



MONTCLAIR STATE
UNIVERSITY

Montclair State University
**Montclair State University Digital
Commons**

Department of Psychology Faculty Scholarship
and Creative Works

Department of Psychology

11-1-2018

School-Based Bullying and Teen Dating Violence Prevention Laws: Overlapping or Distinct?

Michele Cascardi

William Paterson University

Christopher King

Montclair State University, kingch@mail.montclair.edu

Daniel Rector

William Paterson University

Jill DelPozzo

Montclair State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/psychology-facpubs>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

MSU Digital Commons Citation

Cascardi, Michele; King, Christopher; Rector, Daniel; and DelPozzo, Jill, "School-Based Bullying and Teen Dating Violence Prevention Laws: Overlapping or Distinct?" (2018). *Department of Psychology Faculty Scholarship and Creative Works*. 430.

<https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/psychology-facpubs/430>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Psychology at Montclair State University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Department of Psychology Faculty Scholarship and Creative Works by an authorized administrator of Montclair State University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@montclair.edu.

School-Based Bullying and Teen Dating Violence Prevention Laws: Overlapping or Distinct?

Journal of Interpersonal Violence
2018, Vol. 33(21) 3267–3297
© The Author(s) 2018
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/0886260518798357
journals.sagepub.com/home/jiv



Michele Cascardi,¹ Christopher M. King,²
Daniel Rector,¹ and Jill DelPozzo²

Abstract

The most recent legislative attempts to curb violence in schools have been school-based dating violence prevention laws. In the previous decade, there was an increase in legislation designed to prevent bullying in schools; these laws now exist in 50 states. However, most anti-bullying laws provide an expansive definition of bullying that includes any type of peer aggression, harassment, or teen dating violence (TDV). Having several different state and federal laws aimed at curtailing multiple forms of aggression may produce confusion about appropriate intervention and disciplinary responses, requiring school districts to develop parallel sets of policies, educational curricula, intervention approaches, and reporting requirements for overlapping behaviors that can be simultaneously peer aggression, bullying, harassment, and TDV. We conducted a systematic search of applicable laws and systematically coded those we identified for relevant content (i.e., definitions, covered locales, protected groups, and personnel, procedural, preventive, and disclosure elements). Anti-bullying laws were typically more detailed than dating violence laws. TDV laws were more likely to target TDV and control intimate behavior and to provide for education

¹William Paterson University, Wayne, NJ, USA

²Montclair State University, NJ, USA

Corresponding Author:

Michele Cascardi, Department of Psychology, William Paterson University, 300 Pompton Road, Wayne, NJ 07470, USA.

Email: cascardim@wpunj.edu

about healthy relationships. Both types of laws often mandated trainings; specified reportable behaviors; discussed sanctions, recommendations, and interventions; and mentioned counseling, specially trained staff persons, or designated specialists. Both anti-bullying and TDV laws also sometimes directed reporting of aggregate incident rates and impacts of prevention efforts. Neither type of law tended to specify school and community resources or prevention approaches. Results inform discussion of the merits of different approaches to school-based violence prevention laws.

Keywords

bullying, teen dating violence, legal interventions, youth violence

Aggression is commonly defined as an act intended to cause physical harm to another (DeWall, Anderson, & Bushman, 2011). Bullying and teen dating violence (TDV) are two forms of aggression observed among youth that have received increasing attention from lawmakers, scholars, and practitioners over the past few decades. Bullying typically refers to intentional and repeated aggressive acts that may be verbal (e.g., insults), relational (e.g., rumor spreading), or physical (e.g., punching, hitting) when there is power imbalance between the perpetrator and the target (Olweus, 1994). TDV also refers to aggressive acts that may be psychological (e.g., insults, threats, controlling behavior), physical (e.g., pushing, shoving), sexual (e.g., unwanted touching), or stalking (e.g., unwanted contact that is threatening or harassing) in the context of a dating or romantic relationship, either in person or electronically (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2016). These phenomena occur at variable rates, with most estimates of bullying ranging from 8% to 32% (Nansel et al., 2001; Peters, Hatzenbuehler, & Davidson, 2017; Robers, Zhang, Truman, & Snyder, 2010) and estimates of TDV ranging from 10% for physical TDV (Peters et al., 2017; Vagi, Olsen, Basile, & Vivolo-Kantor, 2015) to over 60% for psychological, physical, or sexual TDV inclusive (Taylor & Mumford, 2016). Youth who report having been bullied or victimized by TDV are at greater risk than their nonvictimized peers of academic difficulty, low self-esteem, school avoidance, depression, anxiety, and a variety of other negative outcomes (Banyard & Cross, 2008; Exner-Cortens, Eckenrode, & Rothman, 2013; Green, Felix, Sharkey, Furlong, & Kras, 2013; Nilsson, Gustafsson, & Svedin, 2012). Similarly, individuals who engage in bullying or TDV exhibit greater conduct problems, anger expression, and callous and unemotional traits (Caiuzzo, Houston, & Grych, 2016; Golmaryami et al., 2016; Patchin & Hinduja, 2010; Sigfusdottir, Gudjonsson,

& Sigurdsson, 2010). The high rates and deleterious consequences of bullying and TDV have led to efforts to curb these forms of violence in schools.

In the previous decade, there was an increase in legislation designed to prevent bullying in schools. These laws, which now exist in 50 states, were stimulated by high profile cases in the news, such as the mass shooting in 1999 at Columbine High School by Dylan Klebold and Eric Harris (Brooke, 1999), students who were perceived to have been bullied by their peers. Suicides by youth who had been repeated targets of bullying, such as Ryan Halligan, Phoebe Prince, and Tyler Clementi, further spurred state legislative action to hold schools accountable for reporting and preventing bullying that occurred on school grounds or in locations directly or indirectly related to school activities (Cascardi, Brown, Iannarone, & Cardona, 2014). These tragic events dovetailed with the Supreme Court decision in the case of *Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education (1999)*. As a result of the school's deliberate indifference to prevent sexual harassment, the Supreme Court ruled that the school denied a free and appropriate public education under Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972 (20 U.S.C. § 1681, 2018). Thus, both state anti-bullying laws and federal law prohibiting sexual harassment hold schools accountable.

In 2003, the murder of Ortralla Mosley, a 15-year-old student at Austin's Reagan High School who was brutally stabbed to death in the school hallway by her former boyfriend (Smith, 2003), was an impetus for legislatures to address TDV in schools. This case galvanized Texan lawmakers to develop legislation requiring school districts to adopt policies to prevent TDV. In 2007, Texas became the first state in the United States to pass a law, House Bill 121 (H.B. 121, 2017), to require schools to enforce protective orders, train educators, counsel victims, and educate students about TDV (Jackson, Bouffard, & Fox, 2014; Tex. Educ. Code Ann. § 37.0831, 2017). School-based dating violence prevention laws have become the most recent legislative attempts to curb violence in schools. These laws include provisions either *permitting or requiring* school districts to adopt dating violence prevention education curricula and policies for addressing TDV.

Although there is a clear obligation for schools to protect students from bullying and TDV, the optimal legal strategy to achieve this goal is unclear. On one hand, distinct laws to address specific forms of aggression may offer important clarity to schools about how to intervene when students engage in legally prohibited behaviors, with separate reporting, investigation, intervention, education, prevention, and training requirements for each form of aggression. One benefit of separate approaches for addressing each form of aggression is that interventions may be tailored to maximize student safety (Hertzog, Harpel, & Rowley, 2015). Available evidence suggests that there are

evidence-based approaches to prevent TDV, such as Safe Dates (Foshee et al., 2005), the Fourth R (Wolfe et al., 2009), and Shifting Boundaries (Taylor, Stein, Woods, & Mumford, 2011). There is also ample evidence supporting programs to prevent bullying, such as the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (Olweus & Limber, 2010); see also Evans, Fraser, and Cotter (2014) and Polanin, Espelage, and Pigott (2012) for reviews of bullying prevention. Policies that encourage use of evidence-based approaches for distinct forms of school-based violence may hold promise for reducing this behavior. On the other hand, existing anti-bullying laws already provide an expansive definition of bullying that includes any type of harassment and peer aggression (e.g., Cascardi et al., 2014; Cornell & Limber, 2015). Thus, the definitional contours of bullying and TDV may be so overlapping that TDV may already be covered under anti-bullying laws, obviating the need for separate TDV laws.

The coverage for multiple forms of aggression within a single law may seem advantageous; however, the overly broad definition of prohibited behaviors in current anti-bullying laws has the potential for inappropriate, fragmented, or inconsistent implementation (Cascardi et al., 2014; Cornell & Limber, 2015). In particular, bullying and harassment are commonly conflated, which is problematic because legally schools have different obligations when responding to harassment and bullying (Ali, 2010; Conn, 2004; Stuart-Cassel, Bell, & Springer, 2011). Arguably, distinct laws to address TDV may be necessary to avoid problems of conflation, redundancy, and confusion in light of bullying and harassment laws. However, it is also plausible that laws targeting TDV may introduce more fragmentation and confusion of schools' obligations for preventing bullying and may result in conflicting recommendations or remediation. Accordingly, the primary aim of the current article is to document similarities and differences in the content of school-based state statutes and regulations addressing bullying and TDV.

There is a long tradition of researchers and governmental agencies using 50-state legal surveys to review laws and/or statutes (e.g., Goertz, 1986; Gostin, 1993; Zottoli et al., 2018) for a variety of policy, advocacy, and legal initiatives. For instance, they have been used to inform (a) policy makers about administrative initiatives (Davis, Southwell, Niehaus, Walley, & Dailey, 2014; DeMatteo, Galloway, Arnold, & Patel, 2015; Stuart-Cassel et al., 2011), (b) advocacy organizations for their lobbying and dissemination efforts (American Psychological Association Practice Organization, 2013; National Conference of State Legislatures, n.d.; Uniform Law Commission, n.d.), and (c) lawyers and judges for bolstering their argumentation and reasoning (e.g., Brief for Respondent, 2004; *Roper v. Simmons*, 2005). Previously conducted 50-state surveys have focused on bullying statutes and regulations (Stuart-Cassel et al., 2011) and TDV statutes (National Conference of State

Legislatures, 2017)—both in isolation. And the prior examination of TDV statutes emphasized protection orders and not school-based initiatives to reduce or prevent TDV (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2017). Thus, there remains a need for a comparative survey of legislative and administrative law pertaining to both bullying and TDV.

Conceptual and Empirical Overlap

It may be difficult to tease apart bullying and TDV effectively within distinct statutes and regulations, as both are defined as intentional and repeated verbal, psychological, relational, or physical aggression between peers. Scholars have further argued that TDV is a form of bullying that can occur within the context of a dating relationship; it may be repetitive and used to achieve power and control over another (Corvo & DeLara, 2010; Linder, Crick, & Collins, 2002). TDV may also represent harassment. As defined in federal law, it is a civil rights violation to engage in harassment on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, or disability (i.e., Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972). TDV may be harassment when it occurs on the basis of sex. For example, unwelcome sexual comments, jokes, or gestures may be simultaneously bullying, harassment, and TDV.

Cross-sectional and longitudinal research provides support for the link between bullying, harassment, and TDV (Dishion, Spracklen, Andrews, & Patterson, 1996; Ellis & Wolfe, 2015; Foshee et al., 2011). In a sample of youth who were followed from Grades 6 to 8, those who reported bullying in Grade 6 were more likely to report TDV in Grade 8 compared with their non-bullying peers (Foshee et al., 2014). In cross-sectional work, adolescents in Grades 5 to 8 who reported that they bullied their peers were more likely to engage in TDV against a dating partner and to be victimized by a dating partner than their peers who did not report bullying (Connolly, Pepler, Craig, & Taradash, 2000). Other research has documented that being a victim of verbal, relational, physical, or electronic bullying more than doubles the probability of TDV victimization (Debnam, Waasdorp, & Bradshaw, 2016; Peters et al., 2017). While bullying has been linked to perpetration of TDV, and being a victim of bullying has been linked to TDV victimization, youth who are classified as “bully–victims,” that is, those who are victimized by their peers and who also engage in bullying, have been found to engage in the highest rates of TDV perpetration. For instance, using cluster analysis, Espelage and Holt (2007) found that youth who were both bullies and victims engaged in the highest levels of physical and psychological TDV and sexual harassment.

Another way to examine the overlap between bullying and TDV is with research on shared correlates. Exposure to family violence and conflict, residing in an unsafe community, and experiencing emotional and behavioral disorders have each been found to contribute to peer aggression–victimization, bullying, harassment, and TDV (Finkelhor, Turner, Hamby, & Ormrod, 2011). In other research, anger, anxiety, and family conflict have been identified as shared risk factors for bullying and TDV among girls, whereas anger, alcohol use, family conflict, and peer models of deviant behavior have been identified as shared risk factors for boys (Foshee et al., 2015). In one short-term prospective study, anger mediated the relation of bullying and TDV perpetration for adolescents in Grades 8 to 10, who were assessed in the fall and spring semesters (Foshee et al., 2016). Thus, bullying and TDV may emanate from common pathways, and school-based response and interventions may achieve maximum benefit by targeting shared risk factors.

The Current Study

The conceptual and empirical overlap among bullying, harassment, and TDV suggests that the same students may be engaged in multiple forms of aggression, which are influenced by similar social, familial, and psychological processes. Having different state and federal laws aimed at curtailing these multiple forms of aggression may produce confusion about appropriate education, prevention, intervention, and disciplinary responses. Given the broad definition of bullying in most extant laws, it is unclear the extent to which these laws may be requiring school districts to develop parallel sets of policies, educational curricula, intervention approaches, and reporting requirements. The issues of definition and scope (e.g., assorted behavioral indicators among perpetrators and victims; various locales including school property and the Internet) in these laws may also create arbitrary boundaries for overlapping behaviors, that is, certain behaviors can be simultaneously bullying, harassment, and TDV. The primary aims of this legal survey were (a) to analyze the content of states' anti-bullying and school-based dating violence prevention statutes and regulations, and (b) to examine the overlap in definitions and covered locations of bullying and TDV, special personnel and protected groups, reporting requirements, recommendation and intervention approaches, prevention–education activity and training, outcome tracking requirements, and consequences for noncompliance with legislative and administrative directives.

Method

To identify potential statutes and administrative regulations for coding, the following search string was run in the Thomson Reuters Westlaw Statutes

and Court Rules database and Regulations database, respectively, with an option selected to search across all 50 states:

adv: PR,CA,TE("dating violen!" TDV "dating violen! #and abus!" "dating abus!" "sex! abus!" "sex! violen!" "phys! violen!" "domestic violen!" "harm! relation!" "abus! relation!" "sex! assault!" "health! relation!" anti-bully! bully! harass! intimidat! "rape prevent!" "conflict! resolution" "conflict! management" "relationship violen!" /p school! education! student!).

More simply, we searched for laws featuring variants of a variety of terms related to bullying and TDV within the same paragraph as variants of the words school, education, and student. As of February 20, 2018, this search string returned 1,687 hits in the Statutes and Court Rules database, whereas 1,172 hits were returned in the Regulations database.

We excluded laws that focused exclusively on illicit conduct (e.g., physical or sexual assault) traditionally handled by juvenile or criminal courts rather than statutes and regulations focused on school-based prevention. The emphasis of this analysis was on acts for which schools were held accountable but may not be germane to violations of criminal law. For example, if a law only pertained to sexual assault, harassment, or stalking in criminal code, it was excluded; if it addressed bullying *or* TDV *and* sexual assault, sexual harassment, cyber-sexual assault, cyber-harassment, or stalking in the context of school-based prevention, it was included in the review. Regarding the latter, the number of search hits in the Westlaw Statutes and Court Rules database and Regulations database, respectively, for sexual assault, cyber-sexual assault (no results), or stalking—alongside TDV and bullying—is reported in Table 1.

All statutes or regulations returned were screened for inclusion. A law was included if it dealt with bullying or TDV (the latter also potentially referred to as teen relationship violence, teen partner violence, relationship violence, partner violence, teen dating abuse, teen relationship abuse, teen partner abuse, or related terms). Laws were excluded based on the following criteria:

1. Did not focus on school-based prevention of bullying or TDV. Laws that focused on statutes and regulations exclusive to sexual assault, cyber-sexual assault, sexual abuse, or sex trafficking were excluded if they were not in the context of bullying or TDV. Also excluded were statutes and regulations exclusive to gang violence, hate crimes, school safety plans for general violence, other terms related to general violence but not bullying or TDV, No Child Left Behind, health education regarding sexually transmitted diseases, or school safety plans for managing emergencies or disasters.

Table 1. Search Hits for Bullying or Teen Dating Violence and Sexual Assault, Sexual Harassment, Cyber-Sexual Conduct, Cyber-Harassment, and Stalking.

Violence Type With Bullying or TDV	Hits
Sexual assault ^a	
Statutes	42
Regulations	24
Sexual harassment ^b	
Statutes	13
Regulations	18
"Cyber-sexual" ^c	
Statutes	2
Regulations	0
Cyber-harassment ^d	
Statutes	1
Regulations	0
Stalking ^e	
Statutes	47
Regulations	36

Note. All search strings (superscripts) were run in the Westlaw Statutes and Court Rules database and Regulations database, respectively. TDV = teen dating violence.

^aadv: PR,CA,TE("sex! assault!" & "dating violen!" TDV "dating violen! #and abus!" "dating abus!" "relationship violen!" "harm! relation!" "abus! relation!" "health! relation!" anti-bully! bully! /p school! education! student! % cyber-sex! digital-sex! Internet-sex!).

^badv: PR,CA,TE("sex! harass!" & "dating violen!" TDV "dating violen! #and abus!" "dating abus!" "relationship violen!" "harm! relation!" "abus! relation!" "health! relation!" anti-bully! bully! /p school! education! student!).

^cadv: PR,CA,TE(cyber-sex! digital-sex! Internet-sex! & "dating violen!" TDV "dating violen! #and abus!" "dating abus!" "relationship violen!" "harm! relation!" "abus! relation!" "health! relation!" anti-bully! bully! /p school! education! student!).

^dadv: PR,CA,TE(cyber-harass! digital-harass! Internet-harass! & "dating violen!" TDV "dating violen! #and abus!" "dating abus!" "relationship violen!" "harm! relation!" "abus! relation!" "health! relation!" anti-bully! bully! /p school! education! student!).

^eadv: PR,CA,TE(stalking stalker & "dating violen!" TDV "dating violen! #and abus!" "dating abus!" "relationship violen!" "harm! relation!" "abus! relation!" "health! relation!" anti-bully! bully! /p school! education! student!).

2. Focused exclusively on colleges and universities. Laws pertaining to colleges and universities tend to be found in separate sections of statutory and regulatory codes from laws for elementary, middle, and high school. Coders excluded any laws that focused exclusively on colleges or universities, as evidenced by the text of a specific statute or regulation, or its location within a division of a statutory or administrative code that was clearly exclusive to colleges and universities

(e.g., based on the name of the section or subsection, or the text of its statement of purpose or scope).

3. Part of a jurisdiction's criminal code.

The initial listing of statutes and regulations screened as meeting inclusion criteria for each respective jurisdiction was then compared against the laws listed in the analysis of state bullying laws and policies prepared for the U.S. Department of Education by Stuart-Cassel and colleagues (2011). Additional laws identified by this procedure were coded if they met inclusion criteria. The finalized listing of statutes and regulations for each jurisdiction was then sorted into one of the two categories:

1. *Bullying*, if the law focused exclusively on bullying, including if it simply listed dating violence in the series of acts covered by the statute or regulation, and
2. *TDV*, if the law focused exclusively on dating violence, including if it handled dating violence in its own section separate from bullying (thus, for some jurisdictions, the same statute or regulation was coded twice—once for bullying and once for dating violence).

An online coding portal was created that included numerous variables for coding, which can be roughly classified as pertaining to scope of prohibited behaviors, harmful effects, and definition of school jurisdiction; protected groups; reporting and investigation procedures; reportable events; recommendations and intervention procedures; prevention and training provisions; and outcome tracking and reporting provisions. Variables were generally coded as *yes* (a provision explicitly provides for) or *no-not applicable* (a provision explicitly exempts or no provision explicitly provides for or exempts). Jurisdictions were coded for bullying, and separately for dating violence if applicable, using all included statutes and regulations.

Undergraduate and graduate student research assistants were instructed how to screen within-jurisdiction results for relevant laws for inclusion for coding. All research assistants were trained on a single jurisdiction (California) by the first and second authors. A coding book and instructions were created using common questions that arose among coders during pilot coding. Two research assistants independently coded each jurisdiction. Each dyad resolved all discrepancies by consensus or else referred the discrepancy to the first or second author for a final coding decision.

Research assistants affiliated with the first and second authors collectively coded half of the jurisdictions, respectively, with both coding teams

overlapping on seven jurisdictions. Five of these jurisdictions had an “omnibus law,” meaning that it was reasonably broad and inclusive and took the form of a coordinated set of statutes and regulations addressing a wide variety of aggressive behavior, such as bullying, TDV, and gun violence (cf. school-based threat assessment legislation in Virginia; Deisinger, 2016). Two jurisdictions had distinctive or discrete laws, with coordinated sets of statutes and regulations, but with each set focusing on a singular type of school-based violence (e.g., a coordinated set of statutes and regulations for bullying and a separate coordinated set of statutes and regulations for TDV). The overall agreement rate was 85.59% for the seven overlapping jurisdictions and Cohen’s kappa coefficient was .70, indicating substantial agreement (e.g., Fleiss, Cohen, & Everitt, 1969). The descriptive analysis for statutory and regulatory laws is reported using frequency counts, and significant differences in the rate of provisions between bullying and dating violence laws were evaluated using chi-square tests.

Measures: Description of Content Codes

Definition and scope. Four definitional elements were coded: prohibited behaviors, harmful effects, school jurisdiction, and federally protected groups. Prohibited behaviors included 10 specific features, such as intentional effort to harm one or more persons, bullying, intimidation, harassment, repetition or pattern of behavior, teen–dating–partner relationship violence or abuse, and a list of specific threats or acts (e.g., sexual, verbal, or emotional abuse). Harmful effects on a victim were classified based on safety being jeopardized, school or learning being impaired, or physical or emotional harm or injury. School jurisdictions ranged from acts occurring directly on school property to those occurring via electronic, phone, or digital technology. Finally, protected groups were defined based on demographics (race, ethnic group, religion, national origin); sexual orientation, sexual preference, or gender identity; and any disability (e.g., physical, learning, emotional, cognitive). In addition, a single item was used to assess whether school districts were directed (required or recommended) to develop and implement local policies.

Designated specialist. A single item was used to assess whether school districts were required to assign an individual to be a “designated specialist” for bullying or TDV. This is the school personnel responsible for receiving, responding to, and intervening in reports of bullying or TDV, regardless of their educational background or position as staff, teacher, or administrator within the school.

Reporting and investigation procedures. Four definitional elements were coded regarding schools' responsibility to report and investigate bullying and TDV incidents. This included provisions for defining reportable events as those which are witnessed or learned about from a reliable source; delineating reporting, investigatory, and response steps; and specifying record maintenance procedures and formats.

Recommendations and interventions. Two recommendation elements were coded: whether schools were required to provide a graduated range or schedule of consequences, and whether specific sanctions, recommendations, and interventions were enumerated in the statute or regulation. Schools may offer a wide range of resources, such as counseling, referrals to community-based resources, curricular materials, and legal remedies. Statutes and regulations were coded based on provision of at least one such resource. Also recorded was whether the intervention should be evidence-based.

Prevention and training provisions. Four types of prevention and training activities were coded as either required or recommended, including bullying or TDV prevention–awareness, bystander education, harassment education, and teaching about healthy relationships. Also coded was whether the school staff were required to receive training, and whether the prevention or training should be evidence-based.

Outcome tracking and reporting provisions. Two definition elements were coded: whether schools are required to report statistics about specific incidents, and whether there are consequences for not following state statutes or regulations.

Data Analysis

The number of statutes and regulations we identified for each jurisdiction was tallied. The proportion of states with each respective element within the several measurement categories (e.g., definition and scope, prevention and training provisions) was computed using the total number of states with statutes or regulations pertaining to bullying or TDV as the denominators, respectively. Chi-square tests were employed to test for differences between the rates of occurrence for each element in bullying and TDV prevention statutes and regulations. The mean number of elements within each measurement category was also computed (i.e., the average tally of elements coded as “yes” within a category across jurisdictions). Finally, to evaluate the overlap between bullying and TDV prevention laws, the proportion of statutes and

regulations that mentioned *the same elements in both bullying and TDV laws* was calculated.

Results

Across all 50 states, 360 statutes and regulations pertaining to school-based bullying or TDV were identified (see Table 2). All jurisdictions had laws related to bullying. Although 22 states have been reported to have laws pertaining to dating violence prevention and education (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2017), we only identified 19 as having standalone dating violence legislation. Three states (OH, TN, and VA) required or recommended that health or family life education curriculum incorporate TDV, but did not have explicit state statutes or regulations focused exclusively on TDV. Content analysis of bullying and TDV laws is reported in Table 3.

Definition and Scope

Most, but not all, states provided a definition of bullying for school districts within their laws, although definitions varied greatly. Definitional elements reflected in a majority of jurisdictions' anti-bullying laws related to actions and threats (physical, sexual, verbal) in person or via technology, harassment and intimidation, and intentionality, with 53% of states including the actions–threats definitional element in both sets of laws. In contrast, the scope of prohibited behaviors for TDV focused on teen dating relationships where one partner controlled another (53% of states) or engaged in aggressive actions or threats (79% of states). Aggression against a partner via technology rarely appeared in TDV laws, whereas mention of this modality was extremely common in bullying laws. On average, anti-bullying laws featured twice as many definitional elements as TDV laws (6.1 vs. 2.9 out of 10).

Harmful effects in bullying laws included a school environment not conducive of learning, safety concerns, and emotional or physical injury. These effects also appeared in TDV laws, but with significantly less frequency. Anti-bullying laws included 2.8 harmful effects out of 4, on average, compared to 1.0 harmful effects in TDV laws. The rate of overlap where states with both sets of laws reported the same harmful effects ranged from 16% to 37%.

School jurisdiction was broadly defined in bullying laws but not defined in more than one half of the states with TDV laws. Prohibited behavior could not take place on school property in 47% of states with both sets of laws. A still sizable minority of jurisdictions specified protected groups for anti-bullying but not so for TDV. Both bullying and TDV statutes and regulations

Table 2. Frequencies of Bullying and Teen Dating Violence Statutes and Regulations Across Jurisdictions.

Jurisdiction	Anti-Bullying Laws	Dating Violence Laws	Total
1. Alabama	8	—	8
2. Alaska	5	—	5
3. Arizona	1	2	3
4. Arkansas	2	—	2
5. California	9	4	13
6. Colorado	1	1	2
7. Connecticut	6	6	12
8. Delaware	2	1	3
9. Florida	1	2	3
10. Georgia	3	1	4
11. Hawaii	8	—	8
12. Idaho	4	—	4
13. Illinois	10	2	12
14. Indiana	7	1	8
15. Iowa	3	—	3
16. Kansas	1	—	1
17. Kentucky	1	—	1
18. Louisiana	1	2	3
19. Maine	2	—	2
20. Maryland	3	1	4
21. Massachusetts	8	2	10
22. Michigan	2	—	2
23. Minnesota	1	—	1
24. Mississippi	1	—	1
25. Missouri	2	—	2
26. Montana	8	—	8
27. Nebraska	3	5	8
28. Nevada	20	—	20
29. New Hampshire	11	—	11
30. New Jersey	4	2	6
31. New Mexico	4	—	4
32. New York	17	—	17
33. North Carolina	5	—	5
34. North Dakota	7	—	7
35. Ohio	7	—	7
36. Oklahoma	9	—	9
37. Oregon	6	3	9

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

Jurisdiction	Anti-Bullying Laws	Dating Violence Laws	Total
38. Pennsylvania	2	1	3
39. Rhode Island	15	6	21
40. South Carolina	6	—	6
41. South Dakota	7	—	7
42. Tennessee	7	—	7
43. Texas	14	3	17
44. Utah	14	—	14
45. Vermont	6	—	6
46. Virginia	9	—	9
47. Washington	10	12	22
48. West Virginia	15	—	15
49. Wisconsin	2	—	2
50. Wyoming	3	—	3
Total	303	57	360

Note. A listing of coded statutes and regulations is available from the first author.

stipulate that schools should establish policies for each prohibited set of behaviors, with 68% of states with both sets of laws recommending or requiring policies to prevent bullying and TDV.

Designated Specialist

A minority of states recommended or required that schools designate an specialist in the school whose primary role is to report, investigate, and intervene to prevent bullying or TDV. The laws did not stipulate the professional qualifications of this specialist.

Reporting and Investigation Procedures

Compared with TDV, a supermajority of states considered a bullying event to be reportable when it is witnessed or learned about from a reliable source. A minority required that all school personnel report such events (although none explicitly exempted any staff persons) or specify to whom such events should be reported. Less common were provisions specifying reporting, investigatory, response, and record maintenance procedures and formats. These features were largely absent from TDV statutes and regulations, and when both sets of laws existed within the same state, overlapping procedures were rare.

Table 3. Components of Bullying and Teen Dating Violence Laws.

Variable	Bullying			Teen Dating Violence			χ^2
	Yes	%	M Elements	Yes	%	M Elements	
Purpose statement and prohibited behaviors			6.08			2.95	
• Intentional effort to harm one or more persons	41	82.00		4	21.05		21.05 22.55 ^{***}
• Bullying	49	98.00		0	0.00		0.00 64.24 ^{***}
• Intimidation	39	78.00		3	15.79		15.79 22.37 ^{***}
• Harassment	39	78.00		4	21.05		15.79 19.01 ^{***}
• Teen relationship, dating, and partner violence—abuse	4	8.00		15	78.95		15.79 34.73 ^{***}
• Lists threats or acts of physical, sexual, verbal, emotional, and relational abuse	45	90.00		11	57.89		52.63 9.28 ^{**}
• Behaviors may occur using electronic, phone, and digital technology	47	94.00		1	5.26		5.26 51.21 ^{***}
• Power imbalance between aggressor and victim	7	14.00		1	5.26		5.26 1.03
• Repetition or pattern of behavior	33	66.00		7	36.84		21.05 4.80 [*]
• Purpose of behavior to control a dating partner	0	0.00		10	52.63		0.00 30.78 ^{***}
Harmful effects			2.80			1.05	
• Safety is jeopardized	26	52.00		3	15.79		15.79 7.41 ^{**}
• School work or learning is impaired	40	80.00		4	21.05		15.79 20.71 ^{***}
• Physical harm or injury	43	86.00		7	36.84		36.84 16.67 ^{***}
• Emotional—mental harm or injury	31	62.00		6	31.58		26.32 5.12 [*]
School jurisdiction			3.78			1.05	
• On school property	49	98.00		9	47.37		47.37 26.34 ^{***}
• At school-sponsored events or activities	47	94.00		6	31.58		31.58 30.12 ^{***}
• Going to or from school, on school transportation, at bus stops	46	92.00		5	26.32		27.78 30.81 ^{***}
• Electronic, phone, and digital technology	47	94.00		0	0.00		0.00 56.02 ^{***}

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

Variable	Bullying			Teen Dating Violence			χ^2
	Yes	%	M Elements	Yes	%	M Elements	
Protected groups			1.48			0.16	
• Demographics (e.g., race, ethnic group, religion, national origin)	25	50.00		1	5.26		5.26 11.73**
• Sexual orientation, sexual preference, and gender identity	24	48.00		1	5.26		5.26 10.88**
• Any disability (physical, learning, emotional, cognitive)	25	50.00		1	5.26		5.26 11.73**
Development and implementation of local-district policies	50	100.00		13	68.42		68.42 17.29***
School must assign a designated specialist	19	38.00		3	15.79		10.53 3.13
Reporting and investigation procedures			2.16			0.42	
• Witnessed or reliable information about an incident of prohibited behaviors	45	90.00		7	36.84		31.58 20.95***
• Requires immediate steps to intervene if prohibited behaviors are witnessed by school personnel	23	46.00		0	0.00		0.00 13.11***
• Investigation, response, or documentation procedures are specified	21	42.00		0	0.00		0.00 11.47**
• All school personnel are mandated—required to report offenses	19	38.00		1	5.26		5.26 7.17**
Recommendations and interventions			1.06			0.84	
• A graduated range or schedule of consequences and sanctions for bullying or dating violence is specified	8	16.00		0	0.00		0 3.44
• School enumerates specific sanctions, recommendations, and interventions	45	90.00		16	84.21		78.95 0.45

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

Variable	Bullying			Teen Dating Violence			χ^2
	Yes	%	M Elements	Yes	%	M Elements	
School and community resources			0.46			1.00	
• Counseling services or services by school staff with specialized training	19	38.00		6	31.58		15.79 0.25
• Health and curricular materials	4	8.00	1.94	13	68.42	2.42	10.53 27.07 ^{***}
Prevention and training provisions							
• Bullying or dating violence prevention—awareness	31	62.00		13	68.42		84.21 0.25
• Bystander education	2	4.00		0	0.00		0.00 0.78
• Harassment education—sensitivity training	8	16.00		0	0.00		0.00 3.44
• Healthy relationships	1	2.00		7	36.84		0.00 16.31 ^{***}
• School staff required to receive training	42	84.00	0.70	18	94.74	0.42	78.95 1.40
Outcome tracking and reporting provisions							
• School required to report events—statistics to government entity	29	58.00		6	31.58		26.32 3.85†
• Consequences to school for not following state statute or regulation are enumerated	6	12.00		2	10.53		5.26 0.03

Note. Fisher's exact test was used when expected cell sizes were less than 5. A listing of coded statutes and regulations is available from the first author. M Elements = the average number of elements (bullet points) for a category (boldface) across jurisdictions.
† $p \leq .1$ and $p \geq .05$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Recommendations and Interventions

States infrequently specified a graduated range or schedule of interventions or punishments for students who bully, and this was never mentioned in TDV statutes and regulations. A supermajority of jurisdictions enumerated specific sanctions, recommendations, or interventions for bullying and TDV, and states with both sets of laws often overlapped on this feature. A sizable minority of states provided counseling services for perpetrators and victims for bullying and TDV, whereas only TDV statutes and regulations included health and curricular materials as part of the school response. Of note, no laws specifically mentioned whether interventions should be evidence-based.

Prevention and Training

A moderate majority of states mandated or encouraged bullying or TDV prevention and awareness programs, and on average, states recommended or required about two prevention or training provisions. In states with both sets of laws, 84% of states recommended bullying or TDV awareness or prevention programs. Of note, state laws were not prescriptive in recommending specific educational or prevention programming and were silent on whether such programs should be evidence-based. A majority also required that a variety of staff members (e.g., administrators, teachers, nurses) receive such training, and importantly, among states with both sets of laws, staff were required to receive training for bullying and TDV in 79% of them. Few jurisdictions specified bystander education, harassment education, sensitivity training, and education about healthy relationships for bullying or TDV.

Outcomes

A majority of states were required to report bullying events or statistics to a government entity, whereas a minority of states were required to do so for TDV. Less common were consequences to schools for failing to adhere to bullying or TDV mandates.

Discussion

The primary aim of the current survey was to compare state statutes and regulations, which were developed to prevent or reduce bullying and TDV in schools. Anti-bullying laws were typically more detailed than TDV laws with respect to scope and specification of prohibited behaviors, harmful effects, school jurisdiction, protected groups, and reporting and investigation procedures. They

were also more likely to direct that local policies be developed. Unsurprisingly, TDV laws were much more likely to specifically target TDV and aggressive behavior aimed at controlling a dating partner. They were also much more likely to provide for health and curricular materials and prevention efforts focused on healthy relationships. Both types of laws often mandated trainings, specified reportable behaviors, and discussed sanctions, recommendations, and interventions. They both also regularly mentioned counseling, specially trained staff persons, or designated specialists. Less commonly, both types of laws directed the aggregate reporting of rates of incidents and the impact of efforts to curtail relevant aggression—although neither type of law tended to specify a consequence to a school or district for failing to do so. Similarly, several types of school and community resources and prevention approaches were infrequently contemplated by either type of law.

The finding that laws targeting TDV were far less comprehensive than those focused on bullying is not entirely surprising. TDV laws are relatively new and exist in fewer states compared with anti-bullying laws. In addition, these laws have developed with a primary emphasis on educating students about TDV. Nevertheless, in states that have both bullying and TDV laws, a majority of states require or recommend that schools develop policies for addressing each form of behavior. Despite this encouragement, TDV laws provide little direction to schools about what to include in policy to prevent TDV. To some extent, the lack of specificity may be advantageous, as it avoids potentially overlapping or contradictory policy requirements for bullying and TDV. However, the lack of specificity also makes it unclear how schools should intervene when students engage in aggressive behaviors that are prohibited under both sets of laws, as bullying and TDV may necessitate distinct responses. That is, some features of prohibited behaviors (e.g., specific aggressive acts) and harmful effects (e.g., physical or emotional harm or injury) are overlapping and may result in the classification of identical behaviors as both bullying and TDV.

In states that included both sets of laws, the areas of overlap were predominant in five domains: list of specific acts representing prohibited behavior (e.g., verbal, physical, or sexual aggression), the jurisdiction where prohibited behavior occurred (i.e., on school property), a directive to develop local or district policy, employing anti-bullying or TDV awareness or prevention, and training school staff. This degree of overlap is consequential because it points to precisely the way in which there may be conflation between both sets of laws, leading to fragmented or redundant policy targeting similar behaviors and using distinct training approaches. Moreover, as both sets of laws recommend or require school-based prevention and training of school staff, it is plausible that these efforts may not be coordinated or trainings may

present definitions of each behavior without clearly explaining potential overlap between bullying and TDV, and the practical implications of this. Also concerning is that laws are silent on whether these activities are evidence-based. Thus, neither existing laws nor available research clearly guides schools in appropriate and effective response.

When a student's behaviors simultaneously meet definitions for peer aggression (i.e., aggression between students of similar power or status), bullying, harassment, and TDV, existing statutes and regulations do not provide guidance about how to proceed. If behavior is bullying, harassment, and TDV, but it is instead classified as peer aggression, both students may be mandated for peer mediation or conflict resolution. This may be inappropriate, as one student may be in a less powerful position and unable to negotiate conflict, or the reasons for the aggression may be related to manipulation and domination instead of conflict. Thus, the less powerful student may not receive adequate protection from future harm. Conversely, if the behavior is classified as only bullying but also represents TDV and harassment, the identified aggressor may receive disciplinary consequences and the victim may be offered referrals or counseling. This response may be insufficient because if the behavior also represents harassment, schools may be additionally obligated to address the school norms and climate that allow for (or do not discourage) harassing actions, such as unwanted sexual remarks or contact. Finally, if the students are romantically involved, responding to the behavior as bullying or harassment may be insufficient to prevent TDV. In the context of TDV, it is important to consider the emotional ties that may connect students or the desire on the part of one or both parties for continued engagement. In this instance, the identified victim may benefit from safety planning or a civil protection order, protections that may not be available if the behavior is classified as peer aggression, harassment, or bullying.

A key distinction between bullying and TDV laws is the nature of the relationship between the aggressor and target. That is, TDV laws apply to dating relationships and anti-bullying statutes do not. However, statutes and regulations fail to provide guidance on what constitutes dating. The lack of a definition of dating has been problematic in the context of protection orders, and courts have wrestled with an appropriate and legally defensible definition. For example, in *Oriola v. Thaler* (2000), the California Court of Appeals held that Oriola and the respondent had a brief, nonexclusive, and platonic relationship, and Oriola additionally advised that she and the respondent were acquaintances. Therefore, the court ruled that the relationship did not meet the statutory threshold for dating and the court did not grant her a protection order.

Some states have made progress in defining the relevant factors to consider to determine whether a relationship qualifies as dating, such as length of

the relationship, nature and frequency of interaction, public acknowledgement of status as dating, and expectation about the future of the relationship (Greenless, 2012). While an improvement, even this type of definition may still pose challenges for school policy and practice, as the definition may not conform to the typical romantic relationship experiences of adolescents, such as when two peers may be romantically involved but are not classified as dating. Examination of sexual behavior of adolescents has shown that hookups, one-night stands, or casual sex with friends or ex-partners are not uncommon (Garcia, Reiber, Massey, & Merriwether, 2012). In one study, 61% of sexually active adolescents reported having sex outside of the context of a traditional dating relationship (Manning, Giordano, & Longmore, 2006). These realities of adolescent sexual behavior make it especially challenging for school personnel to determine clearly and consistently whether two students are partners involved in a dating relationship. The reason this is important relates to two prohibited behaviors commonly included in existing TDV statutes: (a) teen relationship, dating, or partner violence or abuse, and (b) purpose of behavior is to control the partner. Existing TDV statutes also do not provide guidance about appropriate classification of aggressive behavior that is bidirectionally perpetrated by both romantically involved peers. This is a likely occurrence, as TDV is often reciprocal, with males and females reporting similar rates of victimization (e.g., Cascardi & Avery-Leaf, 2015; Foshee, 1996; O'Leary, Slep, Avery-Leaf, & Cascardi, 2008). Reciprocal acts may fall within the scope of prohibited behavior under broadly conceived bullying statutes; however, it is not clear whether responses stipulated by anti-bullying statutes will effectively guide school response.

Even if bullying statutes can effectively provide for TDV, an excessively inclusive definition of bullying poses its own challenges. Scholars have previously documented problems linked to the overly expansive definition of bullying in many state statutes, such that they commonly include all forms of peer aggression and harassment, in addition to bullying (e.g., Cascardi et al., 2014; Cornell & Limber, 2015; Stuart-Cassel et al., 2011). Legal challenges associated with this expansive definition include violation of constitutional safeguards such as free speech, due process, and equal protection (Cascardi et al., 2014). If bullying is not distinguished from more serious violent behaviors covered under criminal statutes, it may lead to disciplinary responses that are too harsh. Conversely, if bullying is not distinguished from milder behaviors such as ordinary teasing, horseplay, and conflict, interventions for stopping the persistent humiliation and abuse of one student by another may be ineffective (Cornell & Limber, 2015). In an analysis of the association between state anti-bullying laws and reports of bullying, Nikolaou (2017) found that the effects of these laws were stronger in states that explicitly

define bullying and require schools to report and adopt disciplinary actions against bullying. Thus, the problems associated with the overly expansive definition of bullying are potentially made worse by difficulty in clearly delineating the defining boundaries of TDV and bullying.

While an expansive definition of bullying may be problematic, there is one area where the broader scope is beneficial compared with TDV: behavior expressed through technology. No state TDV law included technology, phones, or social media in the scope of prohibited behaviors or school jurisdiction. In contrast, 47 of 50 states included the use of electronic communication within the scope of prohibited behavior or school jurisdiction in anti-bullying laws. This raises important pragmatic questions about how schools should respond to TDV that occurs through technology, particularly as rates of cyber-based TDV, such as checking a partner's mobile phone without permission or using new technologies to pretend to be another person to test a partner, have been reported to exceed 75% (Borrajó, Gámez-Guadix, Pereda, & Calvete, 2015).

The current status of the school-based violence prevention laws is incomplete and may lead to school-based actions that do not address either bullying or TDV effectively. One important step toward statutes and regulations that guide effective policy is the use of clear and precise definitions of peer aggression, bullying, harassment, and TDV that is covered by one or both sets of laws. One of the most significant challenges in establishing such definitions is how to incorporate the conceptual and empirical interrelation among peer aggression, harassment, bullying, and TDV within the definition of prohibited behaviors. A coordinated set of statutes and regulations (i.e., an omnibus law) for a variety of school-based aggressive behavior for theoretical or practical reasons (e.g., bullying, TDV, sexual harassment, gun violence) may give schools flexibility to establish policies that are responsive to the overlapping and distinct components of each form of behavior. It may also reduce potential redundancy or duplication. For instance, a majority of states' bullying and TDV laws require or recommend that schools assign a designated specialist to investigate and respond to incidents of bullying or TDV. Although schools may assign the same individual as a designated specialist for TDV and bullying, it is important for there to be guidance about how to respond. An omnibus law, or set of coordinated laws, that provides guidance for how to respond to behaviors that represent both bullying and TDV, or how to respond to students involved with both bullying and TDV, has the potential to improve schools' abilities to investigate and respond to incidents jointly and recommend interventions that may reduce multiple problems at the same time.

An integrated approach that considers multiple problems concurrently may also be more developmentally suitable. Scholars have suggested that bullying in early adolescence sets the stage for sexual harassment and TDV

as adolescents mature because bullying is positively reinforced by peers (Espelage & Holt, 2001; Salmivalli, 2010) and establishes social norms that violence and harassment are acceptable behaviors (Espelage & Holt, 2007; Wolfe, Crooks, Chiodo, & Jaffe, 2009). By linking bullying, harassment, and TDV, schools may have greater capacity to design prevention strategies in a cost- and time-effective manner. Such approaches may avoid implementing multiple interventions that target overlapping behaviors (Debnam, Johnson, & Bradshaw, 2014). Instead, integrated prevention approaches may target shared risk factors (e.g., impulsivity, antisocial traits, externalizing tendencies, association with deviant peers) for multiple types of aggressive behaviors, which may ultimately lead to greater reductions in each respective problem behavior (Foshee et al., 2015). Despite the conceptual merit of this approach, it remains unclear whether there are unique predictive factors for discriminating youth who will perpetrate both bullying and TDV from students who will only engage in one or the other.

Despite the efficiencies and potential for positive outcomes associated with a school-based violence prevention law that includes many different types of aggressive and violent behaviors, there are reasons why separate laws may be necessary. Hertzog and colleagues (2015) conducted focus groups with key stakeholders (parents, students, and school personnel) to evaluate perceptions regarding the overlap between bullying and TDV. Stakeholders rated 11 behaviors (e.g., teasing, spreading rumors, insults, hacking into social media accounts, physically hurting) as TDV, bullying, or both. While school personnel perceived the highest degree of overlap for TDV and bullying compared with parents and students, there was consensus that separate policies for TDV and bullying, respectively, may be necessary (Hertzog et al., 2015). Reasons for this included beliefs that TDV victims were viewed by peers and school personnel as more culpable and less deserving of empathy than bullying victims. As such, separate laws may drive training and prevention approaches that help school personnel manage distinct frustrations linked to working with TDV victims, who may be more reluctant to end an abusive relationship compared with victims of bullying. Such training may also delineate safety concerns intrinsic to ending relationships where TDV occurs (e.g., stalking) compared with safety concerns in protecting a bullying victim (Hertzog et al., 2015). In short, despite the overlapping nature of prohibited behaviors and harms experienced by victims, distinct laws may result in the most compassionate and targeted responses by school personnel. But distinct laws must still be well designed, and policy derived from them must consider directives present in both anti-bullying and TDV statutes and regulations to ensure a coordinated effort. A recent policy analysis of TDV laws in Texas revealed that state-wide policies were deficient in protecting victims of TDV and providing plans for safety (Jackson et al., 2014).

Limitations

This study was a comparative analysis of the content of states' bullying and TDV statutes and regulations. The implementation of these laws via district or school policies was not examined, so it remains uncertain whether the potential problems outlined by having separate state laws to prevent bullying and TDV are realized in local policies and practices. The impact of these laws on reducing bullying and TDV was also not examined. Each of these limitations represents pressing areas for future research (e.g., systematic collection and empirical analysis of local and district policies, and data about actual operations, practices, and outcomes pertaining to bullying and TDV). Another limitation was the exclusion of statutes and regulations that exclusively addressed sexual harassment or conduct traditionally prosecuted under criminal law, such as (cyber-)sexual assault and (cyber-)stalking. Although these acts were included in the current analysis if they were present along with TDV or bullying, the scope of education and school-based prevention policy derived specifically from laws focused on sexual assault, sexual harassment, and stalking in the absence of bullying or TDV warrants additional investigation. This area of future work is important as a substantial number of adolescents engage in sexual relationships outside of a traditional or ongoing dating context, such as hookups or sexual encounters with friends or ex-partners (e.g., Garcia et al., 2012; Manning et al., 2006). It is unclear whether such activity would fall within the scope of existing TDV laws, laws specific to sexual assault or harassment, or both.

Conclusions and Future Directions

While overlapping coverage for bullying and TDV may seem better than incomplete laws, the overly broad definition of prohibited behaviors in current anti-bullying laws has the potential for inappropriate, fragmented, or inconsistent implementation. For instance, when both bullying and TDV laws stipulate that schools should assign a designated specialist, it is unclear whether schools typically select the same individual to serve in this role. Similarly, when the scope of prohibited behaviors overlap, it is not clear whether school personnel are able to discriminate between incidents of peer aggression, harassment, bullying, or TDV. Whether school personnel assigned to be designated specialists for both bullying and TDV experience role confusion is an area for future research, as is surveys of local school districts to evaluate implementation of laws and associated policies.

State laws that establish clear definitions is the first step in addressing all forms of school-based harassment and aggression, as these problems cannot

be solved without agreement about what bullying and TDV are and what they are not. From a developmental perspective, a single, coordinated school-based prevention statute aligns with the idea that bullying in early adolescence sets the stage for sexual harassment and TDV. Bullying and TDV may arise from common pathways and school-based policy that informs integrated responses and interventions may achieve maximum benefit by targeting shared risk factors. Along these lines, additional research to demonstrate the effectiveness of prevention programs is necessary. It is also plausible that bullying prevention programs may be effective for primary prevention of TDV as these forms of behavior tend to overlap and bullying often precedes the onset of TDV. Future research on the utility of bullying prevention for TDV can address this idea. In addition, although there is some research on shared and unique risk factors for bullying and TDV, more research tracking the developmental trajectory of those who engage in bullying and TDV will inform assessment, prevention, and intervention. This area of research is particularly important as relationships among adolescents may be transient and uncommitted; the boundaries between acquaintance, friend, and sexual, intimate, or dating partner are unclear. Continued research on the quality of dating and sexual behavior in adolescents will continue to clarify these boundaries. That said, a coordinated set of laws may also reduce the burden on school personnel for defining whether adolescents are partners, dating, or in a romantic relationship. A limitation of existing statutes and regulations is that they are silent on the use of evidence-based interventions, even when they recommend or require prevention and education curricula, or training of school personnel.

Although about one half of bullying laws include provisions for protected groups in their scope, TDV laws typically do not. Moreover, existing laws do not take into consideration diversity factors such as socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity, nationality, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, and age. These factors, especially for historically marginalized and oppressed groups, warrant additional consideration in the law, as identification, prevention, and intervention strategies require specialized (i.e., culturally responsive) knowledge and training. The results of our survey serve as a bird's eye snapshot of the current legal landscape in this area, which can inform future public policy advancements for managing various forms of school-based aggression.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Ali, R. (2010, October). *Dear colleague letter: Harassment and bullying*. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201010.pdf>
- American Psychological Association Practice Organization. (2013). *Telepsychology 50-state review*. Retrieved from <http://www.apapracticecentral.org/advocacy/state/telehealth-slides.pdf>
- Banyard, V. L., & Cross, C. (2008). Consequences of teen dating violence: Understanding intervening variables in ecological context. *Violence Against Women, 14*, 998-1013. doi:10.1177/1077801208322058
- Borrajo, E., Gámez-Guadix, M., Pereda, N., & Calvete, E. (2015). The development and validation of the cyber dating abuse questionnaire among young couples. *Computers in Human Behavior, 48*, 358-365. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.063
- Brief for Respondent at 11, Roper v. Simmons, 543 U.S. 551 (2005) (No. 03-633), 2004 WL 1947812.
- Brooke, J. (1999, April 21). Terror in Littleton: The overview; 2 students in Colorado school said to gun down as many as 23 and kill themselves in a siege. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1999/04/21/us/terror-littleton-overview-2-students-colorado-school-said-gun-down-many-23-kill.html>
- Caiozzo, C. N., Houston, J., & Grych, J. (2016). Predicting aggression in late adolescent romantic relationships: A short-term longitudinal study. *Journal of Adolescence, 53*, 237-248. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2016.10.012
- Cascardi, M., & Avery-Leaf, S. (2015). Gender differences in dating aggression and victimization among low-income, urban middle school students. *Partner Abuse, 6*, 383-402. doi:10.1891/1946-6560.6.4.383
- Cascardi, M., Brown, C., Iannarone, M., & Cardona, N. (2014). The problem with overly broad definitions of bullying: Implications for the schoolhouse, the state-house, and the ivory tower. *Journal of School Violence, 13*, 253-276. doi:10.1080/15388220.2013.846861
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2016). *Understanding teen dating violence*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/teen-dating-violence-2014-a.pdf>
- Conn, K. (2004). *Bullying and harassment: A legal guide for educators*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Connolly, J., Pepler, D., Craig, W., & Taradash, A. (2000). Dating experiences of bullies in early adolescence. *Child Maltreatment, 5*, 299-310. doi:10.1177/1077559500005004002
- Cornell, D., & Limber, S. P. (2015). Law and policy on the concept of bullying at school. *American Psychologist, 70*, 333-343. doi:10.1037/a0038558

- Corvo, K., & deLara, E. (2010). Towards an integrated theory of relational violence: Is bullying a risk factor for domestic violence? *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 15*, 181-190. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2009.12.001
- Davis, C. S., Southwell, J. K., Niehaus, V. R., Walley, A. Y., & Dailey, M. W. (2014). Emergency medical services naloxone access: A national systematic legal review. *Academic Emergency Medicine, 21*, 1173-1177. doi:10.1111/acem.12485
- Davis v. Monroe Country Board of Education, 526 U.S. 629 (1999).
- Debnam, K. J., Johnson, S. L., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2014). Examining the association between bullying and adolescent concerns about teen dating violence. *Journal of School Health, 84*, 421-428. doi:10.1111/josh.12170
- Debnam, K. J., Waasdorp, T. E., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2016). Examining the contemporaneous occurrence of bullying and teen dating violence victimization. *School Psychology Quarterly, 31*, 76-90. doi:10.1037/spq0000124
- Deisinger, G. (2016). *Threat assessment in Virginia public schools: Model policies, procedures, and guidelines* (2nd ed.). Retrieved from <https://www.dcjs.virginia.gov/sites/dcjs.virginia.gov/files/publications/law-enforcement/threat-assessment-model-policies-procedures-and-guidelinespdf>
- DeMatteo, D., Galloway, M., Arnold, S., & Patel, U. (2015). Sexual assault on college campuses: A 50-state survey of criminal sexual assault statutes and their relevance to campus sexual assault. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 21*, 227-238. doi:10.1037/law0000055
- DeWall, C. N., Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2011). The general aggression model: Theoretical extensions to violence. *Psychology of Violence, 1*, 245-258. doi:10.1037/a0023842
- Dishion, T. J., Spracklen, K. M., Andrews, D. W., & Patterson, G. R. (1996). Deviancy training in male adolescent friendships. *Behavior Therapy, 27*, 373-390. doi:10.1016/S0005-7894(96)80023-2
- Ellis, W. E., & Wolfe, D. A. (2015). Bullying predicts reported dating violence and observed qualities in adolescent dating relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*, 3043-3064. doi:10.1177/0886260514554428
- Espelage, D. L., & Holt, M. K. (2001). Bullying and victimization during early adolescence: Peer influences and psychosocial correlates. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 2*, 123-142. doi:10.1300/J135v02n02_08
- Espelage, D. L., & Holt, M. K. (2007). Dating violence & sexual harassment across the bully-victim continuum among middle and high school students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 36*, 799-811. doi:10.1007/s10964-006-9109-7
- Evans, C. B., Fraser, M. W., & Cotter, K. L. (2014). The effectiveness of school-based bullying prevention programs: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 19*, 532-544. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2014.07.004
- Exner-Cortens, D., Eckenrode, J., & Rothman, E. (2013). Longitudinal associations between teen dating violence victimization and adverse health outcomes. *Pediatrics, 131*, 71-78. doi:10.1542/peds.2012-1029
- Finkelhor, D., Turner, H. A., Hamby, S. L., & Ormrod, R. K. (2011). Poly-victimization: Children's exposure of multiple types of violence, crime, and abuse.

- OJJDP Juvenile Justice Bulletin - NCJ235504* (pp. 1-12). Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Fleiss, J. L., Cohen, J., & Everitt, B. S. (1969). Large sample standard errors of kappa and weighted kappa. *Psychological Bulletin, 72*, 323-327. doi:10.1037/h0028106
- Foshee, V. A. (1996). Gender differences in adolescent dating abuse prevalence, types and injuries. *Health Education Research, 11*, 275-286. doi:10.1093/her/11.3.275-a
- Foshee, V. A., Bauman, K. E., Ennett, S. T., Suchindran, C., Benefield, T., & Linder, G. F. (2005). Assessing the effects of the dating violence prevention program "Safe Dates" using random coefficient regression modeling. *Prevention Science, 6*, 245-257. doi:10.1007/s11121-005-0007-0
- Foshee, V. A., Benefield, T. S., McNaughton Reyes, H. L., Eastman, M., Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., Basile, K. C., . . . Faris, R. (2016). Examining explanations for the link between bullying perpetration and physical dating violence perpetration: Do they vary by bullying victimization? *Aggressive Behavior, 42*, 66-81. doi:10.1002/ab.21606
- Foshee, V. A., Reyes, H. L. M., Ennett, S. T., Suchindran, C., Mathias, J. P., Karriker-Jaffe, K. J., . . . Benefield, T. S. (2011). Risk and protective factors distinguishing profiles of adolescent peer and dating violence perpetration. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 48*, 344-350. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2010.07.030
- Foshee, V. A., Reyes, H. L. M., Tharp, A. T., Chang, L. Y., Ennett, S. T., Simon, T. R., . . . Suchindran, C. (2015). Shared longitudinal predictors of physical peer and dating violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 56*, 106-112. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.08.003
- Foshee, V. A., Reyes, H. L. M., Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., Basile, K. C., Chang, L. Y., Faris, R., & Ennett, S. T. (2014). Bullying as a longitudinal predictor of adolescent dating violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 55*, 439-444.
- Garcia, J. R., Reiber, C., Massey, S. G., & Merriwether, A. M. (2012). Sexual hookup culture: A review. *Review of General Psychology, 16*, 161-176. doi:10.1037/a0027911
- Goertz, M. E. (1986). State educational standards: A 50-state survey. *ETS Research Report Series*, i-139. doi:10.1002/j.2330-8516.1986.tb00156.x
- Golmaryami, F. N., Frick, P. J., Hemphill, S. A., Kahn, R. E., Crapanzano, A. M., & Terranova, A. M. (2016). The social, behavioral, and emotional correlates of bullying and victimization in a school-based sample. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 44*, 381-391. doi:10.1007/s10802-015-9994-x
- Gostin, L. O. (1993). Controlling the resurgent tuberculosis epidemic: A 50-state survey of TB statutes and proposals for reform. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 269*, 255-261. doi:10.1001/jama.1993.03500020089038
- Green, J. G., Felix, E. D., Sharkey, J. D., Furlong, M. J., & Kras, J. E. (2013). Identifying bully victims: Definitional versus behavioral approaches. *Psychological Assessment, 25*, 651-662. doi:10.1037/a0031248
- Greenless, G. T. (2012). Drawing the necessary line: A review of dating domestic violence statutes around the United States. *Family Court Review, 50*, 679-692. doi:10.1111/j.1744-1617.2012.01486.x

- H.B. 121, 80th Leg., 2007 Reg. Sess. (Tex. 2017).
- Hertzog, J. L., Harpel, T., & Rowley, R. (2015). Is it bullying, teen dating violence, or both? Student, school staff, and parent perceptions. *Children & Schools, 38*, 21-29. doi:10.1093/cs/cdv037
- Jackson, R. D., Bouffard, L. A., & Fox, K. A. (2014). Putting policy into practice: Examining school districts' implementation of teen dating violence legislation. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 25*, 503-524. doi:10.1177/0887403412475136
- Linder, J. R., Crick, N. R., & Collins, W. A. (2002). Relational aggression and victimization in young adults' romantic relationships: Associations with perceptions of parent, peer, and romantic relationship quality. *Social Development, 11*, 69-86. doi:10.1111/1467-9507.00187
- Manning, W. D., Giordano, P. C., & Longmore, M. A. (2006). Hooking up: The relationship contexts of "nonrelationship" sex. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 21*, 459-483. doi:10.1177/0743558406291692
- Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among U.S. youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 285*, 2094-2100. doi:10.1001/jama.285.16.2094
- National Conference of State Legislatures. (2017). *Teen dating violence*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncsl.org/research/health/teen-dating-violence.aspx>
- National Conference of State Legislatures. (n.d.). *50 state* [Search results]. Retrieved from <http://www.ncsl.org/GoogleResults.aspx?q=50%20state>
- Nikolaou, D. (2017). Do anti-bullying policies deter in-school bullying victimization? *International Review of Law and Economics, 50*, 1-6. doi:10.1016/j.irl.2017.03.001
- Nilsson, D. K., Gustafsson, P. E., & Svedin, C. G. (2012). Polytraumatization and trauma symptoms in adolescent boys and girls: Interpersonal and noninterpersonal events and moderating effects of adverse family circumstances. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*, 2645-2664. doi:10.1177/0886260512436386
- O'Leary, K. D., Slep, A. M. S., Avery-Leaf, S., & Cascardi, M. (2008). Gender differences in dating aggression among multiethnic high school students. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 42*, 473-479. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.09.012
- Olweus, D. (1994). Bullying at school. In L. R. Huesmann (Ed.), *Aggressive behavior: Current perspectives* (pp. 97-130). Boston, MA: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4757-9116-7_5
- Olweus, D., & Limber, S. P. (2010). Bullying in school: Evaluation and dissemination of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 80*, 124-134. doi:10.1111/j.1939-0025.2010.01015.x
- Oriola v. Thaler, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 822, 829 (Cal. Ct. App. 2000).
- Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2010). Cyberbullying and self-esteem. *Journal of School Health, 80*, 614-621. doi:10.1111/j.1746-1561.2010.00548.x
- Peters, Z. J., Hatzenbuehler, M. L., & Davidson, L. L. (2017). Examining the intersection of bullying and physical relationship violence among New York City high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 32*, 49-75. doi:10.1177/0886260515585532

- Polanin, J. R., Espelage, D. L., & Pigott, T. D. (2012). A meta-analysis of school-based bullying prevention programs' effects on bystander intervention behavior. *School Psychology Review, 41*, 47-65.
- Robers, S., Zhang, J., Truman, J., & Snyder, T. D. (2010). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2010*. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011002.pdf>
- Roper v. Simmons, 543 U.S. 551 (2005)
- Salmivalli, C. (2010). Bullying and the peer group: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 15*, 112-120. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.007
- Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Pub. L. No. 93-112, 87 Stat. 355 (codified as amended at 29 U.S.C. § 794 (2018)).
- Sigfusdottir, I. D., Gudjonsson, G. H., & Sigurdsson, J. F. (2010). Bullying and delinquency. The mediating role of anger. *Personality and Individual Differences, 48*, 391-396. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2009.10.034
- Smith, J. (2003, May 16). A shining star goes dark. *The Austin Chronicle*. Retrieved from <https://www.austinchronicle.com/news/2003-05-16/159800/>
- Stuart-Cassel, V., Bell, A., & Springer, J. F. (2011). *Analysis of state bullying laws and policies*. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/bullying/state-bullying-laws/state-bullying-laws.pdf>
- Taylor, B. G., & Mumford, E. A. (2016). A national descriptive portrait of adolescent relationship abuse: Results from the National Survey on Teen Relationships and Intimate Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 31*, 963-988. doi:10.1177/0886260514564070
- Taylor, B., Stein, N. D., Woods, D., & Mumford, E. (2011). *Shifting boundaries: Final report on an experimental evaluation of a youth dating violence prevention program in New York City middle schools*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/236175.pdf>
- Tex. Educ. Code Ann. § 37.0831 (2017)
- Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-336, § 204, 104 Stat. 327 (codified as amended at 42 U.S.C. §§ 121301-12165 (2018)).
- Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Pub. L. No. 88-352, 78 Stat. 255 (codified as amended at 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981-2000e-17 (2012)).
- Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972, Pub. L. No. 92-318, 86 Stat. 235 (codified as amended at 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681-1688 (2018)).
- Uniform Law Commission. (n.d.). *Search* [Search results for "50 state"]. Retrieved from <http://www.uniformlaws.org/Search.aspx?cx=014921086760789645719:at7aeght8rg&cof=FORID%3A9&ie=UTF-8&q=50%20state&sa=Search>
- Vagi, K. J., Olsen, E. O. M., Basile, K. C., & Vivolo-Kantor, A. M. (2015). Teen dating violence (physical and sexual) among US high school students: Findings from the 2013 National Youth Risk Behavior Survey. *JAMA Pediatrics, 169*, 474-482. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2014.3577
- Wolfe, D. A., Crooks, C. C., Chiodo, D., & Jaffe, P. (2009). Child maltreatment, bullying, gender-based harassment, and adolescent dating violence: Making the connections. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 33*, 21-24. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.01469.x

- Wolfe, D. A., Crooks, C., Jaffe, P., Chiodo, D., Hughes, R., Ellis, W., . . . Donner, A. (2009). A school-based program to prevent adolescent dating violence: A cluster randomized trial. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 163*, 692-699. doi:10.1001/archpediatrics.2009.69
- Zottoli, T. M., Daftary-Kapur, T., Edkins, V. A., Redlich, A. D., King, C. M., Dervan, L. E., & Tahan, E. (2018, March). *State of the states: Advancing guilty plea research through a national survey of United States laws*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychology-Law Society, Memphis, TN.

Author Biographies

Michele Cascardi is a professor of psychology and graduate program director of the William Paterson University PsyD program in clinical psychology. Her work focuses on measurement of intimate partner violence in adolescents and young adults, the link between childhood trauma and intimate partner violence, and prevention of sexual assault and intimate partner violence.

Christopher M. King is an assistant professor of psychology at Montclair State University. His research interests include forensic mental health services, correctional psychology, police and public safety psychology, and mental health law. His clinical interests include forensic mental health assessment and interventions for adolescents and young adults with multiple problems.

Daniel Rector is a part-time project specialist with interests in violence prevention.

Jill DelPozzo is a graduate student in the clinical psychology PhD program at Montclair State University, with research and clinical interests in forensic mental health assessment and severe mental illness.