Adrijana Grmuša[1]

Institut za političke studije

Beograd

SCHOOL SAFETY: A REVIEW OF DEFINING DIMENSIONS AND EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES

Abstract

School safety is a critical aspect of creating a positive learning environment, yet its definition remains elusive. This paper aims to analyze the literature on school safety, examining its physical and psychological dimensions as well as the effectiveness of implemented safety strategies. Following a brief analysis of the substantive elements of the school safety concept in the introduction, the paper synthesizes theoretical perspectives on both physical and psychological safety. In addressing the most critical safety concerns, scholars have highlighted two main aspects of physical safety: 1) protecting the school from student misbehavior, crime, and violence using security measures, procedures, and personnel; 2) ensuring that the school can mitigate risks from natural hazards and address traffic safety concerns. Psychological safety focuses on creating a supportive environment that protects students from psychological violence and promotes positive interpersonal relationships. Research has not consistently shown the effectiveness of physical strategies in preventing school violence - no empirical confirmation of their effectiveness has been found, although some studies suggest that School Resource Officers (SROs) may reduce certain forms of school violence, such as assaults without a weapon and student gun possession, and increase the detection of drug offenses. Regarding school preparedness for natural hazards, some studies show moderate preparedness in certain developed countries, but there are significant shortcomings, particularly in developing countries. As for the effectiveness of psychological safety strategies, research suggests that positive interpersonal relationships within an authoritative school climate contribute to a safer school environment by preventing and reducing various forms of problem behaviors.

---

[1] adrijana.grmusa@ips.ac.rs

Keywords: school safety, physical safety, psychological safety, effectiveness of school safety strategies.

Introduction

School safety is an important social issue, but despite agreement on its importance, there is little consensus on what the term actually means (Gastic & Gasiewski, 2008). The term is defined differently in the literature, which makes it difficult to understand and approach the term itself, compare the results of various research, and manage the safety of the educational process (Tadić, 2022). Defining school safety is often challenging, as the definition can encompass a wide range of different themes, where separating rhetoric from reality becomes problematic, and where a key difficulty lies in distinguishing between personal beliefs and evidence-based research (Mayer & Cornell, 2010).

Early definitions were focused on reducing crime and acts of physical violence on school grounds (Furlong, & Morrison, 2000). In contrast, today's definitions are more comprehensive and also include social, emotional, and psychological factors associated with feeling safe at school (Edwards, 2021). School safety is typically conceptualized as a component of school climate (Bradshaw et al., 2021). Despite the fact that there is still no unanimous definition of school climate or school safety, there is a soft consensus that school climate is a broad, multidimensional construct for which school safety is a critical dimension (Edwards, 2021; Lewno-Dumdie et al., 2020).

Although there is still no single definition and no agreement on the substantive elements of school safety (Lewno-Dumdie et al., 2020), it can be seen in the definitions that there is an emphasis on three elements. The first element is the perception of school actors, most often students and teachers. In definitions of this category, perception can refer to individuals' 1) views on the level of school safety (Kutsyuruba et al., 2015); 2) fear of victimization or sense of safety at school (Hernandez et al., 2010; Hilarski, 2004); and/or 3) views on overall physical and emotional safety (Frederick et al., 2021; Wang & Degol, 2016). The second element is related to the environment. In the definitions of this category, the focus is on the environment that is 1) free from violence, crime, intimidation, threats, and fear (Cornell & Mayer, 2010; Butcher & Manning, 2005; Tadić, 2022); and 2) supportive of educational mission and welfare of school actors (Butcher & Manning, 2005; Díaz-Vicario & Gairín Sallán, 2017). The third element involves the presence and implementation of effective, consistent, and fair disciplinary procedures and practices (Hernandez et al., 2010; Wang &

Degol, 2016). In this context, it can be said that research on school safety has flowed along two overlapping but distinguishable dimensions of physical and psychological safety (Reeves et al., 2011).

Dimensions of School Safety

Physical Safety

Physical safety refers to the establishment of a secure environment within the school where students, school staff, and visitors are protected from physical harm, injury, or violence. It encompasses the conditions and structures that ensure the well-being of everyone within the school. At its core, physical safety in schools is concerned with creating an environment where the security risk is minimized. The concept of physical safety includes the protection from internal security risks, such as student misbehavior, crime and violence, as well as from external security risks, such as disasters due to natural hazards and traffic safety near the school (Cornell et al., 2021; Mubita, 2021).

Internal security risks originate from behaviors within the school community that endanger individuals, whether through deliberate acts or negligence. These risks include homicides and suicides, violent and non-violent crimes, possession or use of weapons, student disciplinary offenses that results in injury or pose threat to others, gang activity, and the distribution, possession, or consumption of illicit substances (Fredrick et al., 2021; Robers et al., 2015; Wang & Degol, 2016). In regard to internal security risk, physical safety includes measures, procedures, and personnel put in place by the school to help ensure the security of persons, as well as minimize crime and misbehaviour. The most commonly applied are technological systems such as video surveillance and metal detectors; security procedures such as restricted access to school premises, emergency response protocols; and security personnel, including school resource officers (SROs), security guards, and stationed police officers (Cornell et al., 2021; Lazarus & Sulkowski, 2024; Servoss, 2014).

External risks to physical safety stem from environmental and societal conditions outside the school's immediate control, notably natural disasters and traffic-related hazards. Natural disasters that occur due to natural hazards can cause infrastructural damages to educational institution buildings and these damages may result in fatalities and severe injuries to their occupants in both developing and developed countries. Research indicates that school buildings often exhibit greater structural vulnerability compared to other types of buildings, resulting in a disproportionately higher number of casualties among students during seismic events (Khan et al., 2020). Floods and storm surges alone affect hundreds of thousands of

school-age children annually, disrupting educational access and requiring mass evacuations (Ersoy & Kocak, 2016). Consequently, schools are ethically and operationally responsible for maintaining a disaster-resilient environment (Fahad & Jing, 2018). This includes designing and maintaining facilities to withstand potential disasters; implementing effective evacuation routes and procedures; and ensuring the availability of emergency resources and life-saving equipment (Khan et al., 2020; Tipler et al., 2017).

When it comes to traffic safety, in many developing countries, school-related traffic incidents remain one of the leading causes of injury among students (Srichai et al., 2013). For instance, in countries with large school-age populations, such as India, inadequate school transportation and road safety measures contribute significantly to student injuries (John et al., 2012). Conversely, in developed countries—particularly in urban areas—school traffic safety interventions sometimes yield unintended consequences. Some initiatives, although well-intentioned, limit students' mobility by keeping them off roads without effectively addressing their safety as pedestrians, cyclists, or passengers, thereby creating a false perception of security (Parusel & McLaren, 2010).

Psychological Safety

Regarding the psychological dimension of school safety, different terminology is used in the literature. Some scholars use psychological safety (Cornell et al., 2021; Reeves et al., 2011), others use social-emotional safety (Cohen et al., 2009; Thapa et al., 2013; Wang & Degol, 2016), but there are also those who use the term emotional safety (Frederick et al., 2021).

The various definitions that exist for this dimension can be summarized by referring to an environment that is free from psychological violence in the interactions of its participants (Baeva & Bordovskaia, 2015). Accordingly, psychological safety is concerned with protecting students from aggressive behavior that inflicts emotional distress, rather than physical injury (Cornell et al., 2021).

Psychological safety, in a narrow sense, refers to students' perceptions of their own safety to express their emotions, take risks, and engage in new experiences (Frederick et al., 2021; Hebib & Žunić-Pavlović, 2018). The perception of safety is often confounded with perceived vulnerability or tolerance to contextual risk factors, where feelings of safety play a major role. Feelings of safety can be defined as emotional reactions to relevant contextual factors that allow for a personal sense of safety at school. It is a multidimensional construct

that encompasses a range of reactions to one's safety and includes judgments (e.g., cognitive assessments of the severity or prevalence of crime), values (e.g., concern about crime), and emotions (e.g., feelings of fear) (Fisher et al., 2016).

In a broader sense, psychological safety refers, on the one hand, to the nature of social interactions among various school actors, as well as to their satisfaction with interpersonal relationships (Baeva & Bordovskaia, 2015) and on the other hand, to expectations that the school will enable students' social and emotional needs to be met in a safe manner (Edwards, 2021). Accordingly, psychological safety is focused on the quality of interpersonal relationships at school, with school being perceived as a place where caring and supportive adults, especially teachers, are available (Baeva & Bordovskaia, 2015; Díaz-Vicario & Gairín Sallán, 2017; Edwards, 2021).

Based on how psychological safety is conceptualized, its operationalization is conditionally feasible. To make it practically applicable within the school settings, psychological safety should be delineated into specific elements that can be observed and assessed. These elements serve as a framework for creating an environment in which both students and staff feel emotionally secure. Considering that psychological safety rooted in the theoretical construct of school climate, many of its defining elements overlap with those that foster a positive school climate - namely, trust, respect, and emotional support. These overlapping elements underscore the necessity of a holistic and integrated approach to psychological safety, as a nurturing school climate is inextricably linked to the emotional well-being of both students and school staff (Bradshaw et al., 2021). The following are key elements of psychological safety and the ways in which they can be operationalized within the school context. The first is the teacher–student relationships (TSRs), which can be defined as meaningful emotional and relational bonds that develop between students and teachers through prolonged interaction (Longobardi et al., 2016). Positive TSRs are characterized by the availability of caring and supportive adults, friendship, closeness, and affection (Endedijk et al., 2022; Longobardi et al., 2021). The second element refers to peer relationships (PRs) that occur among same-age peers. Unlike TSRs, peer relationships are voluntary and fundamentally egalitarian (Bukowski et al., 2018). Positive PRs are associated with several psychosocial variables, including the quality of peer attachment and friendship, as well as social positioning indicators such as peer acceptance, perceived popularity, likability, and social preference (Portt et al., 2020). Finally, there are feelings of safety, which encompass emotional responses to contextual factors that shape an individual's subjective sense of security at school. This construct is multidimensional, incorporating cognitive evaluations (e.g., perceived severity or

frequency of crime), affective responses (e.g., fear), and value-based concerns (e.g., personal significance attributed to safety threats) (Fisher et al., 2016).

Strategies of School Safety and their Effectiveness

Physical Safety Strategies

Physical safety strategies involve the use of measures, procedures, and personnel put in place by the school to help ensure the security of students and staff, as well as minimize crime and misbehavior. Collectively, such strategies have been coined as "target hardening", meaning the purposeful strengthening of a school building and other facilities to protect it in the event of an attack (Addington, 2009).

Regarding internal risks, physical safety strategies encompass two functions. The first is the deterrence function, aimed at dissuading the student from exhibiting problem behavior (Cornell et al., 2021; Tanner-Smith et al., 2017). This function is based on the application of rational choice theory, whereby the probability of exhibiting problematic behavior depends on the perceived costs and benefits associated with a specific act, which means that potential perpetrators will make a decision not to initiate or continue activities that lead to the risk of being caught (Tanner-Smith et al., 2017). The second function has a symbolic character and is related to assuring the public that the school is a safe place for students. At the heart of this function is the idea that when cases of serious school violence occur, the school should reassert its power and convince the public that, as a symbol of authority, it maintains control primarily over students (Servoss, 2014). However, policymakers are often criticized by the media and academia for recommending the implementation of strategies that are appealing to the public but have little or no scientific support (Mann & Brock, 2020). Leading academic authorities in the field have concluded that there is a lack of methodologically and analytically rigorous studies of these topics. The quality and quantity of research are uneven across the topics. Some school safety practices draw upon a large and sophisticated research base, while others have little empirical support despite being widely accepted (Lamoreaux & Sulkowski, 2020; Mann & Brock, 2020; Nickerson et al., 2021).

Despite the aforementioned limitations, it can be concluded that research has not found empirical evidence of the effectiveness of strategies based on the use of metal detectors, video surveillance, or increased presence of security personnel in schools in preventing school violence or reducing crime and violence victimization in general (Addington, 2009; Servoss, 2014; Tanner-Smith et al., 2017). In some cases, the use of multiple security measures reduced

the likelihood of exposure to property crime only in high schools but was shown to be ineffective for most other issues in both elementary and high schools (Tanner-Smith et al., 2017). As for the effectiveness of SRO engagement, some studies show that their increased presence reduces some forms of violence in schools, such as physical assaults without a weapon (Sorensen et al., 2023; Theriot, 2016), and student gun possession (Theriot, 2016). The presence of SROs has also been shown to increase the detection and arrest of drug offenses (Gottfredson et al., 2020; Owens, 2017). However, increased SRO presence has not prevented gun-related incidents (Sorensen et al., 2023) and has no effect on bullying (Broll & Lafferty, 2018; Devlin et al., 2018), which has also been confirmed in high schools in Serbia (Grmuša, 2024).

In addition, the implementation of physical safety strategies carries the potential risk of creating a school environment that focuses heavily on rules and their enforcement to the detriment of teaching and learning. In this regard, a potentially negative outcome is that students do not perceive safety strategies as relevant to ensuring their safety, but as an additional means by which school personnel assert (or abuse) their power and control over students (Kupchik & Farina, 2016). This is particularly significant in relation to the engagement of SROs, as by adopting a "zero tolerance" response to student misbehavior, many schools engage SROs as a means of enforcing student discipline (Bleakley & Bleakley, 2018). As a result, SROs are regularly involved in standard school discipline, even for students who have committed minor offenses rather than serious acts of violence (Fisher et al., 2020). There is quantitative evidence that the arrival of an SRO is associated with an increase in standard disciplinary sanctions against students (Gottfredson et al., 2020; Sorensen et al., 2021).

In this regard, schools are increasingly faced with the dilemma of ensuring the physical safety of the school environment without turning it into a fortress (Lazarus & Sulkowski, 2024). It is therefore necessary for policymakers to insist on rigorous studies to justify the huge financial investments in the implementation of physical safety strategies (Cornell et al., 2021).

A small subset of the school safety literature explores school safety in the context of addressing external risks, and this is usually limited to certain countries affected by devastating disasters like earthquakes in Taiwan (Chen & Lee, 2012), New Zealand (Tipler et al., 2017) or Türkiye (Ersoy & Kocak, 2016). Research is limited in terms of nature and level of preparedness in schools and there is a lack of consistent methodology for assessing school disaster preparedness (Khan et al., 2020), and this situation has been recorded in both developing and developed countries (Kano et al., 2017).

In the few specific cases that have been investigated, studies have shown medium to higher level of preparedness in certain US states in terms of school facilities (Kano et al., 2017) and inadequate preparedness in developing countries such as Pakistan (Khan et al., 2020). But even developed countries with multiple experiences with devastating earthquakes, such as Türkiye, face the problem of inadequate preparedness. For instance, training practices and student drills are often considered as a formality and not taken seriously, lacking proper visual materials. Training is limited to response after disasters. Although teachers have very good attitudes during training, they do not have enough detailed knowledge for disaster preparedness (Ersoy & Kocak, 2016). In Serbia, available insights into school safety regarding natural disasters are limited and rely solely on student perceptions. Findings from the only study conducted on this topic reveal that fewer than half of students feel safe within school buildings when considering the potential consequences of natural disasters. (Cvetković, Janković i Milojević, 2016).

In addition, research has shown that previous disaster experiences increase preparedness only for the type of disaster that occurred in the recent past, as demonstrated by the 2011 Christchurch (New Zealand) earthquake, after which schools introduced or reinforced measures aimed at responding only in the event of an earthquake (Tipler et al., 2017).

Psychological Safety Strategies

Regarding psychological safety, a wealth of research has shown the importance of feelings of safety and the quality of interpersonal relationships for both academic and psychosocial outcomes of the educational process and the prevention and reduction of student problem behaviors. Increased feelings of safety at school are associated with more positive academic and psychosocial outcomes for students, as shown in cross-sectional studies (Côté-Lussier & Fitzpatrick, 2016; Johnson et al., 2014).

In this regard, it should be stressed that exposure to violence and victimization, regardless of its type, whether experienced, witnessed, or perpetrated, predicted feeling less safe at school (Bachman et al., 2011). Additionally, students are most likely to feel unsafe in schools where bullying is prevalent (Fredrick et al., 2021; Côté-Lussier & Fitzpatrick, 2016), which has also been confirmed in schools in Serbia (Novoseljački, Šimonji Černak i Pokuševski, 2020; Tadić i Kordić, 2024). Interpersonal relationships (both TSRs and PRs) significantly predicted various forms of problem behaviors (general maladaptive behavior, delinquency, aggression, and violence within and outside of school) that serve to compromise

school safety for all school members (Reaves et al., 2018). Schools, both abroad and in Serbia, characterized by positive TSRs are expected to reduce students' engagement in problem behaviors and limit their risk of being exposed to violence and victimization (Fisher et al., 2018; Grmuša & Hong, 2024; Tadić & Kordić, 2024). As for PRs, students who fail to achieve positive social relationships with their peers represent a risk group for the emergence of behavioral, emotional and academic problems in the following years of life (Spasenović, 2009). In addition, research has shown that interpersonal relationships are particularly associated with bullying perpetration and victimization. A recent comprehensive meta-analysis showed that higher-quality TSRs are associated with less bullying perpetration and victimization. Hence, promoting positive and minimizing negative TSRs may help to tackle school-based bullying issues (Bokkel, et al., 2022). Another meta-analysis suggests that caring, supportive and warm PRs in the class should be considered as a crucial protective factor against bullying victimization (Thornberg et al., 2017).

With this in mind, the only empirically proved strategies that can increase feelings of safety and quality of interpersonal relationships are those that contribute to building an authoritative school climate. Authoritative school climate theory, which serves as a conceptual framework for understanding the linkages between school climate and school safety, is derived from developmental scholarship focused on authoritative parenting (Baumrind, 1968), which includes a combination of high expectations (e.g., demandingness) and emotional support (e.g., responsiveness) for their children. Cornell et al. (2016) conceptualize an authoritative school as one characterized by high levels of structure (strict and consistent, but fair discipline) and high support (school staff demonstrating respect and concern for students). Accordingly, in authoritative schools, structure and support are both high and act in combination, which is associated with greater academic engagement and achievement, fewer mental health problems, less truancy, and less violence and bullying among students (Kloo et al., 2023). An authoritative school climate is associated with improvement in academic outcomes such as engagement, grades, and educational aspirations (Cornell et al., 2016), but it also has multiple benefits for safety, as shown by a wealth of research. Firstly, students feel safer in schools that they perceive to have an authoritative school climate (Fisher et al., 2018). In addition, the probability and frequency of subsequent behavioral problems are lower in schools where students perceive a better-structured school, fair discipline practices, and more positive TSRs (Wang et al., 2010). Schools with more authoritative school climates tend to have lower rates of bullying victimization and perpetration (Gerlinger & Wo, 2014; Cornell et al., 2015). Students attending schools with authoritative school climates also engaged in less risky

behaviors such as drug use, suicide ideation, gang involvement, and carrying weapons (Cornell & Huang, 2016). In contrast, findings from multilevel regression analyses show that students with less authoritative teachers engage more in bullying behaviors and are more often victimized (Kloo et al., 2023).

Conclusions

This review underscores a persistent and pressing challenge in the domain of school safety: although its importance is universally recognized, a unified definition remains elusive. This complexity largely arises from the need to integrate both physical and psychological dimensions of safety. Yet, ambiguity surrounding the specific components of each significantly hinders the development of effective strategies and the ability to compare research meaningfully. While physical security measures are widely implemented, their inconsistent effectiveness in preventing violence raises a critical question about their behavioral impact— do they truly influence actions or simply enhance detection? In contrast, psychological safety approaches, especially those that promote positive interpersonal relationships within a structured and supportive school climate, consistently show greater potential in reducing problematic student behaviors. To move the field forward, future research should prioritize uncovering the causal mechanisms behind safety interventions, focusing on how and why certain measures succeed or fail. Reliance on correlation studies alone is insufficient. Through longitudinal designs, researchers can evolve and move beyond merely evaluating whether strategies work to understanding the conditions under which they do and the reasons behind their effectiveness.

BEZBEDNOST ŠKOLE – RAZMATRANJE NJENIH DIMENZIJA I DELOTVORNIH STRATEGIJA

Apstrakt

Bezbednost škole ima ključnu važnost u stvaranju pozitivnog školskog okruženja za učenje. Ipak, definisanje ovog koncepta ostaje složeno i višeslojno. Ovaj rad analizira postojeću literaturu o bezbednosti škole, fokusirajući se na njene fizičke i psihološke dimenzije, kao i na delotvornost različitih strategija za njeno unapređenje. Nakon uvodne analize glavnih elemenata bezbednosti škole, rad sagledava teorijske perspektive koje se odnose na fizičku i psihološku bezbednost škole. U skladu sa bezbednosnim pitanjima koje autori smatraju

najvažnijim, mogu se identifikovati dva glavna aspekta u definisanju fizičke bezbednosti, a to su: 1) primena bezbednosnih mera i procedura, kao i angažovanje lica zaduženih za bezbednost u školi, radi zaštite školskog objekta i ljudi koji borave u njemu od ponašanja kojim učenici ugrožavaju sebe ili druge; i 2) pripremljenost škole za suočavanje sa rizikom od prirodnih katastrofa i rešavanje problema bezbednosti saobraćaja u okruženju škole. Psihološka bezbednost se fokusira na stvaranje okruženja u kojem učenici imaju neophodnu podršku i zaštitu od psihološkog nasilja i koje podstiče razvoj i unapređenje kvaliteta međuljudskih odnosa. U tom kontekstu, kvalitet međuljudskih odnosa u školi obuhvata dva aspekta: kvalitet odnosa između učenika i nastavnika i kvalitet odnosa među vršnjacima.

Osnovna funkcija strategija fizičke bezbednosti u prevenciji nasilja u školama je efekat odvraćanja. Ove strategije imaju za cilj da obeshrabre učenike od ispoljavanja nedozvoljenog ponašanja. Zasnivanjem na teoriji racionalnog izbora, polazi se od pretpostavke da učenici procenjuju moguće koristi i posledice svojih postupaka – ukoliko je rizik od otkrivanja i sankcija visok, manja je verovatnoća da će se upustiti u nedozvoljena ponašanja. Empirijski dokazi o delotvornosti ovih strategija u prevenciji nasilja u školama su neujednačeni. S jedne strane, nedostaje konzistentna potvrda da vidljive bezbednosne mere poput detektora metala, video nadzora ili pojačanog prisustva stručnih lica zaduženih za bezbednost škole značajno doprinose smanjenju nasilja u školi. S druge strane, pojedina istraživanja ukazuju da angažovanje stručnih lica zaduženih za bezbednost škole može da smanji stopu određenih oblika nasilja u školi, kao što su napadi bez oružja i posedovanje oružja od strane učenika, kao i da poveća otkrivanje krivičnih dela povezanih sa drogom. U tom kontekstu, buduća istraživanja trebalo bi da se usmere na dublje razumevanje delotvornosti strategija fizičke bezbednosti u školama, sa posebnim fokusom na pitanje da li ove strategije zaista utiču na promenu ponašanja učenika ili prvenstveno doprinose većoj identifikaciji i evidentiranju problematičnih ponašanja. Kada je reč o pripremljenosti škola za prirodne katastrofe, istraživanja pokazuju varijabilnost, sa umerenom pripremljenošću u razvijenim zemljama i značajnim nedostacima u zemljama u razvoju. U pogledu delotvornosti strategija psihološke bezbednosti, istraživanja ukazuju da one strategije koje unapređuju pozitivne međuljudske odnose u okvirima autoritativne školske klime doprinose stvaranju bezbednijeg školskog okruženja kroz prevenciju i suzbijanje različitih oblika problematičnog ponašanja učenika. Takva klima, koju karakterišu jasna pravila i dosledna očekivanja, u kombinaciji sa toplinom i podrškom, ne samo da doprinosi smanjenju različitih oblika problematičnog ponašanja, već ima i širi razvojni značaj. Naime, autoritativna školska klima povezuje se sa unapređenjem akademskih postignuća, većim angažovanjem učenika i višim obrazovnim

aspiracijama. S obzirom na to da se psihološka bezbednost – a naročito kvalitet međuljudskih odnosa – uobičajeno proučava u okviru šireg koncepta školske klime, buduća istraživanja trebalo bi da se fokusiraju na diferencirano sagledavanje njenih efekata u poređenju sa drugim komponentama školske klime, poput osećaja pripadnosti školi, stavova učenika prema nasilju. Posebno je važno ispitati u kojoj meri psihološka bezbednost doprinosi prevenciji nasilja, u poređenju sa drugim aspektima školskog okruženja, ali i kako se ona povezuje i potencijalno nadopunjuje sa elementima fizičke bezbednosti – kao što su angažovanje lica zaduženih za bezbednost u školi, primena video nadzora i drugih vidljivih bezbednosnih mera. Razumevanje međusobnih odnosa između psihološke i fizičke bezbednosti može doprineti razvoju sveobuhvatnijih i delotvornijih strategija koje istovremeno unapređuju subjektivni doživljaj bezbednosti učenika, smanjuju izloženost rizičnim ponašanjima i doprinose stvaranju podržavajućeg, podsticjanog i bezbednog školskog okruženja.

Ključne reči: bezbednost škole, fizička bezbednost škole, psihološka bezbednost škole, delotvornost strategija bezbednosti u školama.

References

Addington, L. A. (2009). Cops and cameras: public school security as a policy response to Columbine. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *52*(10), 1426–1446. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764209332556

Bachman, R., Gunter, W. D., & Bakken, N. W. (2011). Predicting feelings of school safety for lower, middle, and upper school students: A gender specific analysis. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, *7*, 386–405.

Baeva I., Bordovskaia N. (2015). The psychological safety of the educational environment and the psychological well-being of Russian secondary school pupils and teachers *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art*, *8*(1), 86–99. https://doi.org/10.11621/PIR.2015.0108

Baumrind, D. (1968). Authoritarian vs. authoritative parental control. *Adolescence*, *3*(11), 255–272.

Bleakley, P., & Bleakley, C. (2018). School resource officers, 'Zero Tolerance' and the enforcement of compliance in the American education system. *Interchange: a Quarterly Review of Education*, *49*(10), 247–261. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-018-9326-5

Bokkel, I. M., Roorda, D. L., Maes, M., Verschueren, K., & Colpin, H. (2022). The role of affective teacher–student relationships in bullying and peer victimization: A

multilevel meta-analysis. *School Psychology Review*, *52*(2), 110–129. https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2022.2029218

Bradshaw, C. P., Cohen, J., Espelage, D. L., & Nation, M. (2021). Addressing achool safety through comprehensive school climate approaches. *School Psychology Review*, *50*(2–3), 221–236. https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2021.1926321

Broll, R., & Lafferty, R. (2018). Guardians of the hallways? School resource officers and bullying. *Safer Communities*, *17*(4), 202–212. https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-06-2018-0018

Bukowski, W. M., Laursen, B., & Rubin, K. H. (2018). Peer relations: past, present, and promise. In W. M. Bukowski, B. Laursen, & K. H. Rubin (Eds.), *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups* (2nd ed., pp. 3–20). The Guilford Press.

Butcher, K. T., & Manning, M. L. (2005). *Creating safe schools*. http://www.joannmaher.com/my_documents/courses_hs_english_012/unit_2/sidcra/resources/creatingsafeschools.pdf

Chen, C. Y., & Lee, W. C. (2012). Damages to school infrastructure and development to disaster prevention education strategy after Typhoon Morakotin Taiwan. *Disaster Prevention and Management*, *21*(5), 541–555.

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. G., Mayer, M. J., & Sulkowski, M. L. (2021). History and future of school safety research. *School Psychology Review*, *50*(2-3), 143–157. https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2020.1857212

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

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*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-016-0424-3

Cornell, D., Shukla, K., & Konold, T. (2015). Peer victimization and authoritative school climate: A multilevel approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *107*(4), 1186–1201. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000038

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

Côté-Lussier, C., & Fitzpatrick, C. (2016). Feelings of safety at school, socioemotional functioning, and classroom engagement. *The Journal of Adolescent Health*, *58*(5), 543–550. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2016.01.003

Cvetković, V.M., Janković, B., & Milojević. S. (2016). Security among students in school buildings during natural disasters. *Ecologica*, 84, 809–814.

Devlin, D.N., Santos, M.R., & Gottfredson, D.C. (2018). An evaluation of police officers in schools as a bullying intervention. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *71*, 12–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2018.07.004

Díaz-Vicario, A., & Gairín Sallán, J. (2017). A comprehensive approach to managing school safety: case studies in Catalonia, Spain. *Educational Research*, *59*(1), 89–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2016.1272430

Edwards, E. C. (2021). Centering race to move towards an intersectional ecological framework for defining school safety for black students. *School Psychology Review*, *50*(2–3), 254–273. https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2021.1930580

Endedijk, H. M., Breeman, L. D., van Lissa, C. J., Hendrickx, M. M. H. G., den Boer, L., & Mainhard, T. (2022). The teacher's invisible hand: A meta-analysis of the relevance of teacher–student relationship quality for peer relationships and the contribution of student behavior. *Review of Educational Research*, 92(3), 370–412. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543211051428

Ersoy, Ş., & Koçak, A. (2015). Disasters and earthquake preparedness of children and schools in Istanbul, Turkey. *Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk*, *7*(4), 1307–1336. https://doi.org/10.1080/19475705.2015.1060637

Fisher, B. W., & Devlin, D. N. (2020). School crime and the patterns of roles of school resource officers: Evidence from a national longitudinal study. *Crime & Delinquency*, *66*(11), 1606–1629. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128719875702

Fisher B. W., Viano S., Curran F.C., Perman F. A., & Gardella J. H. (2018). Students' feelings of safety, exposure to violence and victimization, and authoritative school climate. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *43*(1), 6–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-017-9406-6

Fisher, B., Nation, M., Gardella, J., & Nixon, C. (2016). Students fear after Sandy hook: Does a high profile school shooting affect student's perceptions of their safety at school. *Journal of School Violence*, *16*(4), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2015.1133310

Fredrick, S. S., J. McClemont, A., N. Jenkins, L., & Kern, M. (2021). Perceptions of emotional and physical safety among boarding students and associations with school bullying. *School Psychology Review*, *50*(2–3), 441–453. https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2021.1873705

Furlong, M., & Morrison, G. (2000). The school in school violence: Definitions and facts. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, *8*(2), 71–82.

Gastic, B. & Gasiewski, J. A. (2008). *School safety under NCBL's unsafe school choice option*. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ835616.pdf

Gerlinger, J., & Wo, J. C. (2016). Preventing school bullying: Should schools prioritize an authoritative school discipline approach over security measures? *Journal of School Violence*, *15*(2), 133–157. https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2014.956321

Gottfredson, D. C., Crosse, S., Tang, Z., Bauer, E., Harmon, M., Hagen, C., & Greene, A. (2020). Effects of school resource officers on school crime and responses to school crime. *Criminology & Public Policy*, *19*(3), 905–940. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12512

Grmuša, A. (2024). Effectiveness of school police officer engagement in bullying prevention and intervention in Belgrade secondary schools. *NBP*, *29*(2), 120–133. https://doi.org/10.5937/nabepo29-49596

Grmuša, A., & Hong, J. S. (2024). Preventing and reducing bullying victimization in high schools: Which works better? Physical or psychological safety measures. *Journal of Psychologists and Counsellors in Schools*, *34*(2), 139–152.

https://doi.org/10.1177/20556365241236607

Hebib, E. & Žunić-Pavlović, V. (2018). School climate and school culture: A framework for creating school as a safe and stimulating environment for learning and development. *Journal of Institute for Educational Research*, *50*(1), 113–134. https://doi.org/10.2298/ZIPI1801113H

Hernandez, D., Floden L., & Bosworth K. (2010). How safe is a school? An exploratory study comparing measures and perceptions of safety. *Journal of School Violence*, 9, 357–374.

Hilarski, C. (2004). How school environments contribute to violent behavior in youth. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, *9*(1-2), 165–178.

John, O., John, S. M., & Bose, A. (2012). A study on road safety features and awareness in selected schools in Vellore. *Injury Prevention*, *18*(1), 102–103. https://doi.org/10.1136/injuryprev-2012-040590d.20

Johnson, S. R. L., Blum, R. W., & Cheng, T. L. (2014). Future orientation: A construct with implications for adolescent health and wellbeing. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health*, *26*(4), 459–468. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijamh-2013-0333

Kano, M., Ramirez, M., Ybarra, W. J., Frias, G., & Bourque, L. B. (2007). Are schools prepared for emergencies? A baseline assessment of emergency preparedness at school sites in three Los Angeles county school districts. *Education and Urban Society*, *39*(3), 399–422. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124506298130

Khan, A. A., Rana, I. A., & Najam, F. A. (2020). Assessing school safety against natural and human-made hazards: A case study of Gilgit city, Pakistan. *Journal of Geography and Social Sciences*, *2*(2), 133–147.

Kloo, M., Thornberg, R., & Wänström, L. (2023). Classroom-level authoritative teaching and its associations with bullying perpetration and victimization. *Journal of School Violence*, *22*(2), 276–289. https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2023.2180746

Kupchik, A., & Farina, K. A. (2016). Imitating authority: Students' perceptions of school punishment and security, and bullying victimization. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *14*(2), 147–163. https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204014557648

Kutsyuruba, B., Klinger, D. A., & Hussain, A. (2015). Relationships among school climate, school safety, and student achievement and well-being: a review of the literature. *Review of Education*, *3*(2), 103–135. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3043

Lamoreaux, D., & Sulkowski, M. L. (2020). An alternative to fortified schools: Using crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) to balance student safety and psychological well-being. *Psychology in the Schools*, *57*, 152–165. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22301

Lazarus, P. J. & Sulkowski, M. L. (2024). *Leadership for safe schools: The three pillars approach to supporting students' mental health*. Routledge.

Lewno-Dumdie, B. M., Mason, B. A., Hajovsky, D. B., & Villeneuve, E. F. (2020). Student-report measures of school climate: A dimensional review. *School Mental Health*, *12*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-019-09340-2

Longobardi, C., Settanni, M., Lin, S., & Fabris, M.A. (2021). Student-teacher relationship quality and prosocial behaviour: The mediating role of academic achievement and a positive attitude towards school. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *91*(2), 547–562. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12378

Longobardi, C., Prino, L.E., Marengo, D., & Settanni. M. (2016). Student-teacher relationships as a protective factor for school adjustment during the transition from middle to high school. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *23*(7). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01988

Mann, A., & Brock, S. E. (2020). Analysis of safety policy making: Implications for school psychologists. *Contemporary School Psychology*, *24*(3), 279–294. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-020-00297-7

Mayer, J., & Cornell, D. (2010). New perspectives on school safety and violence prevention. *Educational Researcher*, *39*, 5–6.

Mubita, K. (2021). Understanding school safetyand security: Conceptualization and definitions. *Journal of Lexicography and Terminology*, 5(1), 76–86.

Nickerson, A. B., Randa, R., Jimerson, S., & Guerra, N. G. (2021). Safe places to learn: Advances in school safety research and practice. *School Psychology Review*, *50*(2–3), 158–171. https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2021.1871948

Novoseljački, N., Šimonji Černak, R. & Pokuševski, M. (2020). Učenička percepcija školske klime i nasilja u školi. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, *69*(3), 273–290. https://doi.org/10.5937/nasvas2003273N

Owens, E. G. (2017). Testing the school-to-prison pipeline. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *36*(1), 11–37. https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.21954

Parusel, S., & McLaren, A. T. (2010). Cars before kids: Automobility and the illusion of school traffic safety. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, *47*(2), 129–147. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-618x.2010.01227.x

Portt, E., Person, S., Person, B., Rawana, E., & Brownlee, K. (2020). Empathy and positive aspects of adolescent peer relationships: A scoping review. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *29*(1), 2416–2433. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-020-01753-x

Reaves, S., McMahon, S. D., Duffy, S. N., & Ruiz, L. (2018). The test of time: A meta-analytic review of the relation between school climate and problem behavior. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *39*, 100–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.01.006

Reeves, M., Kanan, L., & Plog, A. (2011). *Comprehensive planning for safe learning environments: A school professional's guide to integrating physical and psychological safety–prevention through recovery*. Routledge.

Robers, S., Zhang, A., & Morgan, R. E. (2015). *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2014*. National Center for Education Statistics.

Servoss, T. J. (2014). School security and student misbehavior: A multi-level examination. *Youth & Society*, *49*(6), 755–778. https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X14561007

Sorensen, L.C., Avila-Acosta, M., Engberg, J.B., & Bushway, S.D. (2023). The thin blue line in schools: New evidence on school-based policing across the U.S. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *42*(4), 941–970. https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.22498

Spasenović, V. (2009). Quality of social relations and school achievement of students of different age. *Journal of Institute for Educational Research*, *41*(2), 331–348. https://doi.org/10.2298/ZIPI0902331S

Srichai, P., Yodmongkol, P., Sureephong, P., & Meksamoot, K. (2013). Managing school safety in Thailand: Assessing the implications and potential of a lean thinking framework. *Sage Open*, *3*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244013489985

Tadić, V. (2022). O pristupima definisanju i operacionalizaciji pojma bezbednosti u školi. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, *71*(2), 249–266. https://doi.org/10.5937/nasvas2202249T

Tadić, V., & Kordić, B. (2024). Školska klima kao faktor bezbednosti u srednjim školama. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, *73*(1), 5–20. https://doi.org/10.5937/nasvas2401005T

Tanner-Smith, E. E., Fisher, B. W., Addington L. A., & Gardella. J. H. (2018). Adding security, but subtracting safety? Exploring schools' use of multiple visible security measures. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *43*(1), 102–119. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-017-9409-3

Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*(3), 357–385. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313483907

Theriot, M. T. (2016). The impact of school resource officer interaction on students' feelings about school and school police. *Crime & Delinquency*, *62*(4), 446–469. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128713503526

Thornberg, R., Wänström, L., Pozzoli, T., & Gini, G. (2017). Victim prevalence in bullying and its association with teacher–student and student–student relationships and class moral disengagement: a class-level path analysis. *Research Papers in Education*, *33*(3), 320–335. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2017.1302499

Tipler, K., Tarrant, R., Johnston, D., & Tuffin, K. (2017). Are you ready? Emergency preparedness in New Zealand schools. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, *25*, 324–333. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.09.035

Wang, M. T., & Degol, J. L. (2016). School climate: A review of the construct, measurement, and impact on student outcomes. *Educational Psychology Review*, *28*(2), 315–352. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9319-1

Wang, M. T., Selman, R. L., Dishion, T. J., & Stormshak, E. A. (2010). A Tobit regression analysis of the covariation between middle school students' perceived school climate and behavioral problems. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *20*, 274–286. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00648.x

Widowati, E., Koesyanto, H., Istiono, W., Sutomo, A. H., & Sugiharto. (2023). Disaster preparedness and safety school as a conceptual framework of comprehensive school safety. *Sage Open*, *13*(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231211209