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Reading the collaborative bibliography, I noticed many similarities between all that were posted. Programs in school set aside to improve relationships and school climate as a whole were seen to be the most effective ways to reduce school violence. Common misconceptions of reducing school violence come from enabling higher security measures and over all strict anti-violence policies. Despite the controversy as to what is right and what is wrong, each bibliography pointed out key elements as to what is the best tactic to diminish school violence, which will further be discussed.

Often times the programs that are concentrated around the worst-case scenario such as the Zero Tolerance Policy, are not the best strategies to use. Rather than decrease school violence, it simply stops the violence for seven hours of the day and causes the main source of elimination to gain strength and power. The same goes for security measures being taken place, such as metal detectors. These ideas make sense on a surface level, but not looking at the future impact of how it affects students. These strategies increase fear in the student body and are only a temporary solution to the problem. Students that are violent and have violent intentions will not be stopped from merely having those violent thoughts. In other words, it may stop the immediate action, but not the future action. A direct example would by my high school. The following year I left, the school board decided to made lanyards that every student had to wear throughout the whole day. To me, this seems more as a labeling system rather than giving a student an identity. The thing that students who are prone to perform a violent act are lacking, is an identity. Taking away their uniqueness and forcing them to wear a lanyard which can be also compared to the labeling system during the holocaust – extreme, is only going to make things worse in the long run. On the other hand, ways to not only stop the violent actions, but also intentions and thoughts are to implement programs that improve the school’s climate and atmosphere. I fully believe that focusing on the good outweighs the focusing on the bad. The way that I think about it is that if you increase the worth of someone, then their thoughts will alter, but if you simply take away their being, their thoughts and anger will be trapped and eventually detonate. Several bibliographies such as the article written by Barnes, Leite, and Smith as well as several others focused on the idea of altering the school climate. This not only allows the school to be a school, but also to be a community because what affects the school also affects the community and vice versa. Rather than the school feeling like a jail and every student on guard, I believe the school should be a welcoming place where students do not have a sense of fear that violence can strike at any moment. In the article I touched base on, it talked about implementing such programs to improve the climate within both the adults in the school building and the students. These programs were proven to reduce school violence which is exactly what this world needs.

A mass of strategies to prevent school violence were discussed. I only touched on a few, however, those few were the ones that I felt were the most imperative. More programs gearing towards the improvement of school climate is greatly needed whereas less barriers and sources of security that induce fear is not.