasing and bullying you see at your school. Do not include friendly teasing that does not hurt anyone's feelings.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
32. Students in this school are teased about their clothing or physical appearance.	1	2	3	4
33. Students in this school are teased or put down because of their race or ethnicity.	1	2	3	4
34. There is a lot of teasing about sexual topics at this school.	1	2	3	4
35. Bullying is a problem at this school.	1	2	3	4
36. Students in this school are teased or put down about their sexual orientation.	1	2	3	4
Validity screening item	1	2	3	4
37. I am telling the truth on this survey.	1	2	3	4

*The score for PTB is the sum of items 32-36 using the weights 1-4 in the cells above. Item 37 is used to screen the surveys for invalid responders. Students are omitted from the sample if they answer 1 or 2 to item 37.

Bullying by Teachers

A teacher or other adult at school bullies a student by repeatedly punishing or criticizing a student unfairly. This goes beyond what is normal discipline in the school. Use this definition in answering the next set of questions.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
38. There are teachers or other adults at this school who bully students.	1	2	3	4
39. There are teachers or other adults at this school who make fun of students.	1	2	3	4
40. Some teachers or other adults at this school say things that make students feel badly.	1	2	3	4
41. Some teachers or other adults at this school pick on certain students.	1	2	3	4

*The score for Bullying by Teachers is the sum of items 38-41 using the weights 1-4 in the cells above. Research supporting this scale is under way.

Aggressive Attitudes scale

Do you agree or disagree with these statements?	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
42. If someone threatens you, it is okay to hit that person.	1	2	3	4
43. It feels good when I hit someone.	1	2	3	4
44. If you fight a lot, everyone will look up to you.	1	2	3	4
45. If you are afraid to fight, you won't have many friends.	1	2	3	4
46. It is your own fault if you let someone bully you.	1	2	3	4
47. Bullying is sometimes fun to do.	1	2	3	4

*The score for this scale is the sum of items 42-47 using the weights 1-4 in the cells above.

Victim Experiences scale

Have any of the following happened to you personally at school this year? This includes while you are going to or from school. This also includes school events like field trips, school dances, and sports events.	No	One time	More than once
48. A student stole my personal property.	1	2	3
49. A student physically attacked, pushed, or hit me.	1	2	3
50. A student threatened to hurt me.	1	2	3
51. A student threatened me with a weapon.	1	2	3
52. A student said mean or insulting things to me.	1	2	3

*The score for this scale is the sum of items 48-52 using the weights 1-3 in the cells above.

Bullying Experiences scale

Use this definition of bullying to answer the questions below: • Bullying is the repeated use of one's strength or popularity to injure, threaten, or embarrass another person on purpose. • Bullying can be physical, verbal, or social. • It is not bullying when two students who are about the same in strength or popularity have a fight or argument.	Never	Once or twice	About once per week	More than once per week
53. I have been bullied at school **this year** (since school started last fall).	1	2	3	4
54. I have bullied others at school this year.	1	2	3	4
Physical bullying involves repeatedly hitting, kicking, or shoving someone weaker on purpose.				
55. I have been physically bullied or threatened with physical bullying at school this year.	1	2	3	4
Verbal bullying involves repeatedly teasing, putting down, or insulting someone on purpose.				
56. I have been verbally bullied at school this year.	1	2	3	4
Social bullying involves getting others repeatedly to ignore or leave someone out on purpose.				
57. I have been socially bullied at school this year.	1	2	3	4
Cyber bullying involves using technology (cell phone, email, Internet, etc.) to tease or put down someone.				
58. I have been cyberbullied at school this year.	1	2	3	4
A teacher or another adult at school bullies a teacher by repeatedly punishing or criticizing a student unfairly. This goes beyond what is normal discipline in the school.				
59. I have been bullied by teachers or other adults at school this year.	1	2	3	4

The score for Bullying Victimization is the sum of items 53, 55, 56, 57, and 58. Research on item 59 is under way.

(If answered positively to one of questions above:) You have just answered some questions about being teased or bullied in some way.	
60. Did you tell a teacher or another adult at school what happened?	
	Yes
	No
61. (If answer above is yes:) One extra question: Did it help to tell the teacher or another adult at school what happened?	
	It seemed to help the situation get better.
	It seemed to make the situation worse.
	It made no difference.

Teen Dating Aggression scale

During the past 12 months how many times has someone you dated or went out with …	Never	Once	Twice	Three times	Four or more times
62. …physically hurt you on purpose? (for example, hit, pushed, or shook you)	1	2	3	4	1
63. …threaten to hurt you?	1	2	3	4	1
64. …call you names or put you down?	1	2	3	4	1
65. …try to kiss you or touch you against your will?	1	2	3	4	1
66. …try to make you drink alcohol or use drugs?	1	2	3	4	1
67. …continue to bother you or harass you after you stopped going out?	1	2	3	4	1
68. …I have dated or gone out with someone in the past 12 months.	1	2	3	4	1

*Research on the new Dating Aggression scale is under way. This scale was used with grades 9-12 and was not included in the middle school grades. See Datta, P., Cornell, D., & Konold, T. (under review). The association of teen dating aggression with risk behaviors and academic adjustment. Unpublished manuscript, Curry School of Education, University of Virginia.

Sexual Harassment index

During the past 12 months, how often did another student…	Never	Once	Twice	Three times	Four or more times
69. ….make unwelcome sexual comments, jokes, or gestures *that made you feel uncomfortable*.	1	2	3	4	1
70. …spread sexual rumors about you.	1	2	3	4	1
71. …touch, brush up against you, grab,or pull your clothing, or corner you in a sexual and unwelcome way.	1	2	3	4	1
72. ….bother you by repeatedly asking you to go out or do something with him/her that you did not want to do.	1	2	3	4	1

*Research on the new Sexual Harassment index is under way. This scale was used with grades 9-12 and was not included in the middle school grades.

Demographic and School Attendance questions

These next questions are used to count how many males and females took the survey, what grades they were in, and their different backgrounds. These questions are necessary so that we can show that students from many different backgrounds took this survey.

73. Are you male or female?	
	Male
	Female
74. What grade level are you in?	
	6th
	7th
	8th
	9th
	10th
	11th
	12th
75. What grades did you make on your last report card?	
	Mostly A's
	Mostly A's and B's
	Mostly B's
	Mostly B's and C's
	Mostly C's
	Mostly C's and D's
	Mostly D's and F's
76.	Do you receive a free or reduced-price meal at school?
	Yes
	No

77. How many days have you been suspended out of school this year?	
0	I have not been suspended from school this year.
1	I have been suspended for one day.
2	I have been suspended for two days.
3	I have been suspended for three days.
4	I have been suspended four days.
5	I have been suspended five or more days.

Ethnicity and Race Demographic questions

78. Does your family speak a language other than English at home?	
	Yes
	No
The new government standard is to ask a separate question about Hispanic or Latino ethnic background. This is a separate question because ethnic background is not the same as race. People of any race can be Hispanic or Latino. 79. Is your ethnic background Hispanic or Latino?	
	Yes
	No
80. What is the best description of your race? (All students can answer this question.)	
	American Indian or Alaska Native
	Asian
	Black or African American
	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
	White
	2 or more races

Educational Aspirations

81. How far do you expect to go in school?	
0	I do not expect to graduate from high school.
1	I might or might not graduate from high school.
2	I expect to graduate from high school.
3	I expect to graduate from a two-year college or technical school.
4	I expect to graduate from a four-year college.
5	I expect to complete post-graduate studies (such as a master's degree or doctoral degree) after graduating from a four-year college.

Parent Educational Attainment

82. How far did your mother, father, or other guardian go in school? (Pick the one who went furthest.)	
0	Did not graduate from high school.
1	Graduated from high school.
2	Graduated from a two-year college or technical school.
3	Graduated from a four-year college.
4	Completed post-graduate studies (such as a master's degree or doctoral degree) after graduating from a four-year college.

Number of Parents in Home

83. How many of your parents live with you? Include biological parents and adoptive parents.	
2	Two parents
1	One parent
0	No parents

84. How many of the questions on this survey did you answer truthfully?	
A	All of them
B	All but 1 or 2 of them
C	Most of them
D	Some of them
E	Only a few or none of them

*Students are omitted from the sample if they answer D or E to item 84.

Peer Nomination Survey (Optional)

Who is being bullied?
Help us stop bullying at this school.

Definition of Bullying. Bullying is defined as the use of one's strength or popularity to injure, threaten, or embarrass another person. Bullying can be physical, verbal, or social. *Physical bullying* is when a student hits, kicks, grabs, or shoves you on purpose. *Verbal bullying* is when a student threatens or teases you in a hurtful way. *Social bullying* is when a student tries to keep others from being your friend or from letting you join in what they are doing. It is not bullying when two students of about the same strength argue or fight.
Based on this definition of bullying, write the names of any students who have been bullied at school during the past month. If you are not sure of the student's full name, give some way to identify the student, such as the student's bus number, grade, or teacher's name. Please do not list someone's name as a joke. We want to have enough time to work with students in need of help.

First and last name of any student who has been a **victim** of bullying in the past month.

Optional Comments
Here you can write any comments or suggestions on school safety. If a student is bullying others, you can ask for help for that student.

_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank you for taking this survey. If any questions on this survey made you feel upset or uncomfortable, you can speak to your school counselor, school nurse, or school psychologist.

Instructions for the Peer Nomination Survey

The Peer Nomination Survey is a direct method of identifying victims of bullying. This one-page form can be appended to a longer survey or administered by itself. Our research has found that online and paper versions of the survey yield comparable results (Cornell & Huang, 2015).

Although school officials sometimes have reservations about asking students to provide the names of their classmates, in over ten years of experience with peer nominations across grades 4-12 we have found it to be a safe and effective way to obtain valuable information about students who are victims of bullying at school. Our research shows that students are not distressed by the peer nomination survey and it does not generate disruptive behavior or other problems among students. On the contrary, it sends a strong message to students that educators are concerned about bullying. Most importantly, it allows school counselors to identify students who are in need of assistance.

It is useful to explain the purpose of the peer nomination survey so that students understand its importance. One option is to show students a short video before answering the peer nomination question: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s6lBeN8OmS4 . However, our research has found that you can obtain equally useful results by having school staff explain the survey without the video. The overwhelming majority of students respond positively to the survey (Cornell & Huang, 2015). A few students will not take the survey seriously and will give inappropriate responses, but this can be expected in any survey and does not prevent the peer nomination data from yielding useful information.

After the survey is administered, school counselors can tabulate the names of nominated students and conduct follow-up interviews guided by another video: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UCeV3qJL7IU&feature=youtube

One repeated finding from our research is that some nominated students are not victims of bullying, but may be embroiled in some other kind of peer conflict that does not meet the technical definition of bullying (Phillips & Cornell, 2012). However, it is useful for school counselors to identify these students as well as those who are actual victims of bullying.

A frequent question is, "How many nominations should be used as a cut-off for interviewing students?" There is no definitive answer to this question. We have examined cut-offs ranging from as few as two nominations to as many as five or more. Generally, the more nominations a student has, the more likely the student is a victim of bullying. Schools typically choose a cut-off based on their staff resources for interviewing students. We recommend a cut-off of three or more nominations.

Cornell, D., & Huang, F. (2015). School counselor use of peer nominations to identify victims of bullying. *Professional School Counseling, 18,* 191-205.

Phillips, V., & Cornell, D. (2012). Identifying victims of bullying: Use of counselor interviews to confirm peer nominations. *Professional School Counseling, 15,* 123-131.

Optional Scales

Supplementary questions to consider including with the student survey.

Items from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance Survey (YRBS) (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2009)

During the past 30 days, on how many days did you carry a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property?	
	0 days
	1 day
	2 or 3 days
	4 or 5 days
	6 or more days
During the past 12 months, how many times were you in a physical fight on school property?	
	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
During the past 12 months, did you ever seriously consider attempting suicide?	
	Yes
	No
During the past 12 months, how many times did you actually attempt suicide?	
	0 times
	1 time
	2 or 3 times
	4 or 5 times
	6 or more times
During the past 30 days, on how many days did you have at least one drink of alcohol?	
	0 days
	1 or 2 days
	3 to 5 days
	6 to 9 days
	10 to 19 days
	20 to 29 days
	All 30 days
During the past 30 days, how many times did you use marijuana?	
	0 times
	1 to 2 times
	3 or 9 times
	10 to 19 times
	20 to 39 times
	40 or more times

Depression Scale (Orpinas, 1993)

In the last 30 days, how often …	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Always
Were you sad?	1	2	3	4	5
Were you grouchy, irritable, or in a bad mood?	1	2	3	4	5
Did you feel hopeless about the future?	1	2	3	4	5
Did you not feel like eating or eating more than usual?	1	2	3	4	5
Did you sleep a lot or less than usual?	1	2	3	4	5
Did you have difficulty concentrating on your schoolwork?	1	2	3	4	5

*The total score for this scale is the sum of all items.

Student Activities scale

How many school activities have you participated in this year?	None	1	2	3 or more
Number of clubs, such as Key Club, Spanish Club, Honor Society	0	1	2	3
Number of performing arts groups, such as band, chorus, or drama	0	1	2	3
Number of sports teams, such as basketball or track	0	1	2	3
Number of other activities, such as student government, ROTC	0	1	2	3

*The total score for this scale is the sum of all items.

Gang Activity questions

Now, we'd like to know about gangs at your school this year. You may know these as street gangs, fighting gangs, crews, or something else. Gangs may use common names, signs, symbols, or colors. For this survey we are interested in all gangs.	Yes	No	I don't know
Are there gangs at your school this year?	1	0	0
Have gangs been involved in fights or other violence at your school this year?	1	0	0
Have gangs been involved in the sale of drugs at your school this year?	1	0	0
Have you considered joining a gang?	1	0	0

*The first three questions are from School Crime Supplement to the 2013 National Crime Victimization Survey.

Educational Services

Yes	No	I don't know	
			Do you have an Individualized Education Program (IEP)?
			Do you have a Section 504 plan?

Peer Support scale

How much do you agree or disagree with these statements?	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Most students at this school care about all students.				
Most students at this school want all students to do well.				
Most students at this school listen to what other students have to say.				
Most students at this school treat other students with respect.				

This scale was created in 2017 at the request of the Virginia Department of Education.

School Resource Officer questions

Many schools have a police officer called a school resource officer (SRO) or a security officer who works in the school. Do you have an officer in your school?	
	Yes
	No
	I don't know

Over the past school year, about how often have you interacted with the school resource officer (or security officer) who works in your school? (If there is more than one officer at your school, add them together.)	
	Every day
	About weekly
	About monthly
	Once or twice a semester
	Never

The school resource officer (or security officer) makes me feel safer at school.	
	Strongly Disagree
	Disagree
	Agree
	Strongly Agree

Positive Values scale

How important are these values to you?	Not Important	Slightly Important	Somewhat Important	Definitely Important	Highly Important	Extremely Important
Telling the truth, even when it is difficult.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Treating others with respect and being considerate of their feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Doing what is right, even if my friends disagree.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Admitting my mistakes when I do something wrong.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Respecting the views of people of a different race or culture.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Helping others who are less fortunate than me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Being kind to others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Doing my part to make the world a better place.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Obeying the law.	1	2	3	4	5	6

*The score for this scale is the sum of all items using the cell weights. For additional information, see Huang, F., & Cornell, D. (2016). Using multilevel factor analysis with clustered data: Investigating the factor structure of the Positive Values Scale. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 34*, 3-14. doi: 10.1177/0734282915570278

Survey Code

The next questions are used to create a code for your survey. This code will be used to compare your answers on this survey with answers to surveys you may take in future years. If you do not know the answer to one of these questions, leave it blank.

On what day of the month were you born? For example, the answer is 10 if you were born on May 10.
___ ___
What is the third letter of your mother's first name? For example, if your mother's name is Janet, the answer is "n".
___
What is the first letter of the name of your favorite pet? If you have no favorite pet, choose X.
___
What is the first letter of the city where you were born?
___
How many letters are in your father's first name? For example, if your father's name is Robert, the answer is 6.
___ ___

This scale was introduced in 2017 as an experimental way to conduct longitudinal research tracking students over time while protecting their anonymity.

Suspension Questions

How many days have you been suspended from school this year?	
	I have not been suspended from school this year.
	I have been suspended for one day.
	I have been suspended for two days.
	I have been suspended for three days.
	I have been suspended four days.
	I have been suspended five or more days.
(If answer above indicates a school suspension) Think about the last time you were suspended. What was the main reason for your suspension? (Choose only one)	
	Fighting or hitting someone
	Breaking a school rule about alcohol, tobacco, or drugs
	Being late or tardy, cutting class, or not being where supposed to be
	Using bad language, arguing with a teacher, or talking in class
	Lying or cheating
	Dress code violation (such as wearing something that is not allowed)
	Breaking a school rule about cell phones, music players, computers, or other technology
	Some other reason
(If answer above indicates a school suspension) I feel that my suspension was fair.	
	Yes
	No

Continued next page

(If answer above indicates a school suspension) After being suspended, I did not into trouble again.	
	Yes
	No
(If answer above indicates a school suspension) After being suspended, my grades improved.	
	Yes
	No

Threat Survey Questions (Nekvasil & Cornell, 2012)

Has another student threatened to harm you in the past 30 days?	
	I have not been threatened.
	I have been threatened, but the person did not really mean it.
	I have been threatened and it was serious.
What did the other student threaten to do to you?	
	Injure me without a weapon (e.g. hit me).
	Injure me with a weapon such as a club, knife, or gun.
	Nothing specific, just a threat to hurt or harm me.
Did you tell anyone about the threat?	
	Yes
	No
What happened with the threat?	
	The threat is over and nothing happened.
	The threat is not over and might be carried out.
	Nothing specific, just a threat to hurt or harm me.

Please explain why you have not anyone that you were threatened. Open-ended responses coded as:	
1	Threat not that serious
2	Help not necessary
3	Fear of retaliation
4	Concern over snitching
5	Help would be ineffective

For additional information see, Nekvasil, E., & Cornell, D. (2012). Student reports of peer threats of violence: Prevalence and outcomes. *Journal of School Violence*, *11*, 357-375.

Authoritative School Climate Survey ©
Secondary School Teacher Version

Items	Item Content
1	Online administration item
2	Staff position item
3	Name of school item
4-9	Student Engagement
10-18	Disciplinary structure
19-22	Student support: Teacher Respect for Students
23-28	Student support: Student Willingness to Seek Help
29-33	Prevalence of teasing and bullying
34-37	Bullying by teachers
38-42	Teacher/staff concerns about safety and discipline
43-47	Student aggression toward staff
48-52	Parent or staff conflict
53-58	Reactions to aggression
59-62	Teacher /Staff Collegiality
63-66	Demographics of gender and race/ethnicity, and teacher/staff experience

2016 Authoritative School Climate Survey©
Teacher/Staff Version

This is a review copy, not for circulation or use. The actual survey is online with formatting for easier reading. Names of scales are not used when the survey is administered. This version has been shortened from the previous version.

Instructions for teachers:

This survey is being given statewide to teachers and other school staff in grades x-x. The purpose of the survey is to help schools maintain a positive school climate that is conducive to learning.

Teacher answers will be summarized in a report to the school that will not include anyone's name. Your individual answers to the survey are anonymous, which means that no one will know how you answered.

The survey should take about 10 minutes to complete.

What is your code number for taking this survey? Your principal should have this number for you. Many teachers and staff members will have the same number, so you will not be identified by this number. The researchers for this survey are obligated to protect your identity and will not share individual surveys with anyone. Only group data will be reported.

1. Are you taking this survey as part of the school safety audit or simply looking it over? (This question for online administration only)	
	Yes, taking this survey for my school.
	No, just reviewing the survey.

2. What is your staff position in this school? In order to protect your anonymity, reports concerning an individual school will combine all staff members into a single group. Your individual answers will not be released to anyone. For statewide reports, however, we want to compare different school roles.	
	Administrator (e.g., principal or assistant principal)
	Counselor
	Nurse
	Psychologist
	School resource officer or security officer
	Social worker
	Teacher
	None of above

3. What is the name of your school?

Student Engagement in School scale

How do students feel about going to this school? Although there will be differences among students, how do most students generally feel?	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
4. Students generally like this school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Students are proud to be at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Students hate going to school. (reverse coded)	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Students finish their homework at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Getting good grades is very important to most students here.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Most students want to learn as much as they can at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	6

*The score for this scale is the sum of items 4-9 using the weights 1-6 in the cells above.

School Disciplinary Structure scale

*The score for this scale is the sum of items 10-17 using the weights 1-6 in the cells above.

Thinking about your school, would you agree or disagree with the statements below? Pick the answer that is closest to your view.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
10. The punishment for breaking school rules is the same for all students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Students at this school only get punished when they deserve it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Students here know the school rules for student conduct.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. If a student does something wrong, he or she will definitely be punished.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Students can get away with breaking the rules at this school pretty easily. (reverse coded)	6	5	4	3	2	1
15. Students get suspended without good reason. (reverse coded)	6	5	4	3	2	1
16. Students get suspended for minor things. (reverse coded)	6	5	4	3	2	1
17. When students are accused of doing something wrong, they get a chance to explain.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. The adults at this school are too strict. (reverse coded)	6	5	4	3	2	1

Teacher Respect for Students subscale

Most teachers and other adults at this school …	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
19. …care about all students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. …want all students to do well.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. …listen to what students have to say.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. …treat students with respect.	1	2	3	4	5	6

*The score for this scale is the sum of items 19-22 using the weights 1-6 in the cells above.

Student Willingness to Seek Help from Teachers scale

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your school?	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
23. Students know who to go to for help if they have been treated badly by another student.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. Students feel comfortable asking for help from teachers if there is a problem with a student.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. Students report it when one student hits another.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. Students are encouraged to report bullying and aggression.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. Teachers take action to solve the problem when students report bullying.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. Teachers know when students are being picked on or being bullied.	1	2	3	4	5	6

*The score for this subscale is the sum of items 23-28 using the weights 1-6 in the cells above. The total for Student Support is the sum of items for both subscales, 19-28.

Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying

These questions are about teasing and bullying you see at your school. Do not include friendly teasing that does not hurt anyone's feelings.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
29. Students in this school are teased about their clothing or physical appearance.	1	2	3	4
30. Students in this school are teased or put down because of their race or ethnicity.	1	2	3	4
31. There is a lot of teasing about sexual topics at this school.	1	2	3	4
32. Bullying is a problem at this school.	1	2	3	4
33. Students in this school are teased or put down about their sexual orientation.	1	2	3	4
A teacher or other adult at school bullies a student by repeatedly punishing or criticizing a student unfairly. This goes beyond what is normal discipline in the school. Use this definition in answering the next set of questions.				
34. There are teachers or other adults at this school who bully students.	1	2	3	4
35. There are teachers or other adults at this school who make fun of students.	1	2	3	4
36. Some teachers or other adults at this school say things that make students feel badly.	1	2	3	4
37. Some teachers or other adults at this school pick on certain students.	1	2	3	4

*The score for Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying (PTB) is the sum of items 29-33 using the weights 1-4 in each cell. The score for the Bullying by Teachers scale is the sum of items 34-37 also using the weights 1-4 in each cell.

Teacher/Staff Concerns about Safety and Discipline

How much do you agree or disagree with these statements?	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
38. I am treated with respect by students at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
39. I feel physically safe at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
40. I feel that there is adequate safety and security in this school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
41. The disciplinary practices at this school are effective.	1	2	3	4	5	6
42. Disciplinary policies are clear to school staff members.	1	2	3	4	5	6

*Research on these items is under way.

Student Aggression toward Teachers/Staff

Have any of the following happened to you personally at school this year? This includes school events like field trips, school dances, and sports events.	No	One time	More than once	Many times
43. A student stole my personal property.	0	1	2	3
44. A student said mean or insulting things to me.	0	1	2	3
45. A student threatened to hurt me.	0	1	2	3
46. A student threatened me with a weapon.	0	1	2	3
47. A student physically attacked, pushed, or hit me.	0	1	2	3

*The total for this scale is the sum for items 48-52 using the cell weights.

Parent or Staff Conflict

Have any of the following happened to you personally at school this year? This includes school events like field trips, school dances, and sports events.	No	One time	More than once	Many times
48. A parent said rude or insulting things to me.	0	1	2	3
49. A parent threatened to complain about me to the administration.	0	1	2	3
50. A parent threatened to harm me.	0	1	2	3
51. A colleague said rude or insulting things to me.	0	1	2	3
52. A colleague threatened to harm me.	0	1	2	3

*The total for this scale is the sum for items 48-52 using the cell weights.

Teacher Reactions to Aggression scale

(If any of the above occurred:) You have just answered some questions about being insulted, threatened, or harmed in some way at school. Think about the overall impact of these experiences. How did they affect you?	Not true	A little true	Somewhat true	Definitely true
53. They bothered me a lot.	1	2	3	4
54. I felt frustrated.	1	2	3	4
55. I felt sad.	1	2	3	4
56. I felt angry.	1	2	3	4
57. I felt burned out about my job.	1	2	3	4
58. It made me think about whether to continue my work in the schools.	1	2	3	4

*The total for this scale is the sum of items 53-58 using the cell weights.

Teacher /Staff Collegiality

How much do you agree or disagree with these statements?	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
59. Teachers and other school staff work well with one another at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
60. There is a strong sense of mutual support among the teachers and other staff at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
61. Teachers and other school staff members trust one another at this school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
62. This school is a collegial environment for teachers and other school staff members.	1	2	3	4	5	6

*Research on this scale is under way.

Demographic items

These final questions are used for demographic purposes to identify any trends associated with gender, race, and years of experience. Reports concerning an individual school will not include gender, race, or experience breakdowns in order to protect anonymity.

63. Are you male or female?	
	Male
	Female
64. How many years have you been working in the school as a teacher or in another professional capacity?	
	1-2 years
	3-5 years
	6-10 years
	More than 10 years

The government standard is to ask a separate question about Hispanic or Latino ethnic background because ethnic background is not the same as race. 65. Is your ethnic background Hispanic or Latino?	
	Yes
	No
66. What is the best description of your race?	
	American Indian or Alaska Native
	Asian
	Black or African American
	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
	White
	2 or more races

Thank you for taking this survey.

Optional Teacher Version Scales

Supplementary questions to consider including with the teacher survey.

Questions about authoritative school characteristics

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your school?	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
This school consistently has high expectations for student behavior with strict and fair discipline.	1	2	3	4	5	6
This school consistently has high academic expectations for students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Teachers and other staff members consistently show respect, warmth, and concern for students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Students consistently feel comfortable seeking help from teachers and other staff members for both academic and personal concerns.	1	2	3	4	5	6

This is a new set of items under investigation.

Effectiveness of School Programs ratings questions

Does your school have one or more of the following programs in place this year? For each program that you know about, please rate how effective it has been.	Don't have it	I don't know if we have it	Not effective	Some-what effective	Moderately effective	Very effective	I don't know how effective it is
Anti-bullying							
Character education							
Classroom management training for teachers							
Conflict resolution							
Effective Schoolwide Discipline (ESD) or Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS)							
Individualized behavior plans for disruptive students							
Mentoring							
Method to report a safety concern anonymously							
Peer mediation							
Problem solving or social skills curriculum							
Student assistance programming							
Substance abuse prevention/intervention							
Truancy prevention/intervention							

Gang Activity questions

Now, we'd like to know about gangs at your school this year. You may know these as street gangs, fighting gangs, crews, or something else. Gangs may use common names, signs, symbols, or colors. For this survey we are interested in all gangs.	Yes	No	I don't know
Are there gangs at your school this year?	1	0	0
Have gangs been involved in fights or other violence at your school this year?	1	0	0
Have gangs been involved in the sale of drugs at your school this year?	1	0	0

*These questions are from the School Crime Supplement to the 2013 National Crime Victimization Survey.

Threat Assessment

Do you know whether your school uses a formal threat assessment process to respond to student threats of violence?	
	Yes
	No
	I don't know

Teacher Perceptions of Suspension Practices scale

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your school?	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Zero tolerance makes a significant contribution to maintaining order at this school. (Zero tolerance is defined as the practice of imposing an automatic and severe punishment for any violation of a certain rule.)						
Zero tolerance sends a clear message to disruptive students about inappropriate behaviors in school.						
Suspension makes students less likely to misbehave in the future.						
Out-of-school suspension is unnecessary if we provide a positive school climate and challenging instruction.						

Peer Support

Students at this school …	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
… care about other students						
… get along well with other students.						
… try to understand how other students think and feel.						
… respect other students.						

School Resource Officer questions

Many schools have a police officer called a school resource officer (SRO) or a security officer who works in the school. Do you have an officer in your school?	
	Yes
	No
	I don't know

Over the past school year, about how often have you interacted with the school resource officer (or security officer) who works in your school? (If there is more than one officer at your school, add them together.)	
	Every day
	About weekly
	About monthly
	Once or twice a semester
	Never

How much do you agree or disagree with these statements?	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The school resource officer (or security officer) makes me feel safer at school.						
The school resource officer (or security officer) makes a positive contribution to our school climate.						

Authoritative School Climate Survey: 2016 Elementary Version©
(Grades 4-5)

The elementary school version has been extensively revised to more closely parallel the secondary school surveys. Validational research is under way.

Items	Item Content
1-3	Student Engagement – Affective
4-6	Student Engagement - Cognitive
7-9	Disciplinary Structure
10-14	Student Support
15-16	Involvement in bullying items
17-20	Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying
21-24	Demographics of gender, age, grade, and ethnicity/race
25-26	Peer nomination about bullying

(Many schools prefer to have a teacher read the survey aloud to students as they answer it.)

Welcome to the school climate survey. Your answers will be private. Your teachers will not know your answers.

Yes	No	Answer Yes or No for each statement.
		I like this school.
		I am proud to be a student at this school.
		I feel like I belong at this school.
		I usually finish my homework.
		I want to learn as much as I can at school.
		Getting good grades is very important to me.

Yes	No	Answer Yes or No for each statement.
		The school rules are fair.
		Students are treated fairly regardless of their race.
		The adults at this school are too strict.
		Most adults at this school care about all students.
		Most adults at this school want all students to do well.
		Most adults at this school treat students with respect.
		There are adults at this school I could talk with if I had a personal problem.
		If I tell a teacher that someone is bullying me, the teacher will do something to help.

What is bullying? There are lots of ways to bully someone. Bullying means hurting someone who is smaller or weaker. • A bully can hurt you by teasing or calling you names. • A bully can hurt you by hitting you or threatening to hit you. • A bully can hurt you by getting everyone to be mean to you. • It is not bullying when two students have a fight or argument and are about the same in strength or power.	Never	Once or twice	About once per week	More than once per week
Have you been bullied at school in the past month?				
Have you bullied someone at school in the past month?				

Yes	No	Answer Yes or No for each statement.
		Students at this school are teased about how they look.
		Students at this school are teased about their clothing.
		Students at this school are teased or put down for their race.
		Bullying is a problem at this school.

Are you a boy or a girl?	Boy	Girl
What grade are you in?	4	5
Are you Hispanic or Latino(a)?	Yes	No
What is your race?	American Indian Asian Black or African-American White Other 2 or more races	

Optional Peer Nomination Question

Who is being bullied? Help us stop bullying. Write the first and last name of any students who have been bullied at school in the past month. If you are not sure of the student's full name, give some way to identify the student, such as the student's bus number, grade, or teacher's name.
Optional Comments: You can write your suggestions on school safety. If a student is bullying others, you can ask for help for that student.

Thank you for taking this survey.

Authoritative School Climate Survey: 2016 Parent Version©
(All Grades)

This is a review copy, not for circulation or use. The actual survey is online with formatting for easier reading. Names of scales are not used when the survey is administered. Some of these items (e.g., gang activity, dating experiences) can be omitted for parents of elementary school children.

Items	Item Content
1-2	Identifying information
3-8	Student Engagement
9-15	Disciplinary Structure
16-23	Student Support
24-26	Additional safety items
27-31	Academic expectations
32-36	Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying
37	Validity screening
38-41	Bullying by teachers
42-44	Gang activity
45-49	Victim experiences
50-56	Bullying experiences
21-24	Demographics of gender, age, grade, and ethnicity/race
25-26	Peer nomination about bullying

Parent Survey

This survey is for parents of all students in your child's school. We want to know your opinion in order to learn ways to improve your child's school. If you have more than one child at this school, think of your oldest child in answering the survey questions.

Your individual answers to the survey are anonymous, which means that no one will know how you answered. Answers will be summarized in a report to the school that will not include anyone's name.

It should take about 15-25 minutes to complete the survey.

What is your code number for taking this survey? Your child's school should have this number for you. Many parents will have the same number, so you will not be identified by this number. _____

1. Are you a parent taking this survey?	
	Yes
	No (someone just looking over the survey)

2. What is the name of your child's school?

Student Engagement Scale

How does your child feel about going to this school? If you have more than one child at this school, answer for the oldest child only.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
3. My child likes this school.				
4. My child is proud to be a student at this school.				
5. My child feels like he/she belongs at this school.				
6. My child usually finishes her/ his homework.				
7. My child wants to learn as much as he/she can at school.				
8. Getting good grades is very important to my child.				

School Disciplinary Structure Scale

Thinking about your school, would you agree or disagree with the statements below? Pick the answer that is closest to how you feel.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
9. The school rules are fair.				
10. The punishment for breaking school rules is the same for all students.				
11. Students at this school are only punished when they deserve it.				
12. Students are suspended without a good reason.				
13. When students are accused of doing something wrong, they				

get a chance to explain.				
14. Students are treated fairly regardless of their race or ethnicity.				
15. The adults at this school are too strict.				

Student Support Scale – Respect for Students subscale

Most teachers and other adults at this school …	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
16. …care about all students.				
17. …want all students to do well.				
18. …listen to what students have to say.				
19. …treat students with respect.				

Student Support Scale – Willingness to Seek Help subscale

How much do you agree or disagree with these statements?	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
20. There are adults at this school my child could talk with if she/he had a personal problem.				
21. If my child tells a teacher that someone is bullying her/him, the teacher will do something to help.				
22. My child is comfortable asking her/his teachers for help with schoolwork.				
23. There is at least one teacher or other adult at this school who really wants my child to do well.				

Additional items not included in Support scale

How much do you agree or disagree with these statements?	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
24. If another student talked about killing someone, my child would tell one of the teachers or staff at school.				
25. If another student brought a gun to school, my child would tell one of the teachers or staff at school.				
26. My child feels safe in this school.				

Academic Expectations scale

How much do you agree or disagree with these statements?	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
27. My teachers expect my child to work hard.				
28. My teachers really want my child to learn a lot.				
29. My teachers expect a lot from all students.				
30. My teachers do not really care how much my child learns.				
31. My teachers expect my child to attend college.				

Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying scale

These questions are about teasing and bullying at your child's school. Do not include friendly teasing that does not hurt anyone's feelings.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
32. Students in this school are teased about their clothing or physical appearance.				
33. Students in this school are teased or put down because of their race or ethnicity.				
34. There is a lot of teasing about sexual topics at this school.				
35. Bullying is a problem at this school.				
36. Students in this school are teased or put down about their sexual orientation.				
Validity screening item				
37. I am telling the truth on this survey.				

Bullying by Teachers

A teacher or other adult at school bullies a student by repeatedly punishing or criticizing a student unfairly. This goes beyond what is normal discipline in the school. Use this definition in answering the next set of questions.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
38. There are teachers or other adults at this school who bully students.				
39. There are teachers or other adults at this school who make fun of students.				
40. Some teachers or other adults at this school say things that make students feel badly.				
41. Some teachers or other adults at this school pick on certain students.				

Gang Activity

Now, we'd like to know about gangs at your school this year. You may know these as street gangs, fighting gangs, crews, or something else. Gangs may use common names, signs, symbols, or colors. For this survey we are interested in all gangs.	Yes	No	I don't know
42. Are there gangs at your child's school this year?			
43. Have gangs been involved in fights or other violence at your child's school this year?			
44. Have gangs been involved in the sale of drugs at your child's school this year?			

Victim Experiences scale

Have any of the following happened to your child at school this year? This includes while your child was going to or from school. This also includes school events like field trips, school dances, and sports events.			
45. A student stole my child's personal property.			
46. A student physically attacked, pushed, or hit my child.			
47. A student threatened to hurt my child.			
48. A student threatened my child with a weapon.			
49. A student said mean or insulting things to my child.			

Bullying Experiences scale

Use this definition of bullying to answer the questions below: • Bullying is the repeated use of one's strength or popularity to injure, threaten, or embarrass another person on purpose. • Bullying can be physical, verbal, or social. • It is not bullying when two students who are about the same in strength or popularity have a fight or argument.	Never	Once or twice	About once per week	More than once per week
50. My child has been bullied at school **<u>this year</u>** (since school started last fall).				
51. My child has bullied others at school this year.				
Physical bullying involves repeatedly hitting, kicking, or shoving someone weaker on purpose.				
52. My child has been physically bullied or threatened with physical bullying at school this year.				
Verbal bullying involves repeatedly teasing, putting down, or insulting someone on purpose.				
53. My child has been verbally bullied at school this year.				
Social bullying involves getting others repeatedly to ignore or leave someone out on purpose.				
54. My child has been socially bullied at school this year.				
Cyber bullying involves using technology (cell phone, email, Internet, etc.) to tease or put down someone.				
55. My child has been cyberbullied at school this year.				
A teacher or other adult at school bullies a student by repeatedly punishing or criticizing a student unfairly. This goes beyond what is normal discipline in the school.				
56. My child has been bullied by teachers or other adults at school this year.				

During the past 12 months how many times did someone your child dated or went out with …	Never	Once	Twice	Three times	Four or more times
57. …physically hurt your child on purpose?					
58. …threatened to hurt your child?					
59. …called your child names or put down your child?					
60. …tried to kiss or touch your child against her/his will?					
61. …tried to make your child drink alcohol or use drugs?					
62. …continued to bother or harass your child after he/she stopped going out?					

During the past 12 months, how often did another student do the following to your child at school?	Never	Once	Twice	Three times	Four or more times
63. Made unwelcome sexual comments, jokes, or gestures *that made your child feel uncomfortable.*					
64. Spread sexual rumors about your child.					
65. Touched, brushed up against you, grabbed or pulled your child's clothing, or cornered your child in a sexual and unwelcome way.					
66. Bothered your child by repeatedly asking her/him to go out or do something with her/him that your child did not want to do.					

Demographic and School Attendance questions

These next questions are used to count how many males and females took the survey, what grades they were in, and their different backgrounds. These questions are necessary so that we can show that students from many different backgrounds took this survey.

67. Is your child male or female? (If you have more than one child at this school, answer for the oldest child.)	
	Male
	Female
68. What grade level is your child in?	
	preK K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
69. What grades did your child make on the last report card?	
	Mostly A's
	Mostly A's and B's
	Mostly B's
	Mostly B's and C's
	Mostly C's
	Mostly C's and D's
	Mostly D's and F's
	My child did not receive a report card or the report card did not use letter grades.
70.	Does your child receive a free or reduced-price meal at school?
	Yes
	No

71. How many days has your child been suspended out of school this year?	
	My child has not been suspended from school this year.
	My child has been suspended for one day.
	My child has been suspended for two days.
	My child has been suspended for three days.
	My child has been suspended four days.
	My child has been suspended five or more days.

Ethnicity and Race Demographic questions

72. Does your family speak a language other than English at home?	
	Yes
	No
The new government standard is to ask a separate question about Hispanic or Latino ethnic background. This is a separate question because ethnic background is not the same as race. People of any race can be Hispanic or Latino. 73. Is your child's ethnic background Hispanic or Latino?	
	Yes
	No

74. What is the best description of your child's race?	
	American Indian or Alaska Native
	Asian
	Black or African American
	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
	White
	2 or more races

Educational Aspirations

75. How far does your child expect to go in school?	
	My child does not expect to graduate from high school.
	My child might or might not graduate from high school.
	My child expects to graduate from high school.
	My child expects to graduate from a two-year college or technical school.
	My child expects to graduate from a four-year college.
	My child expects to complete post-graduate studies (such as a master's degree or doctoral degree) after graduating from a four-year college.

Parent Educational Attainment

76. How far did your child's parents or other guardians go in school? (Pick the one who went furthest.)	
	Did not graduate from high school.
	Graduated from high school.
	Graduated from a two-year college or technical school.
	Graduated from a four-year college.
	Completed post-graduate studies (such as a master's degree or doctoral degree) after graduating from a four-year college.

Number of Parents in Home

77. How many parents live with your child? Include biological parents and adoptive parents.	
	Two parents
	One parent
	No parents

78. How many of the questions on this survey did you answer truthfully?	
	All of them
	All but 1 or 2 of them
	Most of them
	Some of them
	Only a few or none of them

Thank you for taking this survey.

Research Abstracts

The Authoritative School Climate Survey (ASCS) replaced the original version of the survey, the School Climate Bullying Survey (SCBS), which was developed by Dewey Cornell, initially in collaboration with Peter Sheras and with ongoing assistance from their graduate students. A related series of studies were conducted with Jim Unnever using the Olweus survey and some additional scales. The ASCS uses many of the same items as the SCBS but has been updated based upon psychometric analysis. The most recent version of the survey is presented here. The survey builds upon the seminal research on bullying conducted by Olweus (Olweus, 1993; Olweus & Limber, 2000) and other youth aggression researchers (e.g., Rigby 1996; Slaby & Guerra, 1988).

1. Cornell, D. G., & Loper, A. B. (1998). Assessment of violence and other high-risk behaviors with a school survey. *School Psychology Review, 27,* 317-330.

This study reports the results of a school safety survey administered to 10,909 7th-, 9th-, and 11th-grade students in a Virginia suburban school district. The survey assesses attitudes toward aggressive behavior and high-risk behaviors including weapon carrying, fighting, and substance use. Analyses of statistical significance and effect size indicated that the elimination of surveys judged to be invalid substantially reduced the reported incidence of all forms of high-risk behavior; although boys reported more high-risk behavior than girls, more than 10% of girls reported high-risk behavior including fighting, substance use, and carrying weapons at school within a 30-day period; aggressive attitudes and gang membership were linked to high-risk behaviors; and there was strong correspondence between high-risk behaviors at school and outside of school, but lower frequencies at school than outside of school. These results have implications for future use of school surveys and identification of students likely to engage in high-risk behavior.

2. Marsh, T., & Cornell, D. (2001). The contribution of student experiences to understanding ethnic differences in high-risk behaviors at school. *Behavioral Disorders, 26,* 152-163.

Past research reported that adolescent males from ethnic minority groups often engage in high-risk behaviors at school such as weapon possession, gang involvement, and fighting. The purpose of this study was to demonstrate that ethnic differences in high-risk behaviors might be better explained by differential school experiences. The study hypothesized that certain school experiences-termed experiential factors- rendered students more vulnerable to high-risk behaviors. The sample consisted of 7,848 seventh-, ninth-, and eleventh-grade students who completed a school safety survey. Logistic regression analyses revealed that student school experiences explained more variance than ethnicity. Low academic grades, observation and threat of violence, drug use, and perceived lack of adult and peer support were experiential factors associated with student involvement in high-risk behaviors. These results support an emphasis on student experience rather than on ethnic background in understanding high-risk behaviors at school.

3. Unnever, J., & Cornell, D. (2003). Bullying, self-control, and ADHD. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18,* 129-147.

We investigated the influence of low self-control and Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) on bullying and bully victimization in a sample of 1,315 middle-school students using a school survey. Students who reported taking medication for ADHD were at increased risk for bullying as well as victimization by bullies. The correlation between ADHD status and bullying could be explained by low self-control, a construct theorized by Gottfredson and Hirschi to be the most important determinant of criminality. In contrast, the correlation between ADHDstatus and bullying victimization was independent of self-control. Subsequent analyses found that self control influenced bullying victimization through interactions with student gender and measures of physical size and strength. These findings identify low self-control and ADHD as potential risk factors for bullying and victimization and have implications for research on self-control in young adolescents.

4. Unnever, J. & Cornell, D. (2003). The culture of bullying in middle school. *Journal of School Violence, 2,* 5-27.

The purpose of this study was to assess the nature and extent of student attitudes toward bullying. We investigated the consistency and prevalence of student attitudes across gender, race, socioeconomic status, and grade level. We also assessed whether students with positive attitudes toward peer aggression and students with higher trait anger were especially prone to support a normative structure that encourages bullying. Based on a data set including 6 middle schools and over 2,400 students, our results indicate that a culture of bullying is a pervasive phenomenon among middle school students and should be an important consideration in bullying prevention efforts.

5. McConville, D., & Cornell, D. (2003). Attitudes toward aggression and aggressive behavior among middle school students. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 11*, 179-187.

Are student attitudes toward peer aggression predictive of aggressive behavior in middle school? This prospective study found that self-reported attitudes toward peer aggression among 403 middle school students were both internally consistent (Cronbach's alphas = .81 and .82) and stable over time (seven month test-retest r = .66). Most notably, aggressive attitudes were correlated with four outcome criteria for aggressive behavior: student self-report of peer aggression, peer and teacher nominations of bullying, and school discipline referrals. Significant correlations ranged from r = .09 to .37. Receiver operating characteristic analyses resulted in effect sizes ranging from .59 to .75. Overall, this study demonstrates that assessment of student attitudes toward aggression yields concurrent and predictive information related to a range of aggressive and disruptive behaviors in middle school.

6. Unnever, J. & Cornell, D. (2004). Middle school victims of bullying: Who reports being bullied? *Aggressive Behavior, 30,* 373-388.

This study examined factors that influence a student's decision to report being bullied at school. An anonymous survey of 2,437 students in six middle schools identified 898 students who had

been bullied, including 25% who had not told anyone that they were bullied and 40% who had not told an adult about their victimization. We investigated chronicity and type of bullying, school climate, familial, demographic, and attitudinal factors that influenced victim reporting to anyone versus no one, to adults versus no one, and to adults versus peers. Logistic regression analyses indicated that reporting increased with the chronicity of victimization. Reporting was generally more frequent among girls than boys, and among lower grade levels. Students who perceived the school climate to be tolerant of bullying, and students who described their parents as using coercive discipline were less likely to report being bullied. Implications for improving victim reporting of bullying are discussed.

7. Cornell, D., & Brockenbrough, K. (2004). Identification of bullies and victims: A comparison of methods. *Journal of School Violence, 3*, 63-87.

Bullying studies frequently rely on student self-report to identify bullies and victims of bullying, but research in the broader field of peer aggression makes greater use of other informants, especially peers, to identify aggressors and victims. This study compared self, peer, and teacher identification of bullies and bully victims in a sample of 416 middle school students. Overall, there was poor correspondence between self-reports and reports made by peers or teachers, but consistently better agreement between peers and teachers, in identifying both bullies and victims of bullying. Peer and teacher identification of bullies were more consistently associated with subsequent school disciplinary infractions than were self-reports. These results raise concern about reliance on student self-reports of bullying and bully victimization.

8. Cole, J., Cornell, D., & Sheras, P. (2006). Identification of school bullies by survey methods. *Professional School Counseling, 9*, 305-313.

How can middle school counselors identify bullies? This study compared two methods of identifying bullies in a sample of 386 middle school students. A peer nomination survey identified many more bullies than did student self-report. Moreover, self-reported and peer-nominated bullies differed in their types of bullying behaviors, level of general self-concept, attitudes toward aggression, and disciplinary infractions. Overall, this study raises concern about reliance on student self-report and supports the use of peer nomination as a means of identifying school bullies. These findings have implications for school counselors in undertaking efforts to reduce school bullying.

9. Williams, F., & Cornell, D. (2006). Student willingness to seek help for threats of violence. *Journal of School Violence, 5*, 35-49.

This study examined factors that influence a student's willingness to seek help for a threat of violence. The sample consisted of 542 middle school students who completed an anonymous survey that asked students how likely they would be to seek help in response to being bullied or threatened. The survey also included measures of type of bullying, attitudes toward aggressive behavior, and perceptions of teacher tolerance forbullying. Stepwise multiple regression analyses indicated that willingness to seek help is lower in higher grade levels and among males. Students who hold aggressive attitudes and perceive the school climate to be tolerant of bullying were less

likely to report a willingness to seek help. Implications for improving student willingness to seek help are discussed.

10. Ashbaugh, L., & Cornell, D. (2008). Sexual harassment and bullying behaviors in sixth graders. *Journal of School Violence, 7*, 21-38.

Sexual harassment is widely viewed as a form of bullying, but has received little attention in studies of middle school students. A survey of 109 6th grade students found that 29% of students reported at least one sexual harassment experience in the past 30 days, with 11% reporting harassment once per week or more. Although boys and girls reported similar rates of harassment, there were important gender differences—boys were more likely than girls to try to ignore sexual harassment, but girls were more likely to tell someone about their experience and to tell the perpetrator to stop. There was high concordance between sexual harassment and bullying for both boys and girls. These findings indicate the need to recognize the role of sexual harassment in bullying in middle school.

11. Thunfors, P., & Cornell, D. (2008). The popularity of middle school bullies. *Journal of School Violence*, *7*, 65-82.

This study investigated the peer popularity of middle school students involved in bullying. Bullying was assessed by peer report using the School Climate Bullying Survey (SCBS) and popularity was assessed through peer nominations from a student roster. In a sample of 379 middle school students, bullies were among the most popular students in the school, receiving more peer nominations on average (21) than students uninvolved in bullying (13) or victims (4). Comparisons of popular and non-popular bullies found few differences, except that a) popular bullies were less likely to be victimized and b) female bullies had a greater likelihood of being popular than their male counterparts.

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

Researchers examining the effectiveness of schoolwide anti-bullying programs typically use student self-reports to measure reductions in bullying. In contrast, researchers who study peer aggression frequently employ peer nominations. This study compared self-reports of bullying with peer nominations in a sample of 355 middle school students. Self-report demonstrated low to moderate correspondence with peer nominations for bullying others (r = .18) and for victimization (.32). More than twice as many students were categorized as bullies using peer nomination (11%) as compared to self-report (5%). Despite their limited agreement, both self and peer-reported bullying/victimization were associated with school maladjustment. These results raise concern about the reliance on self or peer reports alone to assess the prevalence of middle school bullying.

13. Eliot, M., & Cornell, D. (2009). Bullying in middle school as a function of insecure attachment and aggressive attitudes. *School Psychology International, 30*, 201-214.

This study tested a model for understanding peer bullying as the product of aggressive attitudes and insecure attachment. A sample of 110 sixth grade students completed self-report measures that assessed attitudes toward the use of aggressive behavior with peers and distinguished secure from insecure parental attachment. Bullying behavior was assessed using self and peer-report. Path analyses indicated that aggressive attitudes mediated a relationship between insecure attachment and bullying behavior. These findings have theoretical and applied implications for bullying prevention.

14. Bandyopadhyay, S., Cornell, D., & Konold, T. (2009). Internal and external validity of three school climate scales from the School Climate Bullying Survey. *School Psychology Review, 38*, 338-355.

The School Climate Bullying Survey (SCBS; Cornell & Sheras, 2003) is a self–report survey used to measure attitudes and behaviors associated with school bullying. Two studies were conducted to examine the valid use of its three school climate scales: (1) Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying; (2) Aggressive Attitudes; and (3) Willingness to Seek Help. In Study 1, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were performed with a sample of 2,111 students from four middle schools and established reasonable fit for 20 items with their hypothesized scales. Multi-group confirmatory factor analyses revealed good overall model fit. In Study 2, regression analyses using school-level measures aggregated from 7,318 ninth grade students attending 291 Virginia public high schools indicated that the three scales were related to meaningful criteria for school disorder.

15. Gregory, A., & Cornell, D. (2009). "Tolerating" adolescent needs: Moving beyond zero tolerance policies in high school. *Theory into Practice, 48*, 106-113.

The authors contend that zero tolerance discipline policies are inconsistent with adolescent developmental needs for authoritative, as distinguished from authoritarian, discipline. Previous research has applied the notion of authoritative parenting to teaching styles in classrooms, and a similar model of authoritative discipline can guide schoolwide discipline policies and practices (Gregory & Weinstein, 2004; Walker, 2008; Wentzel, 2002). Schoolwide authoritative discipline combines high levels of both structure and support. The authors conceptualize school structure as adequate supervision of students and consistent and fair enforcement of school rules. They conceptualize school support as the availability of positive adult-student relationships, help for struggling students, and programs to address students' nonacademic needs. With its firm but fair and supportive approach, authoritative discipline can create a safe and secure learning environment conducive to student engagement and achievement.

16. Cornell, D., Sheras, P., Gregory, A., & Fan, X. (2009). A retrospective study of school safety conditions in high schools using the Virginia Threat Assessment Guidelines versus alternative approaches. *School Psychology Quarterly, 24*, 119-129.

Threat assessment has been widely recommended as a violence prevention approach for schools, but there are few empirical studies of its use. This nonexperimental study of 280 Virginia public high schools compared 95 high schools using the Virginia threat assessment guidelines (Cornell & Sheras, 2006), 131 following other (i.e., locally developed) threat assessment procedures, and 54 not using a threat assessment approach. A survey of 9th grade students in each school obtained measures of student victimization, willingness to seek help for bullying and threats of violence, and perceptions of the school climate as caring and supportive. Students in schools using the Virginia threat assessment guidelines reported less bullying, greater willingness to seek help, and more positive perceptions of the school climate than students in either of the other 2 groups of schools. In addition, schools using the Virginia guidelines had fewer long-term suspensions than schools using other threat assessment approaches. These group differences could not be attributed to school size, minority composition or socioeconomic status of the student body, neighborhood violent crime, or the extent of security measures in the schools. Implications for threat assessment practice and research are discussed.

17. Gregory, A., Cornell, D., Fan, X., Sheras, P., & Shih, T. (2010). Authoritative school discipline: High school practices associated with lower student bullying and victimization. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*, 483-496.

This study used several scales from the SCBS as part of a longer school climate survey used in a study of high school safety conditions. The study tested Authoritative Discipline Theory, which posits that two complementary aspects of school climate – structure and support – are important for adolescents' safety in school. Using a statewide sample of over 7,300 ninth grade students and 2,900 teachers randomly selected from 290 high schools, hierarchical linear modeling showed that consistent enforcement of school discipline (structure) and availability of caring adults (support) were associated with school safety. Structure and support were associated with less bullying and victimization after controlling for size of school enrollment and the proportion of ethnic minority and low income students. These findings suggest that discipline practices should not be polarized into a "get tough" versus "give support" debate because both structure and support contribute to school safety for adolescents.

18. Eliot, M., Cornell, D., Gregory, A., Fan, X. (2010). Supportive school climate and student willingness to seek help for bullying and threats of violence. *Journal of School Psychology*, *48*, 533-553.

This study used several scales from the SCBS as part of a longer school climate survey used in a study of high school safety conditions. The study investigated the relations between student perceptions of support and student willingness to seek help for bullying and threats of violence in a sample of 7,318 ninth-grade students from 291 high schools who participated in the Virginia High School Safety Study. Hierarchical linear modeling indicated that students who perceived their teachers and other school staff to be supportive were more likely to endorse positive attitudes toward seeking help for bullying and threats of violence. In schools with more

perceived support, there was less of a discrepancy in help-seeking attitudes between girls and boys. Findings suggest that school staff efforts to provide a supportive climate are a potentially valuable strategy for engaging students in the prevention of bullying and threats of violence.

19. Klein, J., & Cornell, D. (2010). Is the link between large high schools and student victimization an illusion? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102,* 933-946. doi: 10.1037/a0019896

To determine whether larger high schools have more student victimization than smaller schools, this study examined a statewide sample of approximately 7,431 ninth-grade students and 2,353 teachers in 290 Virginia high schools participating in the Virginia High School Safety Study. School size was distinguished from the proportion of students receiving free or reduced-price meals, percentage of minority students, ethnic diversity (heterogeneity), and urbanicity. In larger schools, teachers and students reported that they perceived more bullying and teasing taking place, but student self-reports of being a victim of bullying were not associated with school size. Additionally, school discipline records showed that although the total number of incidents was higher, the rate of bullying offenses was lower in larger schools. Similar results were found for measures of student threats and physical assaults. These findings raise the possibility that the link between larger schools and higher student victimization is an illusion based on perceived frequency rather than rates of victimization.

20. Baly, M., & Cornell, D. (2011). Effects of an educational video on student reports of bullying. *Journal of School Violence, 10,* 221-238. doi:10.1080/15388220.2011.578275

This study of 1,283 middle school students examined the effect of an educational video designed to distinguish bullying from ordinary peer conflict. Randomly assigned classrooms of students either watched or did not watch a video prior to completing a self-report bullying survey. Compared to the control group, students who watched the video reported 32% less social bullying and boys who watched the video reported 54% less physical bullying. These results indicate that student self-reports could yield inflated estimates of the prevalence of bullying if students are not adequately educated about the distinction between bullying and other forms of peer conflict.

21. Cornell, D., & Mehta, S. (2011). Counselor confirmation of middle school student self-reports of bullying victimization. *Professional School Counseling, 14,* 261-270.

School counselors frequently use self-report surveys to assess bullying despite little research on their accuracy. This study raises concern that schools not rely on single self-report items to determine prevalence rates for bully victimization. In this study, counselor follow-up interviews found that only 24 (56%) of 43 middle school students who self-identified as victims of bullying could be confirmed as actual victims. Some students described peer conflicts that did not constitute bullying, mismarked the survey, or reported previous bullying that was outside the 30-day timeframe for the survey. Counselor judgments were supported by peer-nomination data and other survey responses indicative of victimization. These findings underscore the need to educate students about the definition of bullying and to use multiple sources of information in measuring the prevalence of bullying.

22. Gregory, A., Cornell, D., & Fan, X. (2011). The relationship of school structure and support to suspension rates for Black and White high school students. *American Educational Research Journal, 48,* 904-934. doi: 10.3102/0002831211398531

This study examined the relationship between structure and support in the high school climate and suspension rates in a statewide sample of 199 schools. School climate surveys completed by 5,035 ninth grade students measured characteristics of authoritative schools, defined as highly supportive, yet highly structured with academic and behavioral expectations. Multivariate analyses showed that schools low on characteristics of an authoritative school had the highest schoolwide suspension rates for Black and White students after statistically controlling for school demographics. Further, schools low on both structure and support had the largest racial discipline gaps. These findings highlight the characteristics of risky settings that may not meet the developmental needs of adolescents and may contribute to disproportionate disciplinary outcomes for Black students.

23. Cornell, D., Gregory, A., & Fan, X. (2011). Reductions in long-term suspensions following adoption of the Virginia Student Threat Assessment Guidelines. *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, *95,* 175-194.

This quasi-experimental study examined the adoption of the Virginia Student Threat Assessment Guidelines in 23 high schools. After training, school administrators and other staff members demonstrated substantial increases in knowledge of threat assessment principles and decreased commitment to zero tolerance approaches. Schools using the guidelines showed a 52% reduction in long-term suspensions and a 79% reduction in bullying infractions from the pretraining year to the posttraining year, in contrast to a control group of 26 schools not using the guidelines.

24. Lee, T., Cornell, D., Gregory, A., & Fan, X. (2011). High suspension schools and dropout rates for black and white students. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *34*, 167-192.

This study examined the association between school suspension rates and dropout rates in a statewide sample of 289 Virginia public high schools. The contribution of suspension rates on dropout rates was examined for both Black and White students, after controlling for school demographics (school racial composition, percentage of students eligible for Free and Reduced Price Meals, urbanicity), and school resources (per pupil expenditure). Because student attitudes also might influence suspension rates, the prevalence of aggressive attitudes and rejection of school rules among students were used as additional predictors. Hierarchical regression analyses using schools as the unit of analysis found that, after entering both school demographics and student attitude measures, schools with high suspension rates tended to have high dropout rates. There were comparable findings for both White and Black students, although school suspension rates were more strongly associated with White dropout rates than Black dropout rates. These findings contribute new evidence that suspension policies may have an adverse effect on student completion of high school.

25. Cornell, D., Klein, J., Konold, T., & Huang, F. (2012). Effects of validity screening items on adolescent survey data. *Psychological Assessment, 24*, 21-33. doi: 10.1037/a0024824

Two studies examined the use of validity screening items in adolescent survey data. In each study, adolescent respondents were asked whether they were telling the truth and paying attention in answering survey questions. In Study 1 (N = 7,801), the prevalence rates of student risk behaviors were significantly lower after inappropriate ("invalid") responders were screened out of the sample. In addition, confirmatory and multi-group factor analyses demonstrated significant differences between the factor structures of school climate scales using valid versus invalid responders. In Study 2, student perceptions of school climate were correlated with teacher perceptions in 291 schools. A bootstrap resampling procedure compared the correlations obtained using valid versus invalid responding students in each school and found that valid responders had more positive views of school conditions and produced higher correlations with teacher perceptions. These findings support the value of validity screening items to improve the quality of adolescent survey data.

26. Klein, J., Cornell, D., & Konold, T. (2012). Relationships between school climate and student risk behaviors. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *27*, 154-169.

This study examined whether characteristics of a positive school climate were associated with lower student risk behavior in a sample of 3,687 high school students who completed the School Climate Bullying Survey and questions about risk behavior from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance Survey (YRBS). Confirmatory factor analyses established reasonable fit for 20 items with three hypothesized school climate scales measuring (1) prevalence of bullying and teasing; (2) aggressive attitudes; and (3) student willingness to seek help. Structural equation modeling established the relationship of these measures with student reports of risk behavior. Multi-group analyses identified differential effects across gender and race. A positive school climate could be an important protective factor in preventing student risk behavior.

27. Gregory, A., Cornell, D., & Fan, X. (2012). Teacher safety and authoritative school climate in high schools. *American Journal of Education, 118,* 401-425.

Most research on school climate focuses on student well-being, with less attention to the safety of school faculty. The current study examined the relationship between an authoritative school climate (characterized by high levels of student support and disciplinary structure) and both teacher reports of victimization and school records of threats against staff. Regression analyses in a statewide sample of 280 high schools showed that, both structure (as measured by student- and teacher-reported clarity of school rules) and support (as measured by teacher-reported help seeking) were associated with less teacher victimization, after controlling for school and neighborhood demographics. Support, but not structure, was a consistent predictor of school records of threats against faculty. These findings offer implications for improving the workplace for teachers and staff.

28. Phillips, V., & Cornell, D. (2012). Identifying victims of bullying: Use of counselor interviews to confirm peer nominations. *Professional School Counseling, 15,* 123-131.

Schools often rely on anonymous self-report methods to measure bullying victimization, but these methods prevent school personnel from identifying those students who may require support. In contrast, this study employed peer nominations to identify student victims of bullying and used school counselor interviews to confirm the students' victim status. A sample of 1,178 middle school students completed a confidential peer nomination form as part of a standard bullying survey. Students with multiple nominations were interviewed by school counselors to confirm victim status. The proportion of students confirmed as victims increased from 43% for students with two or more nominations to 90% for students with nine or more nominations.

29. Nekvasil, E., & Cornell, D. (2012). Student reports of peer threats of violence: Prevalence and outcomes. *Journal of School Violence, 11*, 357-375.

Authorities in education and law enforcement have recommended that schools use a threat assessment approach to prevent violence, but there is relatively little research on characteristics and outcomes of threats among students. The current study examined student reports of threat experiences in a sample of 3,756 high school students. Approximately 12% of students reported being threatened at school in the past 30 days, but only 23% of threatened students regarded the threat as serious and just 26% reported the threat to school authorities. Only 9% of students who received a threat reported that it was carried out. Five reasons why students did not report threats were identified. Logistic regression analyses identified student and threat characteristics associated with threat reporting and outcome. These findings provide new information about the prevalence and nature of student threats that can inform a threat assessment approach to school violence prevention.

30. Huang, F., & Cornell, D. (2012). Pick your Poisson: A tutorial on analyzing counts of student victimization data. *Journal of School Violence, 11,* 187-206.

School violence research is often concerned with infrequently occurring events such as counts of the number of bullying incidents or fights a student may experience. Analyzing count data using ordinary least squares regression may produce improbable predicted values, and as a result of regression assumption violations, result in higher Type I errors. Count data are optimally analyzed using Poisson-based regression techniques such as Poisson or negative binomial regression. We apply these techniques to an example study of bullying in a statewide sample of 290 high schools and explain how Poisson-based analyses, although less familiar to many researchers, can produce findings that are more accurate and reliable, and are easier to interpret in real-world contexts.

31. Lacey, A., & Cornell, D. (2013). The impact of bullying climate on schoolwide academic performance. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 29*, 262-283.

This study found that the prevalence of bullying and teasing in a high school was predictive of schoolwide performance on state-mandated achievement testing used to meet No Child Left Behind requirements. Measures of the prevalence of bullying and teasing were obtained from a statewide survey of 7,304 ninth grade students and 2,918 teachers randomly selected from 284

Virginia high schools. Hierarchical regression analyses found that the perceived prevalence bullying and teasing was predictive of schoolwide passing rates on Virginia's Standards of Learning (SOL) tests for Algebra I, Earth Science, World History, Biology, and Geometry. These findings could not be attributed to the proportion of minority students in the school, student poverty, school size, or personal victimization, which were statistically controlled. These results support the need for greater attention to the impact of bullying and teasing on high school student performance on high stakes testing.

32. Cornell, D., Gregory, A., Huang, F., & Fan, X. (2013). Perceived prevalence of teasing and bullying predicts high school dropout rates. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *105*, 138-149.

This study of 281 Virginia public high schools found that the prevalence of bullying and teasing perceived by ninth grade students was predictive of dropout rates for this cohort four years later. Negative binomial regression indicated that a one SD increase in a scale measuring perceptions of bullying and teasing was associated with a 21% increase in the number of dropouts, after controlling for the effects of other predictors, including school size, student body poverty and minority composition, and performance on standardized achievement testing. The predictive value of student perceptions of bullying and teasing was comparable in magnitude to the predictive value for other commonly recognized correlates of dropout rates. These results provide new evidence that the prevalence of bullying and teasing in high school is an important factor in high school academic performance.

33. Mehta, S., Cornell, D., Fan, X., & Gregory, A. (2013). Bullying climate and school engagement in ninth grade students. *Journal of School Health, 83,* 45-52.

Background: Many authorities agree that bullying has a widespread impact on school climate, affecting bystanders as well as victims. This study tested the contention that a climate of bullying can have a schoolwide impact on student engagement in school.
Methods: Hierarchical linear modeling assessed the relations between student perception of bullying climate and student engagement at the individual and school level in a statewide sample of 7,058 ninth-graders randomly selected from 289 schools participating in the Virginia High School Safety Study. Student engagement was assessed by self-report scales measuring commitment to school and involvement in school activities.
Results: Individual differences in perception of school climate characterized by bullying were associated with lower commitment to school, but not less involvement in school activities. School level differences in student perceptions of bullying climate were associated with both lower commitment to school and less involvement in school activities, after controlling for the effects of gender, race, school size, proportion of ethnic minority students in the school, and individual level perception of bullying climate.
Conclusion: Efforts to improve student engagement should consider the schoolwide impact of bullying on all students.

34. Lovegrove, P., & Cornell, D. (2013). Patterns of bullying and victimization associated with other problem behaviors among high school students: A conditional latent class approach. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 37*, 5-22. doi: 10.1080/0735648X.2013.832475

Though rates of bullying are commonly found to peak in middle schools, a non-negligible amount of bullying occurs among high schools too. More information regarding patterns of bullying involvement among high school students is needed, however, as well as greater insight into the relationship high school students' bullying involvement has with other problem behaviors. This study used latent class analysis to construct typologies of bullying involvement among over 3500 high school students from Virginia. Covariates of latent class membership were also examined in an effort to better understand the association between bullying involvement and internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors. A latent class model containing four classes was constructed, composed of a non-involved class (65%), a bullies class (12%), a victims class (16%), and a bully-victims class (8%). Externalizing problem behaviors were significantly higher among students in the bullies and bully-victims classes, while internalizing problem behaviors were higher among victims and bully-victims. Implications for the literature and for practitioners are discussed, as well as limitations and future directions.

35. Cornell, D., G., Lovegrove, P. J., & Baly, M. W. (2014). Invalid survey response patterns among middle school students. *Psychological Assessment, 26*, 277-287. doi: 10.1037/a0034808

Student surveys are widely used to assess student risk behavior, bullying, and school climate in middle schools; however, because such surveys are usually conducted on an anonymous basis, little is known about the validity of student reports using external, independent criteria. This longitudinal study examined the response patterns of 382 middle school students who completed confidential (not anonymous) self-report surveys each fall and spring for three years of middle school (grades 6-8). Approximately 10% of students in each wave indicated on validity screening questions that they were either not telling the truth or paying attention (termed "invalid responders"). A repeated measures latent class analysis found that students could be classified into a large group (64%) that were never flagged by the validity questions and a smaller group (36%) that occasionally reported not telling the truth or not paying attention. Hierarchical linear modeling analyses found that invalid responding to validity questions was associated with higher self-reported rates of risk behavior and more negative perceptions of school climate. Based on independent criteria from school records, invalid responding students were more likely to be referred for disciplinary infractions than other students. This study provides new information about student survey validity and appears to be the first to identify characteristics of students who generate invalid response patterns.

36. Baly, M. W., Cornell, D. G., & Lovegrove, P. (2014). A longitudinal investigation of self- and peer reports of bullying victimization across middle school. *Psychology in the Schools, 51*, 217-240. doi: 10.1002/pits.21747

Cross-sectional studies indicate how many students are victims of bullying at a single time, but do not tell us whether the same students continue to be bullied or whether there is a cumulative impact of bullying over time. This study examined the longitudinal stability and the cumulative impact of victimization in a sample of 382 students assessed in the fall and the spring of grades

6, 7, and 8. Victimization assessed by both self- and peer-reports indicated substantial variability in who was bullied, with nearly 51% of students reporting bullying victimization during at least one of the six assessments. The cumulative impact of victimization over three years was demonstrated on grade 8 outcome measures of absences, disciplinary infractions, suspensions, grade point averages (GPA), standardized test scores, reports of youth risk behavior, and perceptions of school climate. This study provides new information about the cumulative impact of peer- and self-reported bullying across middle school.

37. Lacey, A., & Cornell, D. (2014). School administrator assessments of bullying and state-mandated testing. *Journal of School Violence, 15,* 189-212. doi: 10.1080/15388220.2014.971362

This study examined the hypothesis that school administrator assessments of the prevalence of teasing and bullying (PTB) in high school are negatively associated with schoolwide performance on state-mandated testing, and that the use of evidence-based bullying prevention efforts are positively associated with test performance. School administrators from 301 high schools in the United States were surveyed on the prevalence of bullying and teasing as well as the types of bullying prevention efforts currently used in their schools. School administrator assessments of both PTB and evidence-based efforts to prevent bullying were consistently associated with the proportion of students that passed state-mandated achievement testing across 11 subject areas. School administrator assessments of schoolwide teasing and bullying, as well as their efforts to reduce it, are consistently associated with student achievement.

38. Konold, T., Cornell, D., Huang, F., Meyer, P., Lacey, A., Nekvasil, E., Heilbrun, A., & Shukla, K. (2014). Multi-level multi-informant structure of the Authoritative School Climate Survey. *School Psychology Quarterly, 29,* 238-255. doi: 10.1037/spq0000062

The Authoritative School Climate Survey was designed to provide schools with a brief assessment of two key characteristics of school climate—disciplinary structure and student support—that are hypothesized to influence two important school climate outcomes—student engagement and prevalence of teasing and bullying in school. The factor structure of these four constructs was examined with exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses in a statewide sample of 39,364 students (grades 7 and 8) attending 423 schools. Notably, the analyses used a multi-level structural approach to model the nesting of students in schools for purposes of evaluating factor structure, demonstrating convergent and concurrent validity, and gauging the structural invariance of concurrent validity coefficients across gender. These findings provide schools with a core group of school climate measures guided by authoritative discipline theory.

39. Huang, F., Cornell, D., & Konold, T. (2014). Aggressive attitudes in middle schools: A factor structure and criterion-related validity study. *Assessment, 22,* 497-512. doi: 1073191114551016

Student attitudes toward aggression have been linked to individual aggressive behavior, but the relationship between school-wide normative beliefs about aggression and aggressive behavior poses some important measurement challenges that have not been adequately examined. The current study investigated the factor structure, measurement invariance, and criterion-related validity of a six-item Aggressive Attitudes scale using a large sample of seventh- and eighth-

grade students (*n* = 39,364) from 423 schools. Analytic procedures accounted for the frequently ignored modeling problems of clustered and ordinal data to provide more reliable and accurate model estimates and standard errors. The resulting second-order factor structure of the Aggressive Attitudes scale demonstrated measurement invariance across gender, grade, and race/ethnicity groups. Criterion-related validity was supported with eight student- and school-level indices of aggressive behavior.

40. Huang, F., Cornell, D., Konold, T., Meyer, P., Lacey, A., Nekvasil, E., Heilbrun, A., & Shukla, K. (2014). Multilevel factor structure and concurrent validity of the teacher version of the Authoritative School Climate Survey, *85*, 843-859.

School climate is well-recognized as an important influence on student behavior and adjustment to school, but there is a need for theory-guided measures that make use of teacher perspectives. Authoritative school climate theory hypothesizes that a positive school climate is characterized by high levels of disciplinary structure and student support. A teacher version of the Authoritative School Climate Survey was administered to a statewide sample of 9,099 7th and 8thgrade teachers from 366 schools. The study used exploratory and multilevel confirmatory factor analyses (MCFA) that accounted for the nested data structure and allowed for the modeling of the factor structures at two levels. MCFA conducted on both an exploratory (n = 4,422) and a confirmatory sample (n = 4,677) showed good support for all of the factor structures investigated. An overall model that considered all factor correlations at two levels simultaneously found that schools with greater levels of disciplinary structure and student support had higher student engagement, less teasing and bullying, and lower student aggression toward teachers. The teacher version of the Authoritative School Climate Survey can be used to assess two key domains of school climate and associated measures of student engagement and aggression toward peers and teachers.

41. Konold, T., & Cornell, D. (2015). Multilevel, multitrait - multimethod latent analysis of structurally different and interchangeable raters of school climate. *Psychological Assessment, 27*, 1097-1109. doi: 10.1037/pas0000098

Informant-based systems of assessment are common platforms for measuring a variety of educational and psychological constructs where the use of multiple informants is considered best practice. In many instances, structurally different informant types (e.g., students and teachers) are solicited on the basis of their unique roles with the target of measurement. The use of multiple informants provides an opportunity to evaluate the degree to which the obtained ratings are influenced by the trait of focus and extraneous sources that can be attributed to the rater. Data from a multilevel multitrait-multimethod design in which students (*N* = 35,565) and teachers (*N* = 9,112), residing within 340 middle schools, responded to items measuring three dimensions of school climate were evaluated through a multilevel correlated trait – correlated method latent variable model. Results indicated that ratings of school climate obtained by students and teachers demonstrated high levels of convergent validity, and that school-level ratings obtained by students and teachers were equitable in the assessment of teasing and bullying. Student ratings of support and structure yielded somewhat stronger evidence of convergent validity than ratings obtained by teachers as revealed by their respective trait factor

loadings. This was explained in part by the higher levels of common method effects that were observed for teachers.

42. Huang, F., & Cornell, D. (2015). Using multilevel factor analysis with clustered data: Investigating the factor structure of the Positive Values Scale. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 34,* 3-14. doi: 10.1177/0734282915570278

Advances in multilevel modeling techniques now make it possible to investigate the psychometric properties of instruments using clustered data. Factor models that overlook the clustering effect can lead to underestimated standard errors, incorrect parameter estimates, and model fit indices. In addition, factor structures may differ depending on the level of analysis. The current study illustrates the application of multilevel factor analytic techniques using a large statewide sample of middle school students (n = 39,364) from 423 schools. Both multilevel exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were used to investigate the factor structure of the Positive Values Scale (PVS) as part of a school climate survey. Results showed that for the PVS, a two-correlated factor model at level one and a one-factor model at level two best fit the data. Implications and guidance for applied researchers are discussed.

43. Cornell, D., Shukla, K., & Konold, T. (2015). Peer victimization and authoritative school climate: A multilevel multivariate approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 107,* 1186-1201. doi:10.1037/edu0000038

School climate is widely recognized as an important influence on peer victimization in schools. Based on authoritative school climate theory, this study evaluated the influence of two school climate survey measures, structure and support, on three measures of peer victimization. Multilevel multivariate modeling in a statewide sample of 39,364 7th and 8th grade students attending 423 schools revealed meaningful associations at both the student and school levels of analysis. Higher structure was associated with lower levels of prevalence of teasing and bullying (PTB), bullying victimization, and general victimization. Higher support was associated with lower PTB and general victimization. Overall, these findings add new evidence to the theory that an authoritative school climate is conducive to lower peer victimization.

44. Cornell, D., & Huang, F. (2015). School counselor use of peer nominations to identify victims of bullying. *Professional School Counseling, 18,* 191-205.

Peer nominations have been recommended as a way to identify victims of bullying, but there are objections that students might not be comfortable with the process and the results might not be accurate. A sample of 7,889 students in grades 3-12 attending 29 schools completed a peer nomination survey with classrooms randomly assigned to complete the survey online or on paper forms. There were few differences between the two administration conditions, with the overwhelming majority of students reporting they understood the purpose of the survey (93%) and the definition of bullying (95%), felt comfortable completing the survey (91%), and trusted that the survey would help victims of bullying (77%). The 492 students who received 3 or more nominations were interviewed by school counselors to confirm their bullying status. The proportion of students confirmed as victims of bullying or some other form of peer conflict increased with the number of nominations. Follow-up interviewers after one month found that

bullying stopped for 70% of the identified victims. Although further study is needed, these results support the use of peer nominations to identify victims of bullying.

45. Konold, T., & Cornell, D. (2015). Measurement and structural relations of an Authoritative School Climate model: A multi-level latent variable investigation. *Journal of School Psychology, 53,* 447-461. http:/dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2015.09.001

This study tested a conceptual model of school climate in which two key elements of an authoritative school, structure and support variables, are associated with student engagement in school and lower levels of peer aggression. Multilevel multivariate structural modeling was conducted in a statewide sample of 48,027 students in 323 public high schools who completed the Authoritative School Climate Survey. As hypothesized, two measures of structure (Disciplinary Structure and Academic Expectations) and two measures of support (Respect for Students and Willingness to Seek Help) were associated with higher student engagement (Affective Engagement and Cognitive Engagement) and lower peer aggression (Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying) on both student and school levels of analysis, controlling for the effects of school demographics (school size, percentage of minority students, and percentage of low income students). These results support the extension of authoritative school climate model to high school and guide further research on the conditions for a positive school climate.

46. Millspaugh, S. B., Cornell, D. G., Huang, F. L., & Datta, P. (2015). Prevalence of aggressive attitudes and willingness to report threats in middle school. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management, 2,* 11-22. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tam0000031

Violence prevention strategies such as threat assessment rely on information from students; however, students are often unwilling to report threats of violence to school authorities. The current study investigated the hypothesis that middle school students are less likely to report threats of violence when they perceive aggressive behavior as a source of status and popularity among their peers. Our statewide sample consisted of 39,364 7^{th} and 8^{th} graders who completed school climate surveys in 423 schools. Students completed a measure of aggressive attitudes and were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with two statements concerning threats of violence: (1) "If another student brought a gun to school, I would tell one of the teachers or staff at school" (2) "If another student talked about killing someone, I would tell one of the teachers or staff at school." Multilevel logistic regression analyses, which controlled for student and school demographics, found that higher levels of aggressive attitudes at both the school and student level were associated with a lower likelihood of reporting threat behavior.

47. Lacey, A., Cornell, D., & Konold, T. (2015). The relations between teasing and bullying and middle school standardized exam performance. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 37,* 192-221. doi: 10.1177/0272431615596428

This study examined the relations between the schoolwide prevalence of teasing and bullying and schoolwide academic performance in a sample of 271 Virginia middle schools. In addition, the study examined the mediating effects of student engagement. A three-step sequence of path models investigated associations between schoolwide prevalence of teasing and bullying and state-mandated Standards of Learning test pass rates, with effects examined both directly and

indirectly through student engagement while controlling for important school-level characteristics. Separate models were examined for two 7th grade and four 8th grade tests. Results indicated that higher levels of both teacher and student perceptions of schoolwide teasing and bullying were significantly associated with lower achievement pass rates and student engagement. The relationship between perceptions of schoolwide teasing and bullying and achievement was partially mediated by student engagement. These findings bring new support for the need for schoolwide interventions to reduce teasing and bullying among middle schools students.

48. Jia, Y., Konold, T., & Cornell, D. (2015). Authoritative school climate and high school dropout rates. *School Psychology Quarterly, 31,* 289-303. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spq0000139

This study tested the association between school-wide measures of an authoritative school climate and high school dropout rates in a statewide sample of 315 high schools. Regression models at the school level of analysis used teacher and student measures of disciplinary structure, student support, and academic expectations to predict overall high school dropout rates. Analyses controlled for school demographics of school enrollment size, percentage of low-income students, percentage of minority students, and urbanicity. Consistent with authoritative school climate theory, moderation analyses found that when students perceive their teachers as supportive, high academic expectations are associated with lower dropout rates.

49. Huang, F., & Cornell, D. (2015). Multilevel factor structure, concurrent validity, and test-retest reliability of the high school teacher version of the Authoritative School Climate Survey. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 34,* 536-549. doi: 10.1177/0734282915621439

Although school climate has long been recognized as an important factor in the school improvement process, there are few psychometrically-supported measures based on teacher perspectives. The current study replicated and extended the factor structure, concurrent validity, and test-retest reliability of the teacher version of the Authoritative School Climate Survey (ASCS) using a statewide sample of high school teachers. Multilevel confirmatory factor analyses based on surveys completed by 12,808 high school teachers from 302 schools found that factors of disciplinary structure and student support were associated with the prevalence of student teasing and bullying and student engagement. These findings provide empirical support for the use of the teacher-version of the ASCS in high schools.

50. Huang, F., & Cornell, D. (2015). Question order affects the measurement of bullying victimization. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 76,* 724-740. doi: 10.1177/0013164415622664

Bullying among youth is recognized as a serious student problem, especially in middle school. The most common approach to measuring bullying is through student self-report surveys that ask questions about different types of bullying victimization. Although prior studies have shown that question-order (QO) effects may influence participant responses, no study has examined these effects with middle school students. A randomized experiment (n = 5,951 middle school students) testing the QO effect found that changing the sequence of questions can result in 45%

higher prevalence rates. These findings raise questions about the accuracy of several widely used bullying surveys.

51. Huang, F. & Cornell, D. (2015). The impact of definition and question order on the prevalence of bullying victimization using student self-reports. *Psychological Assessment*, *27*, 1484-1493. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pas0000149

Accurate measurement is essential to determining the prevalence of bullying and evaluating the effectiveness of intervention efforts. The most common measurement approach is through anonymous self-report surveys, but previous studies have suggested that students do not adhere to standard definitions of bullying and may be influenced by the order of questions about types of victimization. In the current study, we have presented findings from 2 randomized experiments designed to determine (a) the impact of using or not using a definition of bullying and (b) asking about general versus specific types of bullying victimization and how the order of these questions affects victimization-prevalence rates. The study was conducted using a sample of 17,301 students attending 119 high schools. Findings indicate that the use of a definition had no impact on prevalence rates, but asking specific bullying-victimization questions (e.g., "I have been verbally bullied at school") prior to general bullying-victimization questions (e.g., "I have been bullied at school"), resulted in a 29-76% increase in victimization-prevalence rates. Results suggest that surveys that ask general-to-specific bullying-victimization questions, such as those found in national and international surveys, may be underreporting bullying victimization.

52. Heilbrun, A., Cornell, D., & Lovegrove, P. (2015). Principal attitudes and racial disparities in school suspensions. *Psychology in the Schools, 52*, 489-499. doi: 10.1002/pits.21838

Zero tolerance school discipline practices have been associated with a national increase in suspensions, a practice that has had a disproportionate negative impact on Black students. The present study investigated an association between principal attitudes toward zero tolerance and suspension rates for White and Black students in 306 Virginia high schools. Black suspension rates were more than double White suspension rates. Regression analyses controlling for student poverty and school enrollment showed that principal endorsement of zero tolerance was moderately associated with suspension rates for both White and Black students, but was not associated with the size of the racial disparity. Paired-samples *t* tests showed statistically significant differences in the types of offenses that resulted in suspensions, with Black students significantly more likely to be suspended for disruptive offenses and White students more likely to be suspended for alcohol- and drug-related offenses.

53. Nekvasil, E., & Cornell, D. (2015). Student threat assessment associated with positive school climate in middle schools. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management, 2*, 98-113. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tam0000038

Authorities in law enforcement and education have recommended the use of threat assessment to prevent violence, but few studies have examined its usefulness in middle schools. This retrospective, quasi-experimental study compared middle schools that use the Virginia Student Threat Assessment Guidelines (Cornell & Sheras, 2006; *N* = 166) with schools that either do not use threat assessment (*N* = 119) or use an alternative model of threat assessment (school- or district-developed; *N* = 47). Based on school records, schools using the Virginia Guidelines

reported lower short-term suspension rates than both groups of schools. According to a statewide school climate survey, schools using the Virginia Guidelines also had fairer discipline and lower levels of student aggressive behaviors, as reported by students. Finally, teachers reported feeling safer in schools using the Virginia Guidelines, as opposed to both groups of schools. Additional analyses of school records found that the number of years a school used the Virginia Guidelines was associated with lower long-term suspension rates, student reports of fairer discipline, and lower levels of student aggressive behaviors. All analyses controlled for school size, minority composition, and socioeconomic status of the student body. These findings suggest that use of a threat assessment approach to violence prevention is associated with lower levels of student aggression and a more positive school climate.

54. Berg, J., & Cornell, D. (2016). Middle school aggression toward teachers, authoritative school climate, and teacher distress. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *31*, 122-139. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spq0000132

Aggression toward teachers is linked to burnout and disengagement from teaching, but a positive school climate may reduce aggression and associated teacher distress. Using authoritative school climate theory, the study examined whether schools with high disciplinary structure and student support were associated with less aggression and less distress. The sample of 9,134 teachers in 389 middle schools came from the Virginia Secondary School Climate Survey, a statewide survey administered to all public schools with 7th and 8th grade enrollment. The majority of teachers (75%) were female. More than half (53%) reported that they had more than 10 years of teaching experience; 23% reported 6 to 10 years; 24% reported 1 to 5 years. Students reported on the degree to which their schools were structured and supportive. Teachers reported on their experiences of aggression by students, their level of distress, and their feelings of safety. Staff-related infractions computed from Department of Education records were also used. Multilevel modeling revealed that teachers in authoritative schools experienced less aggression and felt safer and less distressed. Lower aggression by students mediated the association between more authoritative schools and lower distress such that more structured and supportive schools had greater teacher safety and, in turn, less distress. The findings support the idea that more structured and supportive schools relate to greater safety for teachers and, in turn, less distress. Research limitations and implications for practice are discussed.

55. Shukla, K., Konold, T., & Cornell, D. (2016). Profiles of student perceptions of school climate: Relations with risk behaviors and academic outcomes. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *57*, 291-307. doi: 10.1002/ajcp.12044

School climate has been linked to a variety of positive student outcomes, but there may be important within-school differences among students in their experiences of school climate. This study examined within-school heterogeneity among 47,631 high school student ratings of their school climate through multilevel latent class modeling. Student profiles across 323 schools were generated on the basis of multiple indicators of school climate: disciplinary structure, academic expectations, student willingness to seek help, respect for students, affective and cognitive engagement, prevalence of teasing and bullying, general victimization, bullying victimization, and bullying perpetration. Analyses identified four meaningfully different student profile types that were labeled positive climate, medium climate-low bullying, medium climate-high bullying, and negative climate. Contrasts among these profile types on external criteria revealed

meaningful differences for race, grade level, parent education level, educational aspirations, and frequency of risk behaviors.

56. Cornell, D., Shukla, K., & Konold, T. (2016). Authoritative school climate and student academic engagement, grades, and aspirations in middle and high schools. *AERA Open, 2*, 1-18, doi: 10.1177/2332858416633184.

This study tested the theory that an authoritative school climate characterized by disciplinary structure and student support is conducive to positive academic outcomes for students in grades 7-12. Multilevel multivariate modeling at student and school levels was conducted using school surveys completed by statewide samples of 39,364 grade 7-8 students in 423 middle schools and 48,027 grade 9-12 students in 323 high schools. The same pattern of findings was found in both samples, controlling for student and school demographics. Consistent with authoritative school climate theory, both higher disciplinary structure and student support were associated with higher student engagement in school, higher course grades, and higher educational aspirations at the student level in both samples. At the school level, higher disciplinary structure was associated with higher engagement, and higher student support was associated with higher engagement and grades in both samples. Overall, these findings add new evidence that an authoritative school climate is conducive to student academic success in middle and high schools.

57. Berg, J., & Cornell, D. (2016). Authoritative school climate, aggression toward teachers, and teacher distress in middle school. *School Psychology Quarterly, 31,* 122-139. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spq0000132

Aggression toward teachers is linked to burnout and disengagement from teaching, but a positive school climate can reduce aggression and associated teacher distress. This study describes the prevalence of aggression toward teachers by students, parents, and colleagues in a statewide sample of 9,134 teachers in 389 middle schools. Using authoritative school climate theory, the study examined whether schools with high structure and support were associated with less aggression and less distress. Multilevel modeling revealed that teachers in authoritative schools experienced less aggression and felt safer and less distressed. Lower aggression by students mediated the association between more authoritative schools and lower distress such that more structured and supportive schools had greater teacher safety and, in turn, less distress.

58. Cornell, D., & Huang, F. (2016). Authoritative school climate and high school student risk behavior. A cross-sectional multi-level analysis of student self-reports. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 45,* 2246-2259. doi: 10.1007/s10964-016-0424-3

This study tested the hypothesis that an authoritative school climate characterized by strict but fair discipline and supportive teacher-student relationships is conducive to lower risk behavior for high school students. Multilevel regression at student and school levels was conducted using school surveys completed by a statewide sample of 48,027 grade 9-12 students in 323 high schools. Schools with an authoritative school climate had lower levels of student-reported alcohol and marijuana use; bullying, fighting, and weapon carrying at school; interest in gang membership; and suicidal thoughts and behavior. These results controlled for demographic

variables of student gender, race, grade, and parent education level as well as school size, percentage of minority students, and percentage of low income students. Overall, these findings add new evidence that an authoritative school climate is associated with positive student outcomes.

59. Malone, M., Cornell, D., & Shukla, K. (2016). Association of grade configuration with school climate for 7th and 8th grade students. *School Psychology Quarterly*. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spq0000174

Educational authorities have questioned whether middle schools provide the best school climate for 7th and 8th grade students, and proposed that other grade configurations such as K–8th grade schools may provide a better learning environment. The purpose of this study was to compare 7th and 8th grade students' perceptions of 4 key features of school climate (disciplinary structure, student support, student engagement, and prevalence of teasing and bullying) in middle schools versus elementary or high schools. Multilevel multivariate modeling in a statewide sample of 39,036 7th and 8th grade students attending 418 schools revealed that students attending middle schools had a more negative perception of school climate than students in schools with other grade configurations. Seventh grade students placed in middle schools reported lower disciplinary structure and a higher prevalence of teasing and bullying in comparison to those in elementary schools. Eighth grade students in middle schools reported poorer disciplinary structure, lower student engagement, and a higher prevalence of teasing and bullying compared to those in high schools. These findings can guide school psychologists in identifying aspects of school climate that may be troublesome for 7th and 8th grade students in schools with different grade configurations.

60. Jia Y., Konold R. T., Cornell D., & Huang F. (2016) The impact of validity screening on associations between self-Reports of bullying victimization and student outcomes. *Educational and Psychological Measurement.* Advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/0013164416671767

Self-report surveys are widely used to measure adolescent risk behavior and academic adjustment, with results having an impact on national policy, assessment of school quality, and evaluation of school interventions. However, data obtained from self-reports can be distorted when adolescents intentionally provide inaccurate or careless responses. The current study illustrates the problem of invalid respondents in a sample (N = 52,012) from 323 high schools that responded to a statewide assessment of school climate. Two approaches for identifying invalid respondents were applied, and contrasts between the valid and invalid responses revealed differences in means, prevalence rates of student adjustment, and associations among reports of bullying victimization and student adjustment outcomes. The results lend additional support for the need to screen for invalid responders in adolescent samples.

61. Datta, P., Cornell, D., & Huang, F. (2016). Aggressive attitudes and prevalence of bullying bystander behaviors in middle schools. *Psychology in the Schools, 53,* 804-816. doi: 10.1002/pits.21944

Separate lines of research find that proaggressive attitudes promote peer aggression and that bystanders play a pivotal role in deterring or facilitating bullying behavior. The current study

hypothesized that proaggressive attitudes in middle school would deter students from standing up to bullying and encourage them to reinforce bullying behavior. Middle school students (n = 28,765) in 423 schools completed a statewide school climate survey that included an aggressive attitudes scale and their bystander response to a recent episode of bullying, which was categorized as upstanding, reinforcing, or passive. Multilevel logistic regressions indicated that higher aggressive attitudes were associated with less upstanding behavior at the school level and less upstanding behavior and more reinforcing behavior at the individual level, while controlling for other school and student demographic variables. These findings suggest that antibullying programs might address student attitudes toward aggression as a means of boosting positive bystander intervention.

62. Konold, T.R., & Shukla, K. (2016). Estimating school climate traits across multiple informants: An illustration of a multi-trait multi-method validation through latent variable modeling. *Educational Assessment, 22,* 54-69. doi: 10.1080/10627197.2016.1271705

The use of multiple informants is common in assessments that rely on the judgments of others. However, ratings obtained from different informants often vary as a function of their perspectives and roles in relation to the target of measurement, and causes unrelated to the trait being measured. We illustrate the usefulness of a latent variable multilevel MTMM measurement model for extracting trait factors from reports of school climate obtained by students (N = 45,641) and teachers (N = 12,808) residing within 302 high schools. We then extend this framework to include assessments of linkages between the resulting trait factors and potential outcomes that might be used for addressing questions of substantive interest or providing evidence of concurrent validity. The approach is illustrated with data obtained from student and teacher reports of two dimensions of school climate, student engagement, and the prevalence of teasing and bullying in their schools.

63. Huang, F., Eklund, K., & Cornell, D. (2017). Authoritative school climate, number of parents at home, and academic achievement. *School Psychology Quarterly. 32, 480-496.* *http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spq0000182*

School climate is widely recognized as an important factor in promoting student academic achievement. The current study investigated the hypothesis that a demanding and supportive school climate, based on authoritative school climate theory, would serve as a protective factor for students living with one or no parents at home. Using a statewide sample of 56,508 middle school students from 415 public schools in one state, results indicated that student perceptions of disciplinary structure, academic demandingness, and student support all had positive associations with student self-reported grade point average (GPA). In addition, findings showed that academic expectations and student support were more highly associated with GPA for students not living with any parent. Implications for policy and practice are discussed.

64. Huang, F. & Cornell D. (2017). Student attitudes and behaviors as explanations for the Black-White suspension gap. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *73,* 298-308.

Purpose: Although studies have documented that Black students receive out-of-school suspensions (OSS) at much higher rates than White students, few studies have investigated possible explanations for this disparity. The differential involvement hypothesis suggests that disproportionate sanctioning may be a function of racial differences in student misbehavior or characteristics that predispose them to misbehavior. Method: Suspension data, risk behaviors, and aggressive attitudes from self-report surveys were collected from a statewide sample of 38,398 students attending 236 racially-diverse high schools. A series of school fixed-effect logistic and linear regression models were used to test behavioral and attitudinal forms of the differential involvement hypothesis. Results: Racial differences in self-reported suspension could not be explained by different behavioral reasons for suspension (such as fighting, threatening others, and substance possession), by involvement in high risk behaviors of fighting, bullying, carrying a weapon, consuming alcohol, or using marijuana, or by aggressive attitudes that lead to hostile behavior. Conclusions: Overall, these findings do not support the differential involvement hypothesis and although they do not establish the presence of bias, they strengthen concern that racial disparities are likely the result of differential decisions by school authorities.

65. Konold, T., Cornell, D., Shukla, K., & Huang, F. (2017). Racial/ethnic differences in perceptions of school climate and its association with student engagement and peer aggression. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *46*(6), 1289-1303. doi: 10.1007/s10964-016-0576-1

Research indicates that a positive school climate is associated with higher levels of student engagement and lower rates of peer aggression. However, less attention has been given to whether such findings are consistent across racial/ethnic groups. The current study examined whether Black, Hispanic, and White high school students differed in their perceptions of school climate, student engagement, and peer aggression as measured by the Authoritative School Climate survey. In addition, the study tested whether the associations between school climate and both student engagement and peer aggression varied as a function of racial/ethnic group. The sample consisted of 48,027 students in grades 9–12 (51.4% female; 17.9% Black, 10.5% Hispanic, 56.7% White, and 14.9% other) attending 323 high schools. Regression models that contrasted racial/ethnic groups controlled for the nesting of students within schools and used student covariates of parent education, student gender, and percentage of schoolmates sharing the same race/ethnicity, as well as school covariates of school size and school percentage of students eligible for free- or reduced-price meals. Perceptions of school climate differed between Black and White groups, but not between Hispanic and White groups. However, race/ethnicity did not moderate the associations between school climate and either engagement or peer aggression. Although correlational and cross-sectional in nature, these results are consistent with the conclusion that a positive school climate holds similar benefits of promoting student engagement and reducing victimization experiences across Black, Hispanic, and White groups.

66. Shukla, K., & Konold, T. (2017). A two-step latent profile method for identifying invalid respondents in self-reported survey data. *Journal of Experimental Education*. Advance online publication: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2017.1315713.

Insincere respondents can have an adverse impact on the validity of substantive inferences arising from self-administered questionnaires (SAQs). The current study introduces a new method for identifying potentially invalid respondents with response patterns that are typically associated with a lack of cognitive engagement. The two-step procedure involves generating a response inconsistency (RI) score for each participant and scale on the SAQ, and subjecting the resulting scores to latent profile analysis to identify latent classes of respondents with atypical RI profiles. In contrast to other popular approaches for identifying invalid respondents, the proposed procedure can be applied post-data collection without built in validity items or other design features (e.g., recording of response time). The procedure is illustrated through a survey of school climate that was administered to N = 52,102 high school students. Results of this screening procedure revealed high levels of specificity and expected levels of sensitivity when contrasted with results that would be obtained through the use of screening items or response time. Contrasts between valid and invalid respondents revealed similar patterns of differences across the three screening procedures when compared across external measures of academics and risk behaviors. The proposed procedure is advocated as a supplement to other available forms of screening for invalid respondents.

67. Datta, P., Cornell, D., & Huang, F. (2017). The toxicity of bullying by teachers and other school staff. *School Psychology Review, 46,* 335-348.

Although the toxic effects of peer bullying among middle school students are widely recognized, bullying by teachers and other school staff has received little attention. This study compared the prevalence and school adjustment of students bullied by teachers/staff, students bullied by peers, and students who were not bullied. The sample consisted of 56,508 students in Grades 7 and 8 who completed a statewide school climate survey. Students were classified into four groups: (a) not bullied (87.2%); (b) bullied only by peers (9.3%); (c) bullied only by teachers/staff (1.2%); and (d) bullied by peers and teachers/staff (1.5%). In comparison to students who reported no bullying, students bullied by teachers and other school staff were significantly more likely to report lower school engagement and self-reported grades and more negative perceptions of school climate. Students bullied only by peers reported more distress symptoms than those bullied by teachers and other school staff. These findings call for more attention to the problem of teacher and other school staff bullying.

68. Konold, T.R. (2018). A multilevel MTMM approach to estimating the influences of contextual factors on trait and informant based method effects in assessments of school climate. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment 36,* 464-476. doi: 0734282916683286
School level contextual factors have been found to influence reports of school climate. The purpose of the current study was to evaluate the extent to which these associations are related to the school climate traits being measured or the methods (i.e., informants) used to obtain them. Data from a multilevel MTMM design in which structurally different and interchangeable students (N = 45,641) and teachers (N = 12,808), residing within 302 high schools, responded to items measuring four dimensions of school climate were evaluated through a multilevel CT - CM latent analysis that allowed for the estimation of both school level trait and informant based method factors. The resulting trait and method factors were regressed on several school level contextual variables. Results indicated that the percent of students receiving FRPM in schools was associated with both school climate traits and informant based method factors, school size

and the percentage of minority students in schools were associated with some traits, and school size was associated with student method effects. Findings support the use of controlling for school level contextual factors in school climate research.

69. Heilbrun, A., Cornell, D., & Konold, T. (2018). Authoritative school climate and suspension rates in middle schools: Implications for reducing the racial disparity in school discipline. *Journal of School Violence, 17*, 324-338.

The over-use of school suspensions has been linked to a host of negative outcomes, including racial disparities in discipline. School climate initiatives have shown promise in reducing these disparities. The present study used the Authoritative School Climate Survey—which measures disciplinary structure and student support as key measures of school climate—to investigate an association between teacher and student perceptions of school climate and suspension rates in a statewide sample of middle schools. Regression analyses controlling for school-level poverty and school size found that elements of authoritative climate, particularly structure, distinguish high-and-low suspending schools. Schools with high levels of student-and teacher-reported structure had lower overall suspension rates and a lower gap between Black and White suspension rates. These findings can be used to guide school climate initiatives to reduce racial disparities in school discipline.

70. Huang, F. L., & Cornell, D. (2018). The relationship of school climate with out-of-school suspensions. *Children and Youth Services Review, 94*, 378-389.

The use of out-of-school suspensions, particularly for Black students, is recognized as a serious concern given the many negative consequences associated with being removed from school. This study tested the hypothesis that an authoritative school climate (ASC), characterized by strict but fair discipline and supportive teacher-student relationships, was associated with a lower likelihood of suspensions. Logistic regression models were used to analyze cross-sectional, student-report survey data from a statewide sample of 75,081 6th, 7th, and 8th grade students from 310 middle schools. Results indicated that, after controlling for student and school characteristics, higher ASC was associated with a lower likelihood of receiving a suspension. The beneficial association of an ASC did not vary differentially by student race/ethnicity.

71. Jia, Y., Konold, T. R., Cornell, D., & Huang, F. (2018). The impact of validity screening on associations between self-reports of bullying victimization and student outcomes. *Educational and psychological measurement, 78*, 80-102.

Self-report surveys are widely used to measure adolescent risk behavior and academic adjustment, with results having an impact on national policy, assessment of school quality, and evaluation of school interventions. However, data obtained from self-reports can be distorted when adolescents intentionally provide inaccurate or careless responses. The current study illustrates the problem of invalid respondents in a sample (N = 52,012) from 323 high schools that responded to a statewide assessment of school climate. Two approaches for identifying invalid respondents were applied, and contrasts between the valid and invalid responses revealed differences in means, prevalence rates of student adjustment, and associations among reports of

bullying victimization and student adjustment outcomes. The results lend additional support for the need to screen for invalid responders in adolescent samples.

72. Crowley, B. Z., Datta, P., Stohlman, S., Cornell, D., & Konold, T. (2018). Authoritative school climate and sexual harassment: A cross-sectional multilevel analysis of student self-reports. *School Psychology Quarterly 34*, 469-478. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spq0000303

School sexual harassment (SH) is defined as unwelcome behavior of a sexual nature that interferes with a student's ability to learn. There is an important need for schools to assess the prevalence of SH and its relation to school climate to guide intervention efforts. This study investigated 3 research questions: (a) Is there psychometric support for a 4-item multilevel measure of SH? (b) What is the prevalence of SH in a statewide high school sample, and how does SH vary across gender, grade level, race–ethnicity, and socioeconomic status? (c) Is an authoritative school climate—characterized by strict but fair discipline and supportive teacher–student relationships—associated with lower levels of SH for students? A statewide sample of high school students (N = 62,679) completed a school climate survey that included a new 4-item measure of SH. Results of a multilevel confirmatory factor analysis indicated good fit for a single SH factor at both student and school levels. A multiway analysis of variance demonstrated the high prevalence of SH and variations across demographic groups. Multilevel hierarchical regression analyses indicated that an authoritative school climate accounted for 5.7% of the student-level variance and 38.3% of the school-level variance in SH scores. Routine assessment of SH can help school psychologists bring attention to this underrecognized problem.

73. Shukla, K., & Konold, T. (2018). A two-step latent profile method for identifying invalid respondents in self-reported survey data. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *86*, 473-488.

Insincere respondents can have an adverse impact on the validity of substantive inferences arising from self-administered questionnaires (SAQs). The current study introduces a new method for identifying potentially invalid respondents from their atypical response patterns. The two-step procedure involves generating a response inconsistency (RI) score for each participant and scale on the SAQ and subjecting the resulting scores to latent profile analysis to identify classes of atypical RI respondent profiles. The procedure can be implemented post–data collection and is illustrated through a survey of school climate that was administered to N = 52,102 high school students. Results of this screening procedure revealed high levels of specificity and expected levels of concordance when contrasted with the results of traditionally used methods of screening items and response time. Contrasts between valid and invalid respondents revealed similar patterns across the three screening procedures when compared across external measures of academics and risk behaviors.

74. Konold, T., Cornell, D., Jia, Y., & Malone, M. (2018). School climate, student engagement, and academic achievement: A latent variable, multilevel multi-informant examination. *AERA Open*, *4*, 2332858418815661.

This study tested the authoritative school climate theory that schools characterized by high structure and student support have greater levels of student engagement and that these factors are associated with higher academic achievement, as indicated by school graduation rates and school

performance on state-mandated testing. The model was tested through a multilevel multi-informant structural model on a statewide sample of 60,441 students and 11,442 teachers in 298 high schools. Consistent with the authoritative school climate model, both structure and student support were associated with higher student engagement in schools. Moreover, student engagement was directly associated with academic achievement and operated as an intervening factor. Results provide new evidence that an authoritative school climate is associated with high school academic achievement.

75. Huang, F. L., & Cornell, D. G. (2019). School teasing and bullying after the presidential election. *Educational Researcher*, *48*, 69-83.

In response to media reports of increased teasing and bullying in schools following the 2016 U.S. presidential election, we investigated its prevalence with a Virginia school climate survey completed by approximately 155,000 seventh- and eighth-grade students in 2013, 2015, and 2017. Survey results were mapped onto presidential election results for each school division's locality. In localities favoring the Republican candidate, there were higher adjusted rates of students reporting that (a) they had experienced some form of bullying in the past year (18% higher) and (b) "students in this school are teased or put down because of their race or ethnicity" (9% higher). For these two outcomes, there were no meaningful differences prior to the election. These results provide modest support for educator concerns about increased teasing and bullying since the 2016 presidential election in some schools and warrant further investigation.

76. Cornell, D., & Huang, F. (in press). Collecting and analyzing local school safety and climate data. In Mayer, M., & Jimerson, S. (Eds.) *School safety and violence prevention: Science, practice, and policy driving change*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

This chapter describes key issues in the collection and analysis of data measuring school safety and climate. It begins with an analysis of the multidimensional nature of school safety and the different sources of data used to measure it. Next, the chapter critically examines the concept of school climate and how authoritative school climate theory can help clarify research findings and guide future research. Finally, the chapter reviews the limitations of current psychometric standards for the assessment of school climate and safety and makes recommendations for improvement.

Comparison of the Authoritative School Climate Survey with the Olweus Bullying Victimization Questionnaire.

One question that often arises is how the School Climate Bullying Survey compares to the Olweus Bullying Victimization Questionnaire. The SCBS was designed to be a brief instrument that covered aspects of school climate not included in the BVQ. There are some important differences between the Olweus BVQ and the SCBS. The BVQ was developed in Norway and translated into English by Olweus. Although the BVQ is widely used in the United States, there are some qualities of the BVQ that make it difficult to interpret. First, the BVQ presents a lengthy (174 words) and complex definition of bullying that may be difficult for students to apply in a consistent manner. The SCBS definition is shorter, but intended to define the same behaviors as bullying as the BVQ. Second, the BVQ asks students to report on bullying that has occurred during "the past couple of months," whereas the SCBS asks about bullying "in the past month (30 days)."

Another important difference between the two surveys is that they use different response categories. The SCBS asks students if they have been bullied "never," "once or twice," "about once per week," or "several times per week." The Olweus BVQ uses five response categories: "it hasn't happened to me in the past couple months," "only once or twice," "2 or 3 times a month," "about once a week," and "several times a week." The two most frequent categories ("about once a week" and "several times a week") are identical in the two surveys, so the most direct comparisons can be made using these two categories to define bullying. However, Olweus researchers typically include the third category ("2 or 3 times a month") in their definition of bullying, which conceivably could produce higher estimates of bullying than the SCBS.

We compared the BVQ with the SCBS in a middle school of 388 students. In each classroom, half of the students received the BVQ (193) and the other half (195) received the SCBS. The two surveys produced quite similar estimates of the prevalence of bullying.

Bullying others. On both instruments, the percentage of students identifying themselves as bullies is low. On the SCBS, 1.5% of students said they had bullied others at least once per week in the past month A similar percentage (2.5%) of students said they had bullied others 2 or 3 times a month or more on the BVQ.

Olweus Survey How often have you taken part in bullying another student(s) at school the past couple of months?		**School Climate Bullying Survey** I have *bullied others* in the past month	
It hasn't happened to me in the past couple months	88.9	80.8	Never
Only once or twice	8.5	17.6	Once or twice
2 or 3 times a month	1.6	NA	
About once a week	0.5	0.5	About once a week
Several times a week	0.5	1.0	Several times a week

*Being bullied***.** On the SCBS, only 3.6% of students reported being victimized about once per week or more. In comparison, a higher percentage of students (6.8%) reported being victimized 2 or 3 times a month or more on the BVQ. The difference in rates of victimization found on the Olweus and School Climate surveys are largely due to the different cutoff points used to identify victims. The Olweus survey has a lower threshold than the SCBS for the frequency of victimization (2 or 3 times a month) used to classify students as victims. There is closer correspondence if you examine only the two highest categories for each instrument. For the Olweus BVQ, 4.2 students reported being bullied "about once a week" or 'several times a week," similarly, for the SCBS 3.7% of students reported being bullied "about once a week" or "several times a week."

Olweus Survey How often have you been bullied at school in the past couple of months?		**School Climate Bullying Survey** I have been *bullied* in the past month.	
It hasn't happened to me in the past couple months	83.2	72.8	Never
Only once or twice	10.0	23.6	Once or twice
2 or 3 times a month	2.6	NA	
About once a week	2.1	3.1	About once a week
Several times a week	2.1	0.5	Several times a week

References

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education, Joint Committee on Standards for Educational, & Psychological Testing. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing.* Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Bandyopadhyay, S., Cornell, D., & Konold, T. (2009). Internal and external validity of three school climate scales from the School Climate Bullying Survey. *School Psychology Review, 38,* 338-355.

Bear, G. G., Gaskins, C., Blank, J., & Chen, F. F. (2011). Delaware School Climate Survey—Student: Its factor structure, concurrent validity, and reliability. *Journal of School Psychology, 49,* 157-174. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2011.01.001

Berg, J., & Cornell, D. (2016). Authoritative school climate, aggression toward teachers, and teacher distress in middle school. *School Psychology Quarterly, 31,* 122-139. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spq0000132

Bliese, P. (2000). Within-group agreement, non-independence, and reliability: Implications for data aggregation and analysis. In K. Bollen & J. Long (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations: Foundations, extensions and new directions* (pp. 349–381). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brand, S., Felner, R., Shim, M., Seitsinger, A., & Dumas, T. (2003). Middle school improvement and reform: Development and validation of a school-level assessment of climate, cultural pluralism, and school safety. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95,* 570–588.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2009). Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance Survey – United States, 2009. Surveillance Summaries. *MMWR, 59*. Retrieved, from www.cdc.gov/mmwr

Cohen, J., McCabe, L., Michelli, N. M., & Pickeral, T. (2009). School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher education. *The Teachers College Record, 111,* 180-213.

Cornell, D., Gregory, A., Huang, F., & Fan, X. (2013). Perceived prevalence of teasing and bullying predicts high school dropout rates. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 105, 138-149.

Cornell, D., & Huang, F. (2015). School counselor use of peer nominations to identify victims of bullying. *Professional School Counseling, 18,* 191-205.

Cornell, D., & Huang, F. (2016). Authoritative school climate and high school student risk behavior: A cross-sectional multi-level analysis of student self-reports. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1007/s10964-016-0424-3

Cornell, D., & Mayer, M. (2010). Why do school order and safety matter? *Educational Researcher, 39*(1), 7-15.

Cornell, D., Shukla, K., & Konold, T. (2015). Peer victimization and authoritative school climate: A multilevel multivariate approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology* advance online publication doi:10.1037/edu0000038

Cornell, D., Shukla, K., & Konold, T. (2016). Authoritative school climate and student academic engagement, grades, and aspirations in middle and high schools. *AERA Open, 2*, 1-18, doi: 10.1177/2332858416633184.

Datta, P., Cornell, D., & Konold, T. (under review). The association of teen dating aggression with risk behaviors and academic adjustment.

Dedrick, R. F., & Greenbaum, P. E. (2010). Multilevel confirmatory factor analysis of a scale measuring interagency collaboration of children's mental health agencies. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, *19*, 27–40. doi.org/10.1177/1063426610365879

Dyer, N. G., Hanges, P. J., & Hall, R. J., (2005). Applying multilevel confirmatory factor analysis techniques to the study of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16,* 149-167

Gill, M. G., Ashton, P., & Algina, J. (2004). Authoritative schools: A test of a model to resolve the school effectiveness debate. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 29*, 389-409. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2003.10.002

Gregory, A., & Cornell, D. (2009). "Tolerating" adolescent needs: Moving beyond zero tolerance policies in high school. *Theory into Practice, 48,* 106-113.

Gregory, A., Cornell, D., & Fan, X. (2011). The relationship of school structure and support to suspension rates for Black and White high school students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48, 904-934. DOI: 10.3102/0002831211398531

Gregory, A., Cornell, D., & Fan, X. (2012). Teacher safety and authoritative school climate in high schools. *American Journal of Education, 118,* 401-425.

Gregory, A., Cornell, D., Fan, X., Sheras, P., & Shih, T. (2010). Authoritative school discipline: High school practices associated with lower student bullying and victimization. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*, 483-496.

Heilbrun, A., Cornell, D., & Konold, T. (under review). Linkages between authoritative school climate and suspension rates in middle schools.

Huang, F. (2017). Psychometric analyses of the Authoritative School Climate Survey secondary scales for grades 6-8. Unpublished analyses. Curry School of Education, University of Virginia.

Huang, F. & Cornell, D. (2015). The impact of definition and question order on the prevalence of bullying victimization using student self-reports. *Psychological Assessment, 27*, 1484-1493. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pas0000149

Huang, F., & Cornell, D. (2015). Using multilevel factor analysis with clustered data: Investigating the factor structure of the Positive Values Scale. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*. doi: 10.1177/0734282915570278

Huang, F., Cornell, D., & Konold, T. (2015). Aggressive attitudes in middle schools: A factor structure and criterion-related validity study. *Assessment, 22*, 497-512. 1073191114551016

Huang, F., & Cornell, D. (2016). Multilevel factor structure, concurrent validity, and test-retest reliability of the high school teacher version of the Authoritative School Climate Survey. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*. *34*, 3-14. doi: 10.1177/0734282915570278

Huang, F., Cornell, D., Konold, T., Meyer, P., Lacey, A., Nekvasil, E., Heilbrun, A., & Shukla, K. (2015). Multilevel factor structure and concurrent validity of the teacher version of the Authoritative School Climate Survey, *Journal of School Health, 85*, 843-851.

Jia, Y., Konold, T., & Cornell, D. (2015). Authoritative school climate and high school dropout rates. *School Psychology Quarterly, 31*, 289-303. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spq0000139

Johnson, S. L. (2009). Improving the school environment to reduce school violence: A review of the literature. *Journal of School Health, 79*, 451-465. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2009.00435.x

Konold, T. (2017). Psychometric analyses of the Authoritative School Climate Survey for grades 6-8. Unpublished analyses. Curry School of Education, University of Virginia.

Konold, T., Cornell, D., Huang, F., Meyer, P., Lacey, A., Nekvasil, E., Heilbrun, A., & Shukla, K. (2014). Multi-level multi-informant structure of the Authoritative School Climate Survey. *School Psychology Quarterly, 29*, 238-255. doi: 10.1037/spq0000062

Konold, T., & Cornell, D. (2015). Multilevel, multitrait - multimethod latent analysis of structurally different and interchangeable raters of school climate. *Psychological Assessment*, 27, 1097-1109. doi: 10.1037/pas0000098

Konold, T., & Cornell, D. (2015). Measurement and structural relations of an Authoritative School Climate model: A multi-level latent variable investigation. *Journal of School Psychology, 53*, 447-461. http:/dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2015.09.001

Larzelere, R. E., Morris, A. S. E., & Harrist, A. W. (2013). *Authoritative parenting: Synthesizing nurturance and discipline for optimal child development*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Lee, J. S. (2012). The effects of the teacher-student relationship and academic press on student engagement and academic performance. *International Journal of Educational Research, 53,* 330-340. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2012.04.006

Mehta, S., Cornell, D., Fan, X., & Gregory, A. (2013). Bullying climate and school engagement in ninth grade students. *Journal of School Health, 83,* 45-52.

Muthen, B. O. (1991). Multilevel factor analysis of class and student achievement components. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 28,* 338-354.

Nekvasil, E., & Cornell, D. (2012). Student reports of peer threats of violence: Prevalence and outcomes. *Journal of School Violence, 11,* 357-375.

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

Olweus, D. & Limber, S. (2000). *Blueprints for violence prevention: Book 9, Bullying Prevention Program.* Institute of Behavioral Science, Regents of the University of Colorado. Golden, CO: Venture Publishing and Denver, CO: C & M Press.

Orpinas, P. (1993). *Modified Depression Scale*. Houston: University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston.

Pellerin, L. A. (2005). Applying Baumrind's parenting typology to high schools: Toward a middle-range theory of authoritative socialization. *Social Science Research, 34,* 283-303. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2004.02.003

Phillips, V., & Cornell, D. (2012). Identifying victims of bullying: Use of counselor interviews to confirm peer nominations. *Professional School Counseling, 15,* 123-131.

Rigby, K. (1996). *Bullying in schools and what to do about it.* Melbourne, Victoria: The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.

Slaby, R.G. & Guerra, N.G. (1988). Cognitive mediators of aggression in adolescent offenders: 1. Assessment. *Developmental Psychology, 24,* 580-588.

Streiner, D. L. (2003a). Being inconsistent about consistency: When coefficient alpha does and doesn't matter. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 80,* 217-222.

Streiner, D. L. (2003b). Starting at the beginning: an introduction to coefficient alpha and internal consistency. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 80,* 99–103. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327752JPA8001_18

Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. *Review of Educational Research*. Advance online publication. doi 10.3102/0034654313483907

Wang, M. T., & Degol, J. L. (2016). School climate: A review of the construct, measurement, and impact on student outcomes. *Educational Psychology Review, 28*, 315-352. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9319-1

Wang, M., & Eccles, J. (2013). School context, achievement motivation, and academic engagement: A longitudinal study of school engagement using a multidimensional perspective. *Learning and Instruction, 28*, 12-23. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2013.04.002

Acknowledgements

This work was conducted by a large group of faculty and graduate student members of the Youth Violence Project research team. Current and previous graduate students are listed along with their bios on the project website: http://youthviolence.edschool.virginia.edu. Our current team of graduate students include Anna Grace Burnette, Pooja Datta, Yuane Joy Jia, Marisa Malone, and Shelby Stohlman.

Our current faculty colleagues are Francis Huang, Timothy Konold, and Patrick Meyer, and Kathan Shukla. Previous faculty collaborators were Xitao Fan, Anne Gregory, Ann Loper, Peter Sheras, and Jim Unnever. Postdocs who have contributed to the project include Peter Lovegrove, Juliette Berg, and Kathan Shukla.

Much of this research was conducted in collaboration with the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services and the Virginia Department of Education. We thank Donna Michaelis and Jessica Smith of the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services and Cynthia Cave and Jo Ann Burkholder of the Virginia Department of Education for their support of the Virginia Secondary School Climate Study, which has been primary source for most of the recent studies.

Preparation of this document was supported by Grant #2012-JF-FX-0062 awarded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Justice.

For additional information and inquiries, please visit the Youth Violence Project website at http://youthviolence.edschool.virginia.edu. The research team can be contacted directly by email (edh-yvp@virginia.edu) or phone (434-924-8929).