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The purpose of this study was to examine an abbreviated model of the Bully Busters Teacher Training Program (grades 6-8), paired with an added module designed to meet the needs of students with disabilities. The participants in this study were 14 teachers at a middle school in the Midwestern part of the United States. With regard to bullying prevention and intervention for all students – including those with disabilities -- teachers completed pre-test and post-test assessments evaluating their self-efficacy and expectations as related to successfully intervening in a bully victim conflict, knowledge and use of bullying interventions, and perceived frequency of bullying in the school setting. Data analyses revealed that teachers’ self-efficacy, expectations for student behavior, and knowledge and use of bullying interventions significantly increased following training. Comparisons with existing bullying literature and implications for practice are discussed.
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CHAPTER I
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In Chapter I, the author provides an outline of the nature of bullying in the schools, risk factors associated with bullying, and research-based strategies for prevention and intervention. Particular emphasis is placed upon statistics associated with bullying among students with disabilities and implications for anti-bullying initiatives addressing the needs of these students.

Next, the author provides an overview of comprehensive school-based bullying prevention programs that are frequently addressed within the bullying literature. These programs include The Peaceful Schools Project, The Steps to Respect Program, The Expect Respect Program, The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program, Bully Proofing Your School, and The Bully Busters Program. Following discussion of these programs, the author presents an argument for adding to the Bully Busters program as a means of addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities. Within this discussion, the author addresses previous research that has modified the Bully Busters program to meet a diverse range of priorities. The author concludes with a rationale for adding a module to the Bully Busters program. This module describes the elevated statistics for bullying among students with disabilities and includes literature-derived implications for prevention and intervention.

The Current Status of Bullying in Schools

Bullying is arguably the most common form of violence among students in schools (Hoover & Stenhjem, 2003; Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Swearer & Doll, 2001). Specifically, 20% to 30% of all students across the United States experience some form of bullying each year. This comprises over three million students who are victims of bullying, and one student being bullied at school about every seven minutes (Hoover & Stenhjem; National Center for Educational...
Statistics [NCES], 2012; STOMP Out Bullying, 2011). It is estimated that 36% of students are involved in a physical fight each year, and 6% admit to carrying a weapon with them to school (Center for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2006). Research suggests that bullying is an issue that is on the rise, as the percentage of students who reported being bullied at school has increased by over 25% since 2003 (NCES, 2012). The worst time for bullying and victimization tends to occur during the middle school years, as approximately 26% of students aged 11-15 report having been involved in bullying on a regular basis (CDC, 2011). Additional research suggests that seventh grade is typically the worst year for bullying, with a slight decline once students reach high school (Nansel et al., 2001; Olweus & Limber, 2010a).

Both bullies and victims alike are at heightened risk for numerous physical, mental, and social adversities including depression, anxiety, and low self-esteem (Swearer, Collins, Radcliff & Wang, 2011; Swearer et al., 2001). Research also has exposed a strong connection between bullying and school-based issues, including poor social development, chronic truancy, and unsatisfactory academic achievement (Dake, Price, & Telljohann, 2003; Olweus, 2003). In particular, it is estimated that 160,000 students miss school every day due to fear of being bullied (Bully Free, 2014). Unfortunately, many of these students neglect to report bullying due to feelings of shame, not wanting to worry parents, fear of retaliation, and anticipation that reporting will not lead to a resolution (Grills & Ollendick, 2002). Given these feelings of helplessness, it is not surprising that students involved in bullying are more likely to eventually drop out of school and tend to receive lower scores on standardized tests than students who are not involved in bullying (U. S. Department of Education Health and Human Services, n.d.). Perhaps the most devastating reports are those which suggest that bullying has been a variable in
nearly every school shooting since 1992 (Hoover & Stenhjem, 2003). Considering these bleak statistics and the detrimental effects to those involved, it remains critical that we continue to educate ourselves on the complex nature of bullying. It appears that only through examination of our current knowledge and search for new resolution, can we lessen the impact of bullying in our schools.

The Nature of Bullying

Bullying is a complex phenomenon that comes in many different forms. The literature describes bullying as a subset of aggression, which is considered a form of violence (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). The term aggression, as a form of violence, is used to describe behaviors that are generally less extreme, but are still intended to harm to others. Therefore, bullying as a subset of aggression entails intentional and unprovoked negative actions repetitively inflicted on an individual over an extended period of time. Bullying is also characterized by an imbalance of physical, psychological, or social power between a bully and a victim, where individuals identified as bullies carry out actions intended to cause distress to the victim (Olweus, 1993a; Olweus, 2003; Orpinas & Horne; Swearer, Espelage, & Napolitano, 2009; Swearer & Doll, 2002; Ttofi & Farrington, 2010). Given that bullying has become the most prevalent form of violence exhibited by children, it has increasingly become a more complex problem for schools, where children spend the majority of their waking hours (Whitted & Dupper, 2005).

As a form of aggression, bullying may take the form of a physical, verbal, or psychological behavior that is intended to cause harm to an individual (Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Swearer & Doll, 2003). Some research suggests that boys are more frequently involved in behaviors categorized as physical bullying, such as hitting, pushing, and kicking. Girls, on the
contrary, tend to report greater involvement in verbal and psychological bullying behaviors, a term that is often referred to as “relational aggression” (Jeffery, Miller & Linn, 2001; Leff, Kupersmidt, & Power, 2003). This particular type of bullying constitutes intentional harm via social status, and includes behaviors such as spreading rumors and threatening to leave an individual out of an activity (Leff, Power Costigan & Manz, 2003; Orpinas & Horne). Although these tendencies have been described in the literature, as with any form of violence and aggression, there are individuals who may bully in a way that may not be anticipated, given his or her gender. As previously discussed, bullying reaches its apex in middle school, and the most commonly reported type of bullying among this age group is verbal bullying (e.g., name-calling and teasing). This is followed by relationally aggressive acts, such as spreading rumors, and “leaving out”, while acts of physical bullying (e.g., hitting, kicking) are less frequently observed (Bradshaw, Sawyer, & O’Brennan, 2007). In addition to assuming multiple forms, bullying can occur in numerous locations, with most bullying instances unfolding on school grounds (Bradshaw et al.; Swearer & Doll). In particular, students have reported the highest number of bullying occurrences in the classroom (29.5%), hallways (29%), cafeteria (23%), bathrooms (12%) and on the playground (6%) (Bradshaw et al.). It appears that bullying often takes place in settings where there is limited adult supervision (i.e. hallways, cafeteria, and bathrooms; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011).

Given the diverse nature of bullying, it may be most comprehensively viewed as an ecological problem—a reciprocal interaction between the student and his or her peer group, school, family, and community (Swearer & Doll, 2002). Risk for bullying tends to be a result of an interaction between a student’s predisposition to be impulsive, aggressive, and antisocial, and
environmental constituents, such as modeled behaviors and demographic factors (Swearer & Doll). Because students spend approximately 6-9 hours per day in schools, school-based personnel may have great potential to influence bullying behavior (Dake et al., 2003; Espelage & Swearer, 2010; Swearer et al., 2009). Given that instances of bullying happen most frequently in the classroom, it is essential that teachers possess the knowledge within their classrooms to recognize and respond to bullying in an effective manner. Consequently, school-based bullying prevention should remain of high priority to educators, due to both its high prevalence as well as the detrimental effects to those involved.

When examining school-based bullying through an ecological perspective, it is clear that the school environment may play a large role in either encouraging or extinguishing bullying. In fact, development of a positive school climate may be the most important factor in influencing student behavior (Office of Special Education Programs, n.d.; Orpinas & Horne, 2006). Given this research, educators can examine aspects of their classrooms, including behavior management styles, rules and consequences, and their strategies for modeling kind and respectful behavior. When applying this to bullying prevention, educators may seek to foster an environment of peer support and an intolerance of bullying, through setting up concrete rules against bullying, teaching students caring behaviors, and delivering consistent reinforcement for promoting these behaviors (Office of Special Education Programs, n.d.; Orpinas & Horne).

Characteristics of Bullies, Victims, Bully-Victims, and Bystanders

Bullying is a complex issue, in which both students and adults can assume one or more roles at given points in time (Swearer et al., 2009; Swearer, Espelage, Vaillancourt, & Hymel, 2010). Most decidedly, individuals who act as “bullies,” behave as the perpetrator, while
individuals who act as “victims” serve as the target of bullying; however, research suggests that these roles may vacillate over time (Swearer et al., 2011). Some students may experience both victimization as well as perpetrate bullying. These students are referred to as “bully-victims”, or students who fall somewhere between a victim and a bully on the bullying continuum (Swearer et al., 2001; Swearer & Cary, 2003). An additional role in the bullying dynamic is that of the “bystander.” These students identify themselves as outsiders in bullying situations, often observing the bullying incident without actively taking part (Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Swearer & Doll, 2002). Although the literature addresses definitive roles that individuals can assume within bullying, it is important to bear in mind that these roles can vary over time and across situation (Swearer et al., 2011). Yet, in an effort to provide a more thorough review of these differences, the following paragraphs briefly review of the literature regarding particular characteristics of bullies, victims, bully victims, and bystanders.

**Bullies**

In their guide to bully prevention, Orpinas and Horne (2006) argued that students who bully others can be most generally categorized into three types: “aggressive bullies,” “followers,” and ”relational bullies.” The ”aggressive bully” engages in overt physical and verbal aggression. These students tend to displace responsibility for their aggression on other children and lack responsibility for their behaviors (Orpinas & Horne). Although many “aggressive bullies” may lack the ability to understand the effect of their behaviors on the feelings of others, some have high levels of self-esteem and may use bullying as a tactic for reinforcing their feelings of superiority (Gini, 2006; Horne & Socherman, 1996; Johnson et al., 2002; Orpinas & Horne). The second bully profile, the “follower,” does not usually instigate the bullying incident, but serve as
an assistant to an “aggressive bully” (Orpinas & Horne). Contrary to “aggressive bullies,” “followers” are likely to have low self-esteem, and may use affirmation from bullying as a means of increasing their feelings of self-worth (Orpinas & Horne). The “relational bully” uses covert, relational aggressive tactics to manipulate other students (Leff et al., 2003; Orpinas & Horne). Again, although these students may be socially skilled, many lack an alternative outlet for increasing their self-esteem. While these categories may be helpful in terms of describing the types of bullies that have been observed in the literature, bullies differ in terms of how they present (i.e., there is no such thing as a “bully profile” or “typical bully”) and the role they play in bullying (Swearer, et al., 2009).

The extant literature has described many troublesome characteristics associated with the role of bullying. For example, Swearer and colleagues (2001, 2010) have reported that bullying is associated with higher levels of depression and anxiety, as well as poor academic achievement. Specifically, students who bully others tend to have less positive peer relationships which, in turn, is correlated with greater presence of depression and anxiety disorders (Craig, 1998; Swearer et al., 2001). Bullying other students is also associated with greater risk for low academic achievement, which may be due to lack of positive relational skills (Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Swearer et al., 2010). Finally, students who bully others are also at a greater risk for substance abuse and violence-related issues, which may result in involvement in the legal system (Howard, Horne, and Jolliff, 2001; STOMP Out Bullying, 2011).

Victims

As there are different bully profiles, Orpinas and Horne (2006) suggested that victims tend to fall into three categories that may increase their likelihood of victimization. The first type
is the “passive victim.” These students do nothing to elicit the bullying and are often targeted for being different. Such differences include, but are not limited to, lack of social and communication skills, physical anomalies, ethnic minority status, and being younger than same-grade peers (Ma, 2002; Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Swearer et al., 2012). Conversely, “provocative victims” tend to provoke the bully, through pestilent behaviors or interactions. These students often lack appropriate social strategies to engage with peers, and resort to provocation as means of seeking attention (Orpinas & Horne). The final type of victim is the target of relational aggression. These students are victimized for various reasons including jealousy, power, inability to deflect conflicts, and the appearance of vulnerability (Leff, 2007; Orpinas & Horne).

Similar to students who bully others, being a victim of bullying is associated with many negative effects including higher levels of depression and anxiety and low academic achievement (Craig, 1998; Swearer et al., 2001; 2010). Specifically, victims of bullying tend to have lower grade point averages (GPAs) and standardized test scores, and are more likely to drop out of school (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d; Swearer et al., 2010). Victims of bullying also exhibit higher levels of both depression and anxiety than both bullies and non-victims, which may be associated with their risk for dropping out of school (Craig; Swearer et al., 2001).

It is important to note that a common characteristic typically held by all three of Orpinas and Horne’s (2006) victim types is lack of developmentally appropriate social skills. Multiple studies have observed more prevalent social skills problems for victims of bullying than for non-victims (Fox & Boulton, 2005; Gini, 2006; Horne & Socherman, 1996; Johnson et al., 2002). Gini (2006) found that victims of bullying exhibited greater difficulties in a social cognition task
as compared to their peers who were not involved in bullying. Bullies did not demonstrate these difficulties. This finding suggests that victims may experience cognitive deficits in interpreting other students’ behaviors and responding in an appropriate manner. Due to these social inadequacies, teachers may play an instrumental role in educating victims of strategies to recognize and respond to bullying.

**Bully-Victims**

As discussed within the first paragraph of this section (e.g., Swearer et al., 2001), many students involved in bullying fluctuate between their role as a bully and their role as a victim. These "bully-victims" may experience even more pronounced social-emotional and behavioral difficulties than students who are only identified as bullies or victims (Jimerson, Morrison, Pletcher, & Furlong, 2006; Swearer et al., 2001). Specifically, “bully-victims” are at greater risk for depression and anxiety than all other groups of students (Swearer et al., 2001). Additionally, these students tend to exhibit higher levels of aggression, less frequent use of prosocial skills, and less behavioral control than students who identify only as bullies or victims (Jimerson et al., 2006). These students also tend to experience greater levels of social rejection, which may be the greatest predictive factor for involvement in bullying and victimization from primary school to secondary school (Schäfer et al., 2005). Due to the multiple challenges “bully-victim” students may face, responding to the needs of these students may be the greatest charge with respect to bullying prevention.

**Bystanders**

The final role described in the bullying dynamic is the "bystander." As described within the previous roles, Orpinas and Horne (2006) argue that “bystanders” may be categorized into
two different types, one which is part of the problem and one which is part of the solution. The first type of “bystander” contributes to the problem of bullying by indirectly perpetuating the incident by either enticing the bully or observing the situation. These students, particularly the silent observers, often do not possess the skills or knowledge to effectively respond and may greatly benefit from bullying prevention training. The second type of “bystander” attempts to quell the bullying incident by either soliciting assistance, or defending the victim (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). Unfortunately, this type of “bystander” may be much less frequent. It is estimated that 85% of bullying episodes have bystanders present, yet in only 10% of these “bystanders” intervened in an effort to stop the bullying due to self-reported fears that they will become the bully’s next victim (Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Olweus, 1993a).

**Implications Associated with Roles in Bullying**

It is clear that bullying results in an adverse impact for all students involved—bullies, victims, bully-victims, and bystander alike. Specifically, bullies, victims and bully-victims tend to have lower levels of support from parents, teachers, and peers than other students, (Demaray, Malecki, & Furlong, 2006), yet these students are also the students with the highest frequencies of internalizing disorders such as depression, anxiety, and aggression (Swearer et al., 2001; 2011). These low levels of support, paired with high levels of internalizing disorders, underscore the need for adult support within our schools. It may therefore be of paramount importance to train school staff to intervene to prevent involvement in bullying for all students.

In attempting to reduce bullying, it may be particularly important to recognize the inherent characteristics that may cause victims to be perceived as vulnerable to bullies, as well as place bullies at risk for antisocial behavior (Leff, 2007; Rigby, 2006). Furthermore, there may be
particular physical and personality traits that predispose a student to become involved in the bullying dynamic (Felix & You, 2011; Rigby; Swearer et al., 2009). For example, reports have suggested that students of color (e.g., African American, Hispanic, Arab American, and Native American students) are more frequently victimized than students who are White (Bridging Refugee Youth & Children's Services, n.d.; Felix & You; Islamic Networks Group, 2011). Furthermore, over 80% of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered, Questioning, Intersex or Asexual (LGBTQIA) students reported being bullied both verbally and physically because of their sexual orientation (Gay, Lesbian, & Straight Education Network, 2012). Students with disabilities are two to three times more likely to be involved in bullying than their non-disabled peers (Rose, Espelage, Aragon, & Elliott, 2011; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2012).

Rose (2011a) argued that a majority of bullying research accounts for differences in age and gender, but had failed to include implications for students of diverse nature with regard to cultural, gender, or ability status. This gap in the literature is quite surprising, considering that students with disabilities, including students with academic, behavioral, and physical deficits are at greater risk for bullying and victimization than their typically functioning peers (Rose, 2011a; Rose et al., 2011; Swearer et al., 2012). Although multiple surveys examining violence and bullying exist, most of them fail to distinguish between groups of students representing diverse backgrounds (e.g., LGBTQIA students, students with disabilities). This places educators at a need to examine the literature that regarding minority status and involvement in bullying.
Bullying and Victimization among Students with Disabilities

As compared to students without disabilities, students with disabilities tend to engage in fewer prosocial behaviors and interactions, which may serve as significant risk factors for involvement in the bullying continuum (Jimerson et al., 2006; Martlew & Hodson, 1991; Mishna, 2003; Rose, 2011b; Swearer et al., 2012). In a study of classroom social structure, Specht and colleagues (2011) reported that students with disabilities engaged in more negative roles, such as the “victim” and the “bully,” while students without disabilities engaged in more positive roles, such as the “nurturer” and “friend.” Within this content analysis of interviews, “victim” was defined as those students who are “either purposely ignored or is a target of verbal and physical abuse and is either oversensitive or has anti-social behaviors”. “Bully” was defined as one who “focuses aggressive actions on one child (or small group), is physically or verbally abusive, intimidates others, and uses force to achieve desired outcome” (pp. 9). On the contrary, the more positive role of the “nurturer” was defined as a student who “takes on the role of “mother” with the younger students,” and the “friend” as the student who “socializes often, is active member in a social group of friends, and has lots of friends/acquaintances” (pp. 9).

Given these perceptions, it is not surprising that students with disabilities, in general, may be at heightened risk to become bullies, victims, or bully-victims, and therefore report greater rates of both bullying and victimization than students without disabilities (Doren, Bullis & Benz, 1996; Rose, 2011a; Rose, Espelage, & Monda-Amaya, 2009; Swearer et al., 2012). It is estimated that somewhere between 20 and 30 percent of students with academic, behavioral, and physical disabilities are victims of bullying, as opposed to 10% of students without disabilities (Blake et al., 2012; Rose et al., 2011). Earlier research, however, suggested that approximately
66% of students with disabilities reported being bullied by peers, while only 25% of their peers without disabilities reported bullying (Thompson, Whitney & Smith, 1994). In addition to victimization, students with disabilities may be more likely to be perpetrators of bullying (Swearer et al., 2010). Research has suggested that approximately 14% of students with disabilities are identified as bullies, as opposed to 10% of students without disabilities. Furthermore, approximately 16% of students with disabilities engage in physical bullying, as opposed to 12% of students without disabilities (Rose et al., 2011). This is particularly evident for students in elementary and middle school (Blake et al.; Rose et al., 2009). Studies have suggested that students who are initially victims of bullying may develop a reciprocal bully-victim status as a coping mechanism to deal with initial victimization. This may be particularly true for students with disabilities, due to increased risk that they will experience victimization (Rose, 2011a; Swearer et al., 2010).

Risk for students with disabilities to become involved in bullying is not affected by disability status alone, but by additional mediating factors including their educational placement, classroom structure, and specific type of disability (Cummings, Peplar, Mishna & Craig, 2006; Doren et al., 1996; Rose et al., 2009; Rose et al., 2012). As such, examining these factors may be particularly relevant when seeking to address the heightened risk that students with disabilities have for involvement in bullying. The following sections explore these factors in further detail in an effort to provide a greater explanation of their ability to influence how students with disabilities fare with regard to bullying.
The Influence of Educational Placement and Classroom Structure

As indicated above, bully and victim status among students with disabilities may be mediated by environmental factors, particularly a student’s educational placement (Doren et al., 1996; Norwich & Kelly, 2004). Students with disabilities who are placed in secluded or self-contained classrooms tend to report higher levels of both victimization and bullying as compared to students with disabilities in more inclusive settings (Doren et al.; Norwich & Kelly; O'Moore & Hillery, 1989; Rose et al., 2009; Santich, & Kavanagh, 1997). This notion is not surprising given that students with disabilities who are more frequently integrated with their typical peers tend to have more developed social skills and positive perceptions by peers than those who are less frequently integrated (Santich, & Kavanagh). This is an important consideration when seeking to address bullying among students with disabilities. When students with disabilities are given more opportunities to engage with peers they may, in turn, have more opportunities to develop prosocial skills through both peer observation and engagement in positive interaction. Students with disabilities who are perceived more positively by their peers also tend to fare better in terms of victimization (Robert & Lindsell, 1997). This is also an important consideration, as one can extrapolate that when students with disabilities are given more time with typical peers to develop prosocial skills, they may, as a result be more positively received by peers. This may further decrease the likelihood for involvement in bullying.

Additional research suggests that teachers tend to have more positive feelings toward students with disabilities in inclusive settings than students with disabilities in secluded settings (Martlew & Hodson, 1991). This notion can greatly influence the bullying dynamic in the classroom, as teachers’ perceptions and expectations can greatly shape their students’ academic
achievement and behavior in a way that matches their expectations (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). A caveat to the idea that students with disabilities tend to fare better in settings that are more inclusive is research that has suggested that students with disabilities also tend to experience greater victimization in mainstream settings when compared to special schools (i.e., schools designed for their particular disability) (Cook, & Semmel, 1999). This, however, is not surprising given that membership in a minority group is highly related to the likelihood that a student will experience victimization (Felix & You, 2011). This does not diminish the promise that more inclusive placement has to decrease bullying among students with disabilities, particularly in mainstream education.

Finally, all students tend to experience a lower risk for victimization and bullying in classrooms where teachers have a more democratic (egalitarian) approach to behavioral management than in classrooms with a more authoritarian (hierarchical) approach (Ahn, Garandeau & Rodkin, 2010). Furthermore, research has suggested that all students tend to experience greater success in classrooms with low student to teacher ratios as compared to classrooms with high student to teacher ratios (Ahn et al., 2010). These notions clearly implicate the role that teachers can play in reducing bullying, suggesting that when teachers employ effective behavior management strategies and are better equipped to manage their classrooms (i.e., low students to teacher ratios), their students, regardless of ability level, may be less likely to engage in bullying behavior.

Due to the impact that classroom placement and structure may have on the bullying trajectories of students with disabilities, it is imperative that teachers recognize the importance of these factors when responding to bullying incidents and working toward bullying prevention
through positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS). Teachers must understand the importance of modeling inclusive practices in their classroom, as well as attempting to dispel inaccurate perceptions of students with disabilities (Lindsay & McPherson, 2012; Martlew & Hodson, 1991; Swearer et al., 2010). Teachers may also recognize the advantage inclusive practices have on the development of prosocial skills among students with disabilities. They may use this as a vehicle for practice and acquisition of new skills, thus decreasing the likelihood that these students will be involved in bullying (Mishna, 2003; Santich, & Kavanagh, 1997; Swearer et al., 2010).

**The Influence of Disability Type**

In addition to understanding the school-based environmental factors that can place students with disabilities at increased risk for victimization and bullying, it is important to recognize the influence of the characteristic differences between subgroups of students with disabilities, and the effect these characteristics may have on involvement in bullying (Rose & Espelage, 2012). In reviewing the extant literature with regard to examining how disability type may influence student involvement in bullying, multiple models have been used to differentiate among groups of students with different types of disabilities. For example, Swearer and colleagues (2012) examined bullying/victimization differences among students with disabilities across the categories of “observable disabilities,” “non-observable disabilities,” and “behavioral disabilities.” The “observable disabilities” category included students with cerebral palsy, speech language impairment, hearing impairment, and cognitive impairment. The “non-observable disabilities” category included students with specific learning disabilities. Finally, the “behavioral
disabilities” included students with behavioral disorders and those who were educationally identified as Other Health Impaired (OHI) (Swearer et al., 2012).

In another study examining this particular variable with regard to bullying, Cummings and colleagues (2006) classified students with disabilities into to the four categories of “physical disabilities,” “intellectual disabilities,” “learning disabilities,” and “emotional disabilities.” The “physical disabilities” category included students with mobility, sight, communicative, and hearing disorders. The “intellectual disabilities” category included students with cognitive or developmental disabilities. The “learning disabilities” category was designated for students identified with any specific learning disability. Finally, the “emotional disabilities” category included students with anxiety disorder, Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), conduct disorder, and depressive disorders (Cummings et al., 2006). This classification system differed from that of Swearer and colleagues (2012) with respect to the separation of ADHD from other conditions addressed under OHI (e.g., epilepsy, asthma, diabetes). Given that students with ADHD and students with OHI tend to experience distinct involvement in the bullying dynamic, it may be helpful to discuss them with regard to how they are represented within the literature, as opposed to conforming them to a predefined label.

For this purpose, the related literature was classified into the four-category model outlined above by Cummings and colleagues (2006). Therefore, the following sub-categories were used to elaborate on the experiential group differences within the bullying dynamic: (a) “physical disabilities” including students with asthma, allergies, diabetes, hemiplegia, epilepsy, cerebral palsy, language impairments, and students who stutter; (b) “intellectual disabilities” including students with cognitive delay, and students with developmental disabilities such as
Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD); (c) “emotional disabilities” including students with ADHD and depressive disorders; and (e) “learning disabilities” including all specific learning disabilities.

**Physical disabilities.** Students with physical disabilities such as asthma, diabetes, food allergies, vision and/or hearing impairments, epilepsy, and cerebral palsy report heightened levels of victimization—that is, approximately 45%, compared to 13% of peers without physical disabilities (Dawkins, 1996; Nadeau & Tessier, 2009; Sweeting & West, 2001; Yude, Goodman, & McConachie, 1998). These students tend to experience frequent absences and physician visits, which are associated with reduced class time and decreased time spent bonding with peers (Shaw & McCabe, 2008). Given this lost time developing prosocial skills and peer connections, it is not surprising that students with physical disabilities may be more likely to experience bullying than their non-disabled peers (Graetz & Shute, 1995; Lieberman, Weiss, Furlong, Sicherer, & Sicherer, 2010; Storch et al., 2004; Sweeting & West). It has been hypothesized in the literature that social status may develop through peer connections is an important variable with regard to anticipating involvement in bullying (e.g. students with lower social status tend to be more likely to be victimized) (Pellegrini et al., 2010; Swearer et al., 2009).

Victimization statistics among students with asthma are relatively similar to those of students without disabilities. However, sociometric measures from peers suggest that students with asthma are less preferred as playmates and perceived as more isolated from peers. This has been identified as an important variable to consider as related to involvement in bullying (Graetz & Shute, 1995). Additionally, students with Type I diabetes report higher rates of relational victimization than their peers, which may be related to the strict medical regimen imposed by this particular condition (Storch et al., 2004). Students with visual impairments report greater
feelings of isolation and difficulties making friends, which may be due to feelings of a social disconnection with their peers (Huurre & Aro, 1998). Possibly the most concerning finding among students with physical disabilities are reports that have suggested that 79% of students with food allergies experience bullying perceived to be directly related to their allergy (Lieberman et al., 2010). Specifically, many of these students described physical bullying, such as having an allergen thrown at them or intentional contamination of their food with allergen. Even more surprising are reports that suggest that 21% of bullies were actually teachers or school staff, while the remaining 79% were classmates (Lieberman et al.).

While the disabilities described above are physical in nature, research suggests that students whose disabilities are highly visible to others may be at an even greater risk for being bullied than those disabilities that are not as apparent (Dawkins, 1996; Rigby, 2006; Swearer et al., 2009). Specifically, students with highly visible disabilities such as cerebral palsy, spina bifida, epilepsy, and language impairments (e.g., stuttering) report heightened levels of victimization (45%), as compared to peers (13%) without visible disabilities (Dawkins; Knox & Conti-Ramsden, 2003; Nadeau & Tessier, 2009; Yude et al., 1998). Students with highly visible disabilities not only possess physical and language barriers, but also experience negative attitudes and stereotypes related their illness. For example, students with visible disabilities such as cerebral palsy and spina bifida report both verbal name-calling and physical bullying related to their illness, including being pushed out of their wheelchair and extreme social isolation from peers (Dawkins; Nadeau & Tessier; Pivik, McComas, & LaFlamme, 2002). Additionally, one study found that 71% of students with epilepsy report being bullied and teased about having seizures at school (Wilde & Haslam, 1996).
Nearly half of students with Language-Communication Disorders (LCD) report greater experiencing regular teasing related to their communication difficulties (Hugh-Jones & Smith, 1999; Knox & Conti-Ramsden, 2003; Savage, 2005). Sociometric measures have suggested that students with LCD are more likely to receive peer nominations as victims of bullying and less likely to receive nominations as class leaders than their peers (Davis, Howell & Cooke, 2002). Additional observational data suggest that students with LCD spend significantly less time interacting with peers and exhibit more withdrawn behaviors, which may be due to impairment-related embarrassment (Fujiki, Brinton, Isaacson, & Summers, 2001; Langevin, Packman & Onslow, 2010).

Mediating factors affecting the severity of victimization among students with physical disabilities include number of friends, presence of associated academic deficiencies, age of disability onset, and severity of disability (Dawkins, 1996; Hamiwka et al., 2009). Interestingly, although students with physical disabilities are at risk for victimization, they are not necessarily at a higher risk for perpetration of bullying when compared to peers. In fact, peer reports have suggested that students with physical disabilities are actually less frequently involved in perpetration of bullying than their peers (6% of students with visible disabilities compared to 17% of peers) (Yude et al., 1998). Interestingly, only 50% of parents and teachers reported being aware of the bullying of these students, which may have been due to greater passiveness and lack of prosocial skills in situations involving peer confrontation (Hugh-Jones & Smith, 1999). This passivity should not be confused with indifference, as students with physical disabilities reported feelings of low self-esteem and depression. This depression was believed to be a result of the bullying they experienced because of their impairment (Davis, Howell & Cooke, 2002).
**Intellectual Disabilities.** Students with intellectual disabilities such as cognitive delay or developmental disability (i.e., ASD) may be at a high risk for victimization due to deficits in communication skills and difficulties thriving in social situations, as these variables have been identified as predictors of victimization (Chen, & Schwartz, 2012; Cummings et al., 2006; Sofronoff, Dark & Stone, 2011; Twyman et al., 2010). Unfortunately, there is much less research in the specific area of bullying and victimization as related to students with cognitive and/or developmental disabilities (Cummings et al.). One explanation for this discrepancy could be the recent interest in both bullying and ASD within the media. Regardless of the justification, the intellectual and social processing deficits faced by these students, often predispose them to involvement in the bullying dynamic (Sofronoff et al.).

Among students with cognitive disabilities, research has suggested that these students may be more likely to be both victims and bullies than their typically developing peers (Reiter & Lapidot-Lefler, 2007; Sheard, Sheard, Clegg, Standen & Cromby, 2001). However, this involvement as a victim, bully, or bully-victim may be mediated by additional behavioral variables. For example, students with cognitive disabilities who are identified by peers and teachers as bullies or bully-victims tend to exhibit higher levels of challenging behaviors such as hyperactivity, tantrums, and lying. Correspondingly, students with cognitive disabilities who are identified as victims of bullying are generally more likely to display emotional issues including depression and low self-esteem (Reiter & Lapidot-Lefler; Sheard et al., 2001).

As previously addressed, there is a much greater body of literature regarding bullying among students with developmental disabilities such as ASD than students with cognitive disabilities. Students with developmental disabilities may spend more time alone on the
playground to avoid high noise and activity levels. This may place them at a disadvantage in developing friendships and predispose them to be a target for bullying (Attwood, 2007; Chamberlain, Kasari & Rotheram-Fuller, 2007). In addition to ostracism, students with ASD may exhibit atypical interests and behaviors, which may further set them up as a target for bullying (Cappadocia, Weiss, & Pepler, 2012; Twyman et al., 2010).

Due to the multiple social skills deficits associated with ASD, these students tend to experience the highest levels of victimization when compared to students with emotional disabilities and students with physical disabilities (Sofronoff et al., 2011; Twyman et al, 2010). Specific reports of victimization among students with ASD range from 46% to 94%; however, these variations may be due to the diversity of respondents including self-reports, parents, peers, and teachers (Carter, 2009; Little, 2002; Twyman et al.; Van Roekel, Scholte & Didden, 2010). Of students with ASD involved in bullying, research suggests that 46 to 94% are considered victims, 9 to 36% are considered bully-victims, and 14% are considered bullies (Chen, & Schwartz, 2012; Sterzing, Shattuck, Narendorf, Wagner & Cooper, 2012). These statistics suggest that students with ASD are much less likely to bully other students than they are to experience victimization. However, given that students often use bullying as a means of self-affirmation and social ingratiation, students with limited social intelligence may be likely to use bullying as a mechanism for acceptance (Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Sofronoff et al.).

Of the 46% to 94% of students with ASD who are victimized, many of them experience physical victimization. Specifically, 47% of students with ASD report being hit by peers or siblings and 15% report being sexually assaulted (Carter, 2009; Chen & Schwartz, 2012; Little, 2002). Unfortunately, these numbers may be highly under representative of the true population
of students with ASD who experience a form of victimization. Due to difficulties interpreting social interactions, students with ASD may be less likely to report victimization as they may consider such behavior to be typical play and therefore misinterpret bullying situations as non-bullying (Van Roekel et al., 2010).

**Emotional disabilities.** Students with emotional and behavioral disabilities such as ADHD, conduct disorder, and mental health disorders are frequently involved in the disciplinary system due to difficulties negotiating needs, complying with rules, respecting authority, and regulating behavior (Jimerson et al., 2006; Rose & Espelage, 2012). These students are likely to exhibit unique bully-victim complexes, which may be due to the nature and severity of their disability (Doren et al., 1996). In particular, approximately 25% of students with emotional disabilities report being victims of bullying, while nearly the same proportion report being bullies (Kumpulainen, Räsänen, & Puura, 2001; Unnever & Cornell, 2003; Wiener & Mak, 2009). Furthermore, students with emotional disabilities tend to engage in higher levels of bullying perpetration and physical aggression than students with other types of disabilities (Rose & Espelage). This may be attributed to the notion that students who are prone to moral disengagement and lack of empathy are also more likely to justify their use of aggressive behavior (Gini, 2006). Therefore, students who have difficulties understanding the consequences associated with their actions may be more prone to engage in antisocial behaviors.

Bullying and victimization reports among students with emotional disabilities may be highly dependent on the source, as self-reports and teacher reports yield significant variation. Specifically, students with emotional disabilities tend to report greater rates of peer victimization, while their teachers tend to report greater rates of bullying (Weiner & Mak, 2009).
It is also important to note that these statistics are highly variable according to student gender and severity of condition. For example, boys tend to be at higher risk for involvement in interdependent bully-victim issues than girls, and more highly developed social skills tend to be associated with decreased victimization (Kumpulainen et al., 2001; Weiner & Mak). Additional moderating factors include presence of an appropriate medication regimen and student physical size (Unnever & Cornell, 2003).

**Learning disabilities.** Students with specific learning disabilities may experience similar bullying trajectories as students with emotional disabilities, since both groups tend to have heightened risk for bully-victim issues (Kaukiainen et al., 2002; Swearer et al., 2010; Whitney, Nabuzoka & Smith, 1992). Reports of victimization and bullying are comparable between students with learning disabilities and students with emotional disabilities, as approximately 22% of students with learning disabilities are identified as bullies, and 33% are identified as victims (Whitney et al., 1992). Many students with learning disabilities report victimization directly related to their learning disability, as well as their participation in remedial or special education classes (O’Moore & Hillery, 1989; Singer, 2005). Sociometric measures completed by teachers and peers have suggested that students with learning disabilities are more likely to be nominated as “rejected,” “victims of bullying,” and “unpopular,” and are less likely to be nominated as “cooperative,” or as “class leaders” than their peers (Kuhne & Wiener, 2000; Nabuzoka, 2003; Nabuzoka & Smith).

Differing from students with emotional disabilities, students with learning disabilities are at an equally high risk for perpetration of bullying (Whitney et al., 1992). However, similar to students with emotional disabilities, it is argued that a primary factor that predicts the likelihood
that students with learning disabilities will become bullies is their level of social competency (Kaukiainen et al., 2002; Swearer et al., 2010). It is reported that students with learning disabilities who possess greater social competence may be less likely to be victims of bullying and more likely to be bullies; however, students with learning disabilities with extremely low social competence may also be more likely to bully others (Kaukiainen et al.). Specifically, Gini (2006) found that bullies tended to perform well on social cognition tasks. This was confirmed by Kaukiainen and colleagues (2002) when they examined students with learning disabilities. These findings suggest that students with learning disabilities may be at a higher risk for bullying others due to greater social intelligence (ability to manipulate others), or very poor social intelligence. Students with disabilities with poor social intelligence were reported to have inadequate strategies for navigating social situations, and instead simply observed and repeated the behaviors of others (i.e., mimicked other students) (Gini, 2006; Kaukiainen et al.).

**Implications for Prevention and Intervention**

Due to the multiple bully-victim experiences students with disabilities face, it is critical that school personnel are equipped with the knowledge to respond in a meaningful way. Many instances of bullying and victimization occur at school; therefore, school-based bullying interventions should be of high priority to educators (Bradshaw et al., 2007; Swearer & Espelage, 2010). It is estimated that over two-thirds of students believe that schools respond inefficiently to bullying (Hoover & Stenhjem, 2003). It has also been observed in the literature that in order to improve these attitudes, schools may implement bullying prevention initiatives on a systemic level, through providing education to staff, and responding to students through a continuum of services (Beane, 2009; Dake et al., 2003; Olweus, 2003; Rahey & Criag, 2002;
Stevens, De Bourdeaudhuij & Van Oost, 2000; Swearer et al., 2009). This approach addresses the needs of all students, while also considering the risk factors that may predispose students to require additional targeted and intensive supports. These prevention and intervention efforts should consider group and individual characteristics that may place students at risk for bullying and victimization (Felix & You, 2011).

Unfortunately, most bullying prevention programs do not address group-based risk factors such as those experienced by students from diverse cultural backgrounds, students with disabilities, and students who identify as LGBTQIA (Raskauskas & Modell, 2011; Swearer et al., 2010). Consequently, teachers have reported wanting more anti-bullying programs to include training related to diverse student characteristics in an effort to respond appropriately to the unique needs of these students (Bradshaw, Waasdorp, & O’Brennan, 2013). The U.S. Department of Education (2000) provided modest suggestions for preventing bullying among students with disabilities, including providing awareness of frequencies of bullying and victimization among students with disabilities to staff and students, and modifying existing bullying programs to include students with disabilities (U.S. Department of Education, 2000).

Additionally, students with disabilities have described various strategies to help decrease disability-related bullying. These include providing accurate information about disabilities, and increasing teacher awareness of bullying among students with disabilities (Lindsay & McPherson, 2012). It is also recommended that teachers seek to validate the strengths of these students, build prosocial skills and self-confidence, and reinforce their ability to overcome weaknesses. In addition to facilitating these efforts, teachers can also model behavior that
emphasizes equality and acceptance (Cummings et al., 2006; Lindsay & McPherson; Raskauskas & Modell, 2011; Swearer et al., 2012).

Schools can also make environmental changes, such as increasing supervision during classroom changes and designing structured activities at recess to include students with disabilities (Swearer & Doll, 2002). Teachers can also strive to facilitate a classroom structure that discourages social isolation (Swearer & Doll). For example, teachers may construct assigned seating in classrooms, as well assigning students to groups instead of allowing them to choose to ensure inclusion of students with disabilities (Cappadocia et al., 2012). Teachers can also encourage bystanders to report bullying incidents, and enlist students without disabilities to help students with disabilities successfully navigate social situations (Attwood, 2007; Doll, Song, Champion, & Jones, 2011; Swearer & Doll). As previously discussed, students with disabilities may be more prone to bullying behaviors than their peers due to poor acquisition of prosocial skills (Swearer et al., 2012). Therefore, it may be particularly important for teachers to promote positive social behavior among these students in an effort to decrease their involvement in bullying. Teachers can promote these behaviors through providing opportunities for positive peer interaction and reinforcing instances of prosocial behavior.

In summary, bullying prevention programs that encourage schools to promote a universal understanding of disabilities may have the greatest capabilities to decrease victimization among these students (Savage, 2005; Swearer et al., 2010). Therefore, it may be important for bullying prevention programs to address factors pertaining to student diversity, and more specifically factors affecting students with disabilities. To address these differences, training needs to begin
with the adults in the schools. Teachers are the frontline personnel involved in working with students, they may be the strongest treatment agents with respect to bullying prevention efforts.

**The Role of School Psychologists in Enhancing Teacher Training**

School psychologists are specifically trained to understand individual differences and to demonstrate the sensitivity needed to work with diverse individuals, as well as understand the inner workings of the school system and how various policies affect students with unique needs (National Association of School Psychologists [NASP], 2010). To respond to teacher desire for more school-based anti-bullying programs that include training related to diverse student characteristics, school psychologists may be the ideal members of the school community to facilitate these efforts (Bradshaw et al., 2013). School psychologists may serve as a primary resource to teachers for accessing accurate information and implications associated with bullying among students with diverse needs (i.e., students with disabilities). Exposing teachers to accurate information about bullying and victimization among students with disabilities may decrease the perceived burden of many disabilities on teachers, particularly those disabilities with which they may have less experience. Through first addressing the specific needs of students with disabilities among teachers, bullying and victimization among students with disabilities may be improved from a culture of unpreparedness to one of competence and understanding.

**Current School-Based Bullying Prevention Efforts**

Although bullying is a widely discussed epidemic, school staff members tend to underestimate the number of students involved in bullying (Sawyer et al., 2007). This may be due to multiple factors, including whether the type of bullying they most frequently observe is verbal or physical, as well as their personal beliefs about bullying (Holt, Keyes, & Koenig, 2011;
Unfortunately, over one quarter of teachers believe that verbal bullying is a part of “normal” social development (i.e., they view it as acceptable behavior for the school setting) (Holt et al., 2011; Hoover & Stenhjem; Kochenderfer-Ladd, & Pelletier). In addition, teachers are more likely to report and respond to incidents of physical bullying, rather than verbal or relational bullying (Yoon, & Kerber). Therefore, it is not surprising that almost half of students who experience bullying do not report it to their teacher, due to beliefs that they will not respond in an effective manner (Sawyer et al., 2007). These reports bolster the need for improved bullying prevention efforts at the universal level. As previously discussed, it may be most beneficial to view bullying as a social-ecological issue that is influenced by multiple systems including individual student characteristics, schools, families, and communities (Swearer & Doll, 2002; Rose, 2011b). Therefore, it is important for schools to consider individual student characteristics, as well as greater school-based and community characteristics when implementing school-based prevention efforts (Hazler & Carney, 2006; Swearer et al., 2010).

Meta analyses have revealed that school-based bullying intervention programs have the potential ability to promote average decreases in bullying by 20-23% and decreases in victimization by 17-20% (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). Results of meta analyses and research reviews also indicate that bullying and victimization are more likely to decrease when a universal anti-bullying approach is used. This comprehensive approach consists of multiple evidence-based components, including systematic bullying assessment, identification of a bullying prevention leadership team, provision of extensive staff training, fostering collaboration between the home and school environments, development of concrete anti-bullying policies, encouraging
discussions of bullying among all students, and providing targeted intervention to bullies and victims (Beane, 2009; Dake et al., 2003; Limber, 2011; Olweus, 2003; Rigby, 2006; Swearer et al., 2009; Ttofi & Farrington). Although the components of a comprehensive anti-bullying approach may yield improvements in bullying and victimization, these efforts must also strive to identify and address the intra-individual issues that make a student more susceptible to bullying and/or victimization (Swearer & Doll, 2002; Swearer et al., 2012). For example, schools must explore how to address bullying prevention efforts related to a diverse body of students through providing awareness to staff regarding their unique needs. Specifically, teachers must possess a greater understanding of the different ways students with disabilities respond to bullying in order to address it in a way that is meaningful to them. Through addressing these issues, stakeholders involved in bullying prevention efforts may develop a more thorough understanding of individual involvement in bullying, which may provide additional implications for prevention and intervention strategies.

As indicated above, an important feature of effective anti-bullying programs is fostering adult support of prevention through the provision of staff training (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). Teachers may be the most important targets for bullying prevention training, as they are more likely to witness bullying incidents than other school-based professionals (Bradshaw et al., 2013). Interventions that enhance teachers’ skills in recognizing and responding to bullying may be particularly effective. Specifically, teachers with greater feelings of self-efficacy for handling bullying situations are more likely to intervene in bullying incidents, as well as to successfully dissolve the situation (Bradshaw et al., 2007; Howard et al., 2001). Furthermore, when teachers regularly respond to bullying paired with consistent consequences, both bullying and
victimization tend to decrease (Doll et al., 2011; Ttofi & Farrington). In order to dispel many teachers’ inaccurate conceptualizations about the socially ‘normal’ and innocuous nature of bullying, it also may be important to expose them to information about the complex origins of bullying and its implications (Beane, 2009; Hazler & Carney, 2006; Hoover & Stenhjem, 2003; Olweus & Limber, 2010; Swearer et al., 2009; Ttofi & Farrington; Whitted & Dupper, 2005; Yoon, & Kerber, 2003).

Critical components to teacher training include a) definitions of bullying, b) discussion of social-ecological correlates of bullying and victimization, c) outlining evidence-based prevention and intervention strategies, and d) implications for responding to bully/victim issues (Hazler & Carney, 2006; Holt et al., 2011; Swearer et al., 2009). To promote comprehension and retention of these materials, teachers must be provided with regular support groups that allow them to review program material, discuss current issues, engage in problem solving, and maintain excitement about bullying prevention (Limber, 2011; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004).

Furthermore, Howard and colleagues (2001) argued that for an intervention program to be successful, it must strive to increase teachers’ sense of self-efficacy (i.e., personal effectiveness), provide teachers with knowledge and skills, and help educators better understand the importance of their role in intervening when they observe bullying in the school.

Given that teachers’ feelings of knowledge and self-efficacy in addressing behavior may be highly correlated with the actual likelihood that they will address it, bullying prevention programs must seek to first foster an understanding among teachers (Howard et al., 2001; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Therefore, it appears that a promising means of addressing bullying may be through employing bullying prevention programs that first focus on teacher
training and support. Specifically, these programs must be developed to assist teachers in becoming more effective in reducing bullying through seeking to increase their feelings of knowledge and self-efficacy in responding (Howard et al.).

**Research-Based Bullying Prevention Programs for Teachers**

Although there have been many efforts to provide bullying prevention and intervention at the school-based level, few have been evaluated in multiple trials across a variety of environments (Swearer et al., 2010; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). The programs outlined below have all been reviewed throughout the related literature in compilations which include the *Handbook of School Violence and School Safety: From Research to Practice* (Jimerson & Furlong, Eds., 2006), *Bullying in North American Schools* (Espelage & Swearer, Eds., 2011), and the *Handbook of Bullying in Schools: An International Perspective* (Jimerson, Swearer & Espelage, Eds., 2010). The programs strive to address school-based bullying in a comprehensive manner, by targeting various systems involved in the bullying dynamic (i.e., students, staff, parents, and community members). These programs also provide a notable emphasis on extensive staff training, and place much of the responsibility on the adults in the school to facilitate a positive and cooperative climate, which is a critical factor in effective bullying prevention (Ttofi & Farrington). Within their teacher training components, each of these respective programs address the three common themes of a) awareness building, b) efficacy building, and c) skill building, all which are critical factors in any bullying prevention program (Howard et al., 2001; Swearer et al, 2010). Given this notion, the following paragraphs detail some of the leading research-based bullying prevention programs that address bullying through the practices listed above. Furthermore, those programs outlined below primarily focus on
teachers as the agents of change. Specific descriptions of these programs are outlined in the following section.

**The Peaceful Schools Project**

The Peaceful Schools Project was developed for grades K-5, and focuses on improving the school environment through establishing a school-based positive climate campaign (Twemlow et al., 2010). In controlled studies, this program has resulted in significant decreases in bullying and victimization, as well as discipline referrals (Fonagy et al., 2009; Twemlow et al.). The Peaceful Schools Project particularly emphasizes providing teachers with strategies to enhance their classroom management skills, through both training and mentorship opportunities, where they are paired with groups of students to supervise recreational activities and intervene in bullying instances (Twemlow et al.) Teachers are also primarily responsible for implementing climate standards and providing training to students in effective problem-solving strategies (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). Students participate in bullying prevention training at the universal level, and targeted interventions are provided to bullies and victims. These targeted interventions encourage bullies to reflect on personal behavior, and provide additional problem-solving supports for victims (Twemlow et al.).

**The Steps to Respect Program**

The Steps to Respect Program (StR) is an anti-bullying program that was specifically developed for grades K-6 (Committee for Children, 2001). Analyses of the StR program indicate that successful decreases in student-reported victimization and aggression, and increased frequencies of prosocial skill use on the playground (Hirschstein, Edstrom, & Snell, 2009; Hirschstein & Frey, 2006). The StR program has reduced bullying through a) increasing adult
awareness of bullying and implementing more rigorous monitoring systems, b) enhancing teacher support for positive behavior, and c) teaching students prosocial skills that promote a positive school climate (Hirschstein & Frey). The program begins with a staff training component that consists of both written and visual materials that define and discuss bullying and provide strategies for responding to bullying incidents (Hirschstein & Frey; Low et al., 2011). In addition to the teacher training program, parents also receive training manuals to implement at home. Following training, teachers of third-through sixth-grade students implement an anti-bullying curriculum in their classrooms (Hirschstein & Frey; Low et al.).

The Expect Respect Program

The Expect Respect Program was also created for the elementary school level; however, this approach differs from other bullying prevention and intervention programs in that it focuses on recognizing both bullying and sexual harassment, and learning to respond to these behaviors (Sanchez et al., 2001). This program has resulted in greater student awareness of bullying as well as ability to identify bullying and sexual harassment. Teachers also report greater feelings of self-efficacy in responding to bullying situations following program training. The Expect Respect training program includes staff and students, and parents are provided with supplemental information regarding bullying and sexual harassment. The staff training component includes discussion of current research on bullying and sexual harassment, and strategies for responding at the school, classroom, and individual levels. School staff are also given tools for classroom management that facilitate respect among students and are provided with lesson plans for integrating training material into the general curriculum (Rosenbluth, Whitaker, Valle, & Ball, 2011; Whitaker, Rosenbluth, Valle, & Sanchez, 2003).
The Olweus Bully Prevention Program

The Olweus Bully Prevention Program (OBPP) has been validated for students across grades (K-12), and has been highly effective in repeated trails in reducing both bullying and victimization (Limber, 2011; Olweus & Limber, 2010a; Olweus & Limber, 2010b). The OBPP is based on four principles that place the primary responsibility on the adults in the school building (Olweus, 1993a). These principles include a) being involved in the lives of students, b) implementing concrete behavior policies, c) providing consistent consequences for incompliance, and d) serving as models of positive behavior (Olweus & Limber, 2010b). The OBPP consists of a two-day training workshop for teachers, which is followed by periodic mentoring sessions with OBPP trainers. The teacher training component focuses on developing an understanding of bullying, the emotional and behavioral correlates of those involved in bullying, and providing teachers with strategies to intervene in bullying situations in an effective manner. Teachers also learn how to implement the parent and student components of the OBPP program (Olweus & Limber, 2010a; Olweus & Limber, 2010b).

Bully Proofing Your School

Bully Proofing Your School (BPYS) has two levels intended for students in grades K-5 and 6-8. Analyses of this program indicate that it has successfully reduced bullying, increased student awareness of bullying, and improved perceptions of school climate (Garrity & Jens, 1997; Plog, Garrity, Jens, & Porter, 2011; Porter, Plog, Jens, Garrity, & Sager, 2010). Like the OBPP, BPYS also begins at the systems level, thus placing the primary responsibility on the adults in the school building to address and reduce bullying. Teachers complete a day-long training in defining bullying, discussing roles involved in bullying, developing skills in
responding to bullying, and learning to implement an anti-bullying curriculum with students. The student curriculum emphasizes conflict resolution skills, and encourages bystanders to support victims through addressing bullying incidents. In addition to classroom prevention, bullies and victims receive targeted counseling and social skills supports (Garrity & Jens; Garrity et al., 2011; Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Porter et al., 2010).

The Bully Busters Program

The Bully Busters Program: A Teacher’s Manual for Helping Bullies Victims, and Bystanders is a comprehensive, group-based program at both the elementary and middle school levels, in which educators serve as the focus of bullying intervention (Horne, Bartolomucci & Newman-Carlson, 2003; Newman, Horne, & Bartolomucci, 2000). The training program is primarily designed to increase teachers' knowledge and use of effective intervention skills for decreasing bullying. The program contains seven core modules that provide teachers with information about bullying and implications for response, as well as suggested classroom activities to share with their students (Newman et al., 2000). Specifically, the Bully Busters program has yielded increases in teachers’ knowledge about bullying, teachers’ skills and strategies for responding to bullying, teachers’ self-efficacy in their skills and knowledge to intervene in bullying incidents, as well as decreases in classroom behavior referrals (Howard et al., 2001; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). Given the impact this program has had on teacher knowledge about bullying and self-efficacy in responding, this program may be given particular consideration when seeking to enhance teachers’ skills. The following section reviews the research literature associated with the Bully Busters Program, as its paramount focus on teacher training has qualified it as the intervention of interest in this study.
Review of Studies Evaluating the Bully Busters Program

The following paragraphs contain a discussion of studies that have evaluated the effectiveness of the Bully Busters program in terms of its application to teacher and staff training within the context of bullying prevention programming. The theoretical foundation of the Bully Busters program is presented first, followed by a review of research outcomes associated with this program. Research evaluating the effectiveness of the Bully Busters program with regard to teacher and staff training and development as related to comprehensive bullying prevention programming is highlighted.

Theoretical Bases of the Bully Busters Program

The Bully Busters program was conceived by viewing bullying from an ecological perspective, which considers all factors impacting the student’s behavior, including individual, family, school, community, and social factors (Horne, Swearer, Givens & Meints, 2010; Swearer & Doll, 2002). Through an ecological frame of reference, the Bully Busters program takes a psychoeducational approach to bullying prevention. This approach seeks to target variables that can be controlled within the school environment (i.e., the individual student and the school) (Horne, Bell, Raczynski, & Whitford, 2011). Furthermore, the Bully Busters program subscribes to the belief that bullying originates from social skills deficits, including lack of perspective taking, empathy, and problem-solving skills (Horne et al., 2010). This approach may be particularly effective when working with students with disabilities, as these students often have underdeveloped social skills compared to their peers without disabilities.

The Bully Busters program is similar to other programs as it is comprehensive in nature, particularly regarding the teacher training component. However, the Bully Busters program
improves upon other programs, as teacher feelings of knowledge and self-efficacy in addressing bullying are included as key variables in evaluating program success. It has been argued that increasing teacher awareness of bullying and its correlates and providing them with information for response are critical factors for managing bullying in the schools (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004; Swearer et al., 2009). Furthermore, beginning a schoolwide intervention program through first implementing a teacher-centered psychoeducational program may be more cost-effective and time efficient (Newman-Carlson & Horne). Therefore, these variables should arguably be considered as a part of the general protocol for anti-bullying program evaluations.

Currently, there are two versions of the Bully Busters: A Teacher’s Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders applicable to the school setting, an elementary school version (i.e., grades K-5; Horne et al., 2003) and a middle school version (i.e., grades 6-8; Newman et al., 2000). The Bully Busters program was designed to increase teachers' knowledge and use of effective intervention skills for decreasing bullying and victimization. This program subscribes to the approach that teachers who believe they have the skills to effectively intervene in bullying instances will respond both earlier and more effectively than those who do not (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). Therefore, the overarching goals of the Bully Busters program are to a) increase teachers’ knowledge of bullying intervention skills, b) increase teachers’ use of bullying intervention skills, c) increase teachers’ self-efficacy regarding their ability to effectively intervene in bullying incidents, and d) decrease the amount of bullying in the school environment (Howard et al., 2001).

The Bully Busters program for teachers of grades 6-8 is comprised of the following core modules: (1) increasing awareness of bullying, (2) recognizing the bully, (3) recognizing the
victim, (4) interventions for bullying behavior, (5) recommendations and interventions for assisting victims, (6) the role of prevention, and (7) relaxation and coping skills (Horne et al., 2011; Newman et al., 2000; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). The K-5 program includes an additional module focusing on building personal power (Horne et al., 2003). Each module includes both a) content that is intended to enhance teachers’ knowledge and skills in responding to bullying, and b) suggested activities for them to implement in the classroom. Additionally, each module concludes with an individualized set of personal goals that teachers may tailor to their particular students (Newman et al., 2000). These modules have been highly effective in improving teachers’ knowledge and skills regarding bullying and their self-efficacy within these domains (Howard et al., 2001; Newman-Carlson & Horne).

**Review of Research Evaluating the Bully Busters Program**

The Bully Busters program has increased teachers' self-perceived knowledge and use of bullying intervention skills, as well as their sense of self-efficacy in addressing bullying incidents at both the elementary and middle school levels (Bell, 2008; Bell, Raczynski & Horne, 2010; Browning, Cooker, & Sullivan, 2005; Howard et al., 2001; Newgent, Higgins, Lounsberry, Behrend & Keller, 2011; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). These findings support the notion that with increased education regarding bullying detection and prevention, teachers’ sense of self-efficacy and knowledge will also increase (Newgent et al., 2011). Furthermore, the Bully Busters program has been successful in reducing classroom bullying as measured by teacher completed office referrals (Horne et al., 2011) and student self-report of bullying and victimization (e.g., Orpinas, Horne, & Staniszewski, 2003).
The Bully Busters program has demonstrated effectiveness across a variety of settings and conditions. For example, the program has been effective at both the elementary (e.g., Newgent et al., 2011) and middle school (e.g., Bell et al., 2010) levels in increasing teacher knowledge and skills about bullying, as well as their feelings of self-efficacy in addressing bullying incidents (Bell, 2008; Bell et al., 2010; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004; Newgent et al.). The program has also been implemented in abbreviated versions and these versions have yielded comparable increases in teacher reports of knowledge and feelings of self-efficacy. Specifically, Bell and colleagues (2010) shortened the length of each of the Bully Busters seven modules for middle school teachers, which resulted in promising outcomes related to teachers’ self-efficacy in improving student behavior with regard to aggression and victimization. Furthermore, Newgent and colleagues (2011) evaluated an abbreviated, four-module version of the Bully Busters program for elementary school teachers. This abbreviated model used in Newgent’s research includes four of seven modules that teachers reported to be the most effective at improving their knowledge and use of bullying interventions: Recognizing the Bully (module two), Recognizing the Victim (module three), Recommendations and Interventions for Bullying Behavior (module four), and Recommendations and Interventions for Helping Victims (module five) (Newgent et al.). This four-module version has not yet been evaluated among middle school teachers; however, given its success at the elementary level, implementation at this level may warrant further investigation. These findings suggest that the Bully Busters program is not only effective in increasing teachers’ knowledge, skills and self-efficacy related to intervention, but also can be tailored to the diverse needs of the school in which it is being implemented.
The Bully Busters program also has demonstrated high social validity, through positive teacher reports of the program’s usability and applicability within their classrooms (Browning et al., 2005). Teachers have reported that the strategies provided through the Bully Busters program are easy to implement at both the classroom and school-wide level (Browning et al.). The Bully Busters program has also promoted teacher retention of content through voluntary check-in sessions that follow initial training. Teachers report that these sessions helped bolster their maintenance of both their knowledge of bullying as well as their self-efficacy for acquisition of bullying intervention skills (Browning et al.). These high levels of teacher support for the Bully Busters program reinforce its continued use within the school setting.

**Rationale for the Current Study**

Research has demonstrated that students with disabilities may be more likely to become both victims and perpetrators of bullying; however, there has been limited published research focusing on ameliorating this issue. In October 2014, The U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights issued a letter providing an overview of a school district’s responsibilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to address bullying of students with disabilities (U.S Department of Education, 2014). The contents of this letter discuss the obligation schools have to ensure that students with disabilities receive a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE), as well as the impact that bullying can have on their access to this education. In summary, the letter indicted that if bullying of a student with a disability results in the student not receiving meaningful access to their education, it constituted a denial of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) under the IDEA and must be remedied by the school. Furthermore, even if it is determined that a FAPE is not being denied, it was argued that bullying
can hinder a student’s ability to achieve his or her full academic potential, and should therefore be addressed by the school. Within this letter, the U.S. Department of Education asserted that schools should consider modifying their school based bullying prevention efforts to address the issue of bullying among students with disabilities. It was argued that school personnel needed to be aware that students with disabilities were significantly more likely than their peers without disabilities to be the targets of bullying, as well as additional factors that contributed to their increased risk of being bullied. Lastly, included were recommendations that teachers be trained in effective evidence-based strategies for responding to bullying among students with disabilities, as well as evidence-based strategies in classroom management (U.S. Department of Education, 2014).

Training is essential in helping school personnel recognize the different forms of bullying that may be directed at students with disabilities, and the unique vulnerabilities these students may have to social isolation, manipulation, conditional friendships, and exploitive behaviors. Students do not always recognize problem behaviors as bullying. They may also be reluctant to stand up for themselves or others, seek help, or report bullying due to fear of retaliation, particularly if adults are involved. Due to the complexities of their disabilities, students with intellectual, communication, processing, or emotional disabilities may not understand manipulation or exploitive behavior as harmful. They may lack the knowledge and skills to explain the situation to an adult who can help.

Although there is a relatively small body of recommendations within the literature regarding how to respond to bullying among students with disabilities. Many authors have agreed that the very act of systematically bringing awareness to school staff may be a critical
element in decreasing bullying and victimization among this population (Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Raskauskas & Modell, 2011; Swearer et al., 2009; Swearer et al., 2012). Therefore, encouraging staff awareness through a systematic approach may be the first step in the reduction of the exceedingly high rates of bullying and victimization among students with disabilities. Furthermore, it is argued that many anti-bullying programs may not have been entirely successful in part because they have failed to consider aspects of diversity, and lack an emphasis on acceptance of individual differences with the context of a positive school climate (Newgent et al., 2011; Swearer et al., 2010). Consequently, in order to increase the likelihood that these initiatives will be successful, interventions seeking to reduce bullying and victimization should include a component specifically addressing the needs of students with disabilities. This may be addressed in part through the teacher training component of bullying prevention programming.

Nearly all anti-bullying staff training programs address awareness building factors associated with bullying and victimization; however, most do not address categories of diversity awareness (Raskauskas & Modell, 2011; Swearer et al., 2010). Most anti-bullying interventions deemphasize the influence that internalizing issues can have on a student’s involvement in bullying (Swearer et al., 2011). Thus, developing anti-bullying interventions through an all-purpose model may not yield real changes in bullying and victimization (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). Meta-analyses and comprehensive literature reviews have suggested that most anti-bullying programs produce positive effects; however, these effects are often statistically insignificant (Ferguson et al., 2007). Ferguson and colleagues (2007) argue that because these programs generally target the low-risk general population, they may be less effective than if greater effort was targeted at seriously at-risk students. Therefore, implementing additional anti-
bullying initiatives, specifically addressing the needs of students with disabilities, may be a more effective use of school-based resources (Ferguson et al.; Rose et al., 2009; Rose et al., 2011).

Given the paucity of evidenced-based interventions addressing bullying among students with disabilities, it has been recommended that schools consider modifying existing programs in order to identify effective strategies for preventing bullying among these students (Rose et al., 2009; Rose et al., 2011). Providing awareness of implications for students with disabilities may be included as a part of an anti-bullying curriculum (Thompson et al., 1994). This includes training teachers to understand the specific risk factors that may increase student involvement in bullying (i.e., disability status, disability type and classroom placement/structure), as well as providing them with strategies designed to decrease bullying among at-risk students (Demaray et al., 2006; Thompson et al.). Specifically, students with disabilities may require supports within a Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) framework. Subsequently, this multi-tiered framework may be effective for use among specific at-risk subgroups of victims or bullies, such as students with disabilities, as well as providing insight into individual supports for more severe cases (Raskauskas & Modell, 2011; Rose et al., 2009).

Specific recommendations for modifications to anti-bullying program content and delivery method to include implications for teachers working with students with disabilities are relatively infrequent in the literature. Although there is a vast amount of research which suggests that students with disabilities are at an increased risk for bullying and victimization, few authors have provided concrete suggestions as to how to decrease bullying among these students. There exists a gap in the research investigating programs incorporating such recommendations into existing research-to-practice initiatives (Newgent et al., 2011; Raskauskas & Modell, 2011).
addition to adjusting existing anti-bullying policies to address students with disabilities, these recommendations particularly emphasize the role of school staff members in preventing bullying among students with disabilities. Specifically, it is recommended that staff training components of anti-bullying programs be modified to promote an understanding of the unique bullying experiences of students with disabilities, and how to respond to their students’ needs (Newgent et al., 2011; Raskauskas & Modell; Rose, 2011a; Rose et al., 2009; Rose et al., 2011; Rose et al., 2012; Swearer et al., 2012). Furthermore, staff should be trained to enforce tolerance and acceptance of students with disabilities among peers, as research suggests that students’ attitudes toward their peers who have disabilities are the most important factor in determining if they will engage with them in prosocial interactions (Raskauskas & Modell; Roberts & Lindsell, 1997; Swearer et al., 2012). Lastly, it is recommended that teachers understand the importance of using bullying situations as an opportunity for prosocial skills instruction through provision of appropriate replacement behaviors (Raskauskas & Modell; Swearer et al., 2012).

**Purpose Statement and Research Questions**

Given the scarcity of research-based anti-bullying programs designed to address issues experienced by students with disabilities, teachers may be unaware of the unique bully-victim risks of this group of students. To respond to this need, this study sought to examine the effects of a modified, research-based anti-bullying program on teacher knowledge of bullying among students with disabilities, as well as their self-efficacy in responding to bullying among this population. Because there is a gap in the literature in terms of identifying research- based program developed to enhance teachers’ knowledge and use of skills geared toward addressing
the unique needs of students with disabilities regarding bullying prevention and intervention, this study modified a previously validated training program.

The Bully Busters program was chosen as the primary staff training protocol, as it has been easily modified in recent research and can be easily tailored to meet the needs of diverse ecologies (Bell, 2008; Bell et al., 2010; Horne et al., 2010; Newgent et al., 2011). Specifically, it has been argued in previous Bully Busters literature that future research should examine the effectiveness of the Bully Busters program on victimization reduction for students who are the most at-risk for being victimized (i.e., students with disabilities, minority students, and students who identify as LGBTQIA) (Newgent et al.).

As addressed in previous sections, the Bully Busters program has been custom-tailored to meet the particular timing needs of participant schools across grade levels. The abbreviated model for elementary school teachers administered by Newgent and colleagues (2011) illustrated clinically significant improvement on measures of teachers’ knowledge of bullying, use of bullying interventions, and feelings of self-efficacy in the classroom. However, this four-module version has not yet been validated among middle school teachers (Newgent et al., 2011). The present study sought to continue the use of the four-module version of the Bully Busters program among middle school teachers, with an added module addressing the particular needs of students with disabilities.

This research sought to expand upon our current knowledge of anti-bullying initiatives addressing the needs of diverse students. Specifically, the present study examined the effectiveness of a four-module version of the Bully Busters: A Teacher’s Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (grades 6-8) paired with an additional module addressing
bullying among students with disabilities. Previous literature that has evaluated the Bully Busters program often refers to it as a “psychoeducationally-based bullying program for teachers,” (Bell, 2008; Bell et al., 2010; Howard et al., 2001). Therefore, this study referred to the program used for the purpose of this research (i.e., the four-module version of the Bully Busters: A Teacher’s Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (grades 6-8) paired with the additional module addressing bullying among students with disabilities) as a “psychoeducationally-based bullying program for teachers addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities,” (Bell, 2008, p. 54; Bell et al., 2010, p. 259, Howard et al., 2001, pp. 5-6). Much of the related literature has examined the effect of the Bully Busters program on teachers’ knowledge and use of skills, as well as their feelings of self-efficacy at both the elementary and middle school levels (Bell et al., 2010; Newgent et al., 2011). Given that the related literature has validly examined these constructs as related to modified versions of the Bully Busters program across grade levels, this study examined the following research questions:

1. Does a psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying program for teachers addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities, affect teacher participants’ self-efficacy and expectancy as it relates to successfully intervening in a bully victim conflict?
2. Does a psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying program for teachers addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities, affect teacher participants’ knowledge and use of bullying intervention skills?
3. Does a psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying program for teachers addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities, affect teacher participants’ perception of bullying frequency?
CHAPTER II

METHODODOLOGY

Overview

This study was designed to investigate the effects of a psychoeducationally-based bullying program on teacher knowledge and self-efficacy in addressing bullying involving all students, including students with disabilities. As presented in Chapter I, implementation of the Bully Busters: A Teacher’s Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders has resulted in increases in teachers’ knowledge about bullying, skills and strategies for responding to bullying, and self-efficacy in intervening in bullying incidents at both the elementary and middle school levels (Bell et al., 2010; Howard et al., 2001; Newgent et al., 2011; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). Previous literature has also demonstrated that the Bully Busters Program can be successfully modified to fit a variety of needs (see Bell, 2008; Bell et al., 2010; Newgent et al., 2011). Expanding upon this research, this study sought to examine the effects of a modified version of the Bully Busters: A Teacher’s Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (grades 6-8), addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities, on a) teachers’ self-efficacy and expectations in responding to bullying incidents, b) knowledge and use of bullying information and response strategies, and c) their perception of school and classroom bullying frequencies. This study sought to provide a unique contribution to the literature in its effort to address the needs of students with disabilities.

This chapter includes a discussion of participant recruitment and demographics, the independent variable, instrumentation, study procedures, research design, and data analyses. Specifically, the contents of the Bully Busters: A Teacher’s Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders for teachers of grades 6 through 8 is reviewed, and a newly developed module
targeting the needs of students with disabilities is presented. Following this discussion, the particular instruments used to examine each of the three research questions, and the modifications that were made to each instrument are presented. Thereafter, the program procedures and measures are addressed. This chapter concludes with an explanation of the research design and data analytic procedures used in the study.

**Research Questions**

This study was grounded in the following research questions:

1. Does a psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying program for teachers addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities, effect teacher participants’ self-efficacy and expectations as it relates to successfully intervening in a bully victim conflict?

2. Does a psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying program for teachers addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities, effect teacher participants’ knowledge and use of bullying intervention skills?

3. Does a psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying program for teachers addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities, effect teacher participants’ perception of bullying frequency?

**Participants and Setting**

This study included 14 middle school teachers from a public middle school in a Midwestern region of the United States. All participants were given a demographic survey assessing years of teaching experience, gender, ethnicity, grade taught, whether they taught general education or special education classes, and how long they had served in their current role
as well as within the field of education (see Appendix A). Demographic information for the participants is provided in Table 1.

**Inclusionary Criteria**

Participants recruited were all general education and special education teachers (of all academic subjects) employed by a middle school in the Midwestern region of the Unites States (N = 18). Teachers included in this study were determined by their choice to participate in the training program, as well as by their completion of informed consent and pre-test and post-test measures. This study sought to include 10-25 teacher participants because this range matches the approximate sample size used in previous studies evaluating the effectiveness of the Bully Busters Program (e.g., Bell, 2008; Browning, 2004; Howard et al., 2001; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004).

**Response Rate**

Of the 18 teachers available in the district, 15 agreed to participate in the study. After the first training session, one of the 15 teachers withdrew from the program due to family needs, thus reducing the sample to 14 teachers. This teacher’s withdrawal was deemed a typical, unpredictable event; there were no concerns about participation and nothing unique about this participant’s reason for withdrawal. All 14 of the teachers remained in the program and completed the post-test assessment.
Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Taught</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Classes Taught</td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Current Role</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Field of Education</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Researcher Qualifications

Developers of the Bully Buster’s program (Newman, Horne, & Bartolmucci, 2000), indicated in the manual that there are no necessary qualifications for individual trainers. Typical trainer qualifications discussed in the related research include a basic understanding of behavioral psychology and the tenants of the Bully Busters program. The researcher and trainer in this study was a school psychology doctoral candidate at Kent State University. The trainer
was a state-credentialed practicing school psychologist, with a background in the area of bullying research and an informed perspective of the current status of bullying in schools.

Setting

This study was conducted in the middle school of a school district in the Midwestern region of the United States. The district serves 71 square miles with residents from two counties and accepts open enrollment students from more than 10 neighboring districts. The district served approximately 1,110 students comprised of the following ethnic backgrounds: 95 percent European American, 1.5 percent Hispanic/Latino, .4 percent Asian American, .5 percent African American, and 2.5 percent Multi-racial. Of these students, approximately 46 percent were eligible for the Free or Reduced School Lunch Program. The district boasts a graduation rate of approximately 92 percent, while approximately 22 percent of students are identified as having disabilities. This percentage is much noticeably greater than the national average of 13 percent of students identified as having a disability (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2017). The middle school was comprised of grades 6 through 8 with a total of 262 students. Of the 70 teachers in the district, 18 were middle school teachers. The research study subsumed in the building library. Participants sat at tables in order to facilitate a group-based training effort.

Institutional Research Approval, Recruitment, and Consent

Approval to conduct this study was granted by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Kent State University. In addition, this study was approved by both the district superintendent and the middle school principal.
Participant Recruitment

Participants were recruited via consultation with the district superintendent and school principal. A brief summary of the program and procedures was provided to the superintendent and principal, along with other supporting documentation (i.e., program materials and the researcher’s curriculum vitae). Once permission was granted, requests for participants were distributed via flyers placed in teachers’ mailboxes. These flyers briefly described the program, the time that would be invested, and any potential benefit to their participation. Following the distribution of the flyers, interested participants were invited to attend an introductory session, which detailed the program and related commitment. All teachers at the school were recruited through convenience sampling, as participant selection was determined by those who chose to participate (Dimitrov, 2009).

Participant Consent

Prior to the first program-specific training sessions, teachers who were interested in participating attended an introductory session. At the end of this session, those who chose to participate completed the Informed Consent Form (see Appendix B), indicating that they consented to participate in this study and understood they could withdraw at any time without negative consequences.

Independent Variable

The Bully Busters: A Teacher’s Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders for teachers of grades 6 through 8 (Newman et al., 2000) was used as the primary independent variable for the purpose of this study. The Bully Busters program (grades 6-8) is a group-based program in which teachers receive training in research-derived bullying information as well as
implications for prevention and intervention (Horne et al., 2011). As discussed in Chapter I, the four-module version of the Bully Busters program for elementary school teachers has yielded increases in teachers’ knowledge about bullying, teachers’ skills and strategies for dealing with bullying in the classroom setting, and teachers’ confidence in using their skills to intervene in bullying incidents (Newgent et al., 2011). This study employed the same four modules that are equivalent in the Bully Busters program for teachers of grades 6 through 8, as used in the study by Newgent and colleagues (2011) among elementary school teachers, in addition to an added module, entitled “Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities (see Appendix C).” The five modules used in the present study, incorporated content from the Bully Busters program (grades 6-8), in addition to the added module are described with detail below.

**Module One: Recognizing the Bully (derived from Newman et al., 2000)**

This module sought to promote teachers’ understanding of the different influences in a student’s environment that can contribute to bullying behavior. This module encouraged teachers to recognize environmental factors and their influence on the development of bullying perpetration, and provided a description of the different types of bullies and forms of bullying. Within this module, teachers also learned about myths and misconceptions about bullying, as well as differences between boys and girls with regard to involvement in bullying.


This module described the different types of victims and sought to improve teacher recognition of the signs of victimization. This module addressed factors associated with victimization and the negative effects that bullying can have on victims. This module also
addressed myths and misconceptions associated with victimization. Lastly, it discussed differences between boys and girls with regard to the role of the victim.


This module provided teachers with intervention tools that are effective in confronting and managing bullying. This module also described strategies to improve areas of developmental need among students who bully, and outlined basic principles of behavior change.


This module provided teachers with strategies for intervening with and supporting students who are victims of bullying. This module also addressed principles of behavioral change for victims, and introduced interventions for specific types of victims.

**Module Five: Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities (new material developed for this study)**

The primary goal of the modified Bully Busters program for teachers employed in this study was to address the needs of all students, including those with disabilities. Following from this objective, an additional module (i.e., Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities) was added to the four-module version of the Bully Busters program (grades 6-8) (see Newgent et al., 2011). The goal of the added module was to create awareness of bullying and victimization as related to students with disabilities and specific categories of disabilities, and to outline implications related to prevention and intervention. This module was developed based on the current literature addressing bullying among students with disabilities (see Appendix C).
Participants completed training modules derived from the original Bully Busters program (grades 6-8) prior to completing the Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities module. The modules were implemented in this order in an effort to deviate as little as possible from the original Bully Busters program (grades 6-8) and recent research including this program as a primary independent variable.

In a manner similar to the four original modules, the Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities module took approximately one hour to complete and was modeled using the same format as the other modules in the Bully Busters program (grades 6-8) (Newman et al., 2000). The descriptions below provide a brief outline of the content that was provided in the fifth module, Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities. These sections were modeled directly from the content associated with all original Bully Busters modules.

**Overview.** The overview summarized the big ideas that were presented in each module and outlined the content provided in the given module.

**Goals.** This section included a bulleted list of the goals of the module, including what each participant could expect to learn.

**Background.** This section included preliminary content information, such as definitions and statistics. This module presented bullying statistics among students with disabilities and provided literature-derived explanations for the elevated bullying and victimization statuses among this group.

**Disability-specific factors.** This subsection described the literature among different disabilities and their individual rates of involvement within the bullying dynamic. The different types of disabilities that were addressed were as follows: a) physical disabilities including
students with asthma, allergies, diabetes, hemiplegia, epilepsy, cerebral palsy, language impairments as well as students who stutter; b) intellectual disabilities including students with cognitive delay, and students with developmental disabilities such as autism; c) emotional disabilities including students with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and depressive disorders; and d) learning disabilities including all specific learning disabilities.

Environmental factors. This subsection discussed additional school-based factors that can influence bullying and victimization among students with disabilities. These factors included type of educational placement and classroom structure.

Myths and misconceptions about bullying among students with disabilities. The myths and misconceptions section of this module included a series of myths about bullying among students with disabilities, and provided corresponding ‘reality’ statements following each myth.

General implications for intervening in bullying incidents among all students, including students with disabilities. This section provided recommendations from the literature for responding to bullying among all students, including those with disabilities. Strategies that may be particularly effective for addressing bullying and victimization among different groups was included.

Content review. The content review section included a checklist of statements that referred to the individual participant’s ability to achieve the learning goals of the module.

The big questions. This section encouraged participants to reflect upon the ‘Big Questions’ addressed in the Bully Busters program (grades 6-8) and how they related to current module.
**Personal goals form.** Following each module, participants completed a personal goals form that was designed to tailor module content to their individual students and classrooms.

**Classroom activities.** This section provided additional voluntary activities for individual classroom or student use. Due to the voluntary nature of the classroom activities, they were not monitored for the purpose of this study. That is, these activities were not a mandatory requirement of the program. This approach has been applied in the majority of prior studies evaluating the Bully Busters program at both the elementary and middle school levels, and was therefore determined as an appropriate voluntary option for this study (see Bell et al., 2010; Browning, 2004; Howard et al., 2001; Newgent et al., 2011).

In order to evaluate the overall structure and format of the additional module of the modified Bully Busters program for teachers, three individuals with some expertise in psychoeducational programming were asked to review the four original modules of the Bully Busters program (grades 6-8) and compare the content of the added module for the visual and structural (format), language (style), and content concordance (see Appendix F). Within their qualitative written review of program materials, the experts reported the degree to which they felt the content in the added module coordinated with the other modules, as well as any alterations they felt were necessary. Following this expert input, the added module was amended accordingly.

**Procedure**

This study included a pre-intervention introductory session, two 2-hour training sessions, one 1-hour training session, and a follow-up session. These sessions are described in more detail below.
**Introductory Session**

During the introductory session, participants were provided with information about the time that would be required, as well as the need for and objectives associated with the Bully Busters program (grades 6-8) with the added module. At the end of this meeting, those who agreed to participate were provided with a copy of Bully Busters: A Teacher’s Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (grades 6-8) (Newman et al., 2000), a supplemental document that described the contents of the added module, Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities, and an overview of the schedule associated with the in-service trainings and follow-up meeting. During this initial meeting, participants completed the voluntary informed consent and the Pre-test Instrument (see Appendix D).

**Bully Busters Training Sessions**

Following the introductory session, participants completed two, 2-hour and one, 1-hour in-services of a psychoeducationally-based bullying program comprised of the four-module version of the Bully Busters program for teachers (grades 6-8) and the added fifth module. Specifically, the first training session focused on the following modules from the original curriculum: Recognizing the Bully (Module One), and Recognizing the Victim (Module Two). The second training session focused on the following modules: Taking Charge: Interventions for Bullying Behavior (Module Three), and Assisting Victims: Interventions and Recommendations (Module Four). The third training session focused on the final module, Special Considerations for Bullying among Students with Disabilities (Module 5). To the greatest extent possible, the psychoeducationally-based bullying program was implemented according to the methodology associated with the abbreviated model described by Newgent and colleagues (2011). However, to
accommodate the added module, the current program was implemented over a total of five hours, instead of three. The added module, Special Considerations for Bullying among Students with Disabilities, was incorporated into the program as the final training module. This was done so that the four modules that were a part of the original Bully Busters program (grades 6-8) could follow the format of the full original to the greatest extent possible. In a similar manner to previous Bully Busters research, at the beginning of each session, participants were encouraged to discuss recent bullying situations they had experienced and engage in group discussion. During the final 10 minutes of each session, participants reviewed the issues they had addressed during that particular meeting (Bell et al., 2011; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004).

**Follow-Up Session**

Four weeks following the final training session, participants attended a mandatory one-hour follow up session to complete the Post-test Instrument (see Appendix D). Previous Bully Busters researchers have administered post-test assessments at multiple lengths following initial program completion. For example, Browning and colleagues (2005) administered a post-test assessment on the final day of training; while others delayed six weeks (see Howard et al., 2001), or until the conclusion of the school year (see Bell et al., 2010; Newgent et al., 2011). During this session, participants also reviewed current conflicts with students, and shared ideas for response strategies based on the knowledge they gained from their training. This approach has been used within the related literature to bolster participants’ recall of program content, and has demonstrated high social validity among participants (Horne et al., 2011; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). This session was conducted accordingly with previous Bully Busters literature (see Horne et al., 2011; Newman-Carlson & Horne).
Although abbreviated models of the Bully Busters program used in prior research did not include a follow up session (See Bell et al., 2010; Newgent et al., 2011), developers of the program argued that teachers greatly benefitted from having one or more follow up sessions. In addition to completing the Post-test Instrument, this session has a) helped to remind teachers to continue addressing bullying, b) provided them with an opportunity to discuss specific problems with students, c) provided them with an opportunity to review effective response strategies, and d) offered a venue for creativity and support (Horne et al., 2011). The follow up session was used for the purpose of this study as a way to promote retention of material, particularly given the model’s short, yet intensive implementation period.

**Treatment Integrity**

A Treatment Integrity Checklist (see Appendix E) was completed by the researcher following each session to monitor compliance with the program objectives and activities, a procedure that was adopted from related literature (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). Following each of the five required sessions, the researcher completed the corresponding Treatment Integrity Checklist in an effort to ensure that all session tasks were completed according to the Project Management Plan (see Table 2). This checklist consisted of three to 10 ‘yes’ or ‘no’ questions assessing execution of program activities that followed the curriculum outlined in the four modules of the Bully Busters program (grades 6-8) as well as the added module. At the end of each session, the percentage of steps completed was calculated in order to determine the degree to which they were successfully actualized. During the introductory session 10 of the 10 scheduled steps were completed. During the first training session, 6 of the 6 scheduled steps were completed. In a similar manner, during the second training session 5 of the 5 steps were
completed, and during the third and final training session 4 of the 4 steps were completed. During the follow-up session 3 of the 3 steps were conducted, comprising a 100 percent rate of treatment integrity across all treatment sessions.

**Instrumentation**

To measure dependent variables associated with the research questions, a teacher self-report survey was developed for the purpose of this study and was administered to all participants as a pre- and post- intervention measure. Teacher report has been frequently used to assess effectiveness of school-based bullying interventions. This type of reporting system is moderately correlated with both student reports and direct observations, and may therefore prevent concerns about students participating in behavioral assessment (Cornell, Sheras & Cole, 2006). The teacher self-report measure employed in this study was comprised of content from the following literature-derived scales: a modified version of the Teacher Efficacy and Expectation Measure (TEEM) (Howard et al., 2001), the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Tschaannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001), a modified version of the Teacher Inventory of Skills and Knowledge (TISK) (Newman et al., 2000), and the Teacher Perception of Bullying Frequency Scale (created for this study). These four measures were combined to generate the pilot instrument, which was evaluated and revised to become the final pre-test/post-test instrument. The table below provides an overview of each particular instrument’s connection to each of the respective research questions. The paragraphs following this table provide greater descriptions of these measures and how they were modified or incorporated for this study.
Table 2

*Overview of Instruments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does a psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying program for teachers addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities, effect teacher participants’ self-efficacy and expectations as it relates to successfully intervening in a bully victim conflict?</td>
<td>Teacher Efficacy and Expectation Measure (TEEM) (modified) Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Efficacy in Classroom Management subscale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does a psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying program for teachers addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities, effect teacher participants’ knowledge and use of bullying intervention skills?</td>
<td>Teacher Inventory of Skills and Knowledge (TISK) (modified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does a psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying program for teachers addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities, effect teacher participants’ perception of bullying frequency?</td>
<td>Teacher Perception of Bullying Frequency Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Instruments Used to Develop the Pre-/Post- Survey*

The Teacher Expectation and Efficacy Measure (TEEM) (Howard et al., 2001; Multisite Violence Prevention Project [MVPP], 2005) was used to assess variables associated with the first research question in the present study. Multiple studies have used the TEEM, and variations thereof, to address research questions evaluating teachers’ feelings of self-efficacy in responding to bullying incidents in addition to their level of expectation for success in working with challenging students (Bell et al., 2010; Bell, 2008; Howard et al., 2001; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). The TEEM is a 22-item questionnaire designed to evaluate elementary and middle
school teachers’ expectations for adaptive behavior and their feelings of self-efficacy in working
with both bullies and victims of bullying (Bell et al., 2010; Howard et al.; MVPP, 2005). The
TEEM consists of two vignettes, each accompanied by a subscale of Expectations and a subscale
of Self-Efficacy. The first vignette describes a student likely to perpetrate bullying and the other
describes a student likely to be the victim of bullying. For each vignette, teachers answer 11
questions; four questions that measure expectations of success for the student, and seven
questions that measure self-efficacy for responding to the student’s behavior (Bell; Howard et
al.). For each of the items related to Expectation subscale, teachers indicate on a five-point Likert
scale if they (1) completely disagree, to (5) completely agree with a series of statements.
Likewise, for each of the items on the Self-Efficacy subscale, teachers respond on a five-point
Likert scale the degree to which they feel (1) not confident to (5) very confident, responding to
each of the given vignettes. Consequently, higher scores on the TEEM suggest that the
respondent has more positive expectations for the student and higher levels of self-efficacy in
addressing the student’s behavior (Howard et al.).

Previous psychometric evaluation of the TEEM indicates that it yields moderate to high
reliability coefficients on both the Expectation and Self-Efficacy subscales (Howard et al., 2001;
MVPP, 2005). Reliability coefficients for scores on the Expectation subscales were .81 for the
student likely to bullying (vignette 1) and .85 for the student likely to be victimized (vignette 2),
and coefficients for scores of both vignettes on the Self-Efficacy subscale were .93 (Howard et
al.; MVPP).

In order to measure outcomes directly related to the content in the added module (i.e.,
Special Consideration for Students with Disabilities) on teacher self-efficacy and expectations, a
third and fourth vignette and corresponding items were added to the TEEM as it appears in the pre-test/post-test instrument. The third vignette described Casey, a student with autism who was likely to perpetrate bullying and be victimized, and the fourth vignette described Jamie, a student with a learning disability who was also likely to perpetrate bullying and to be a victim of bullying. Both of these vignettes addressed issues covered in the Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities module (Module 5). Like the previous two vignettes, the 11-items associated with the third vignette measured participants’ expectations for Casey’s success, and their self-efficacy for responding to Casey’s behavior. Correspondingly, the 11-items associated with the fourth vignette measured participants’ expectations for Jamie’s success, and their feeling of self-efficacy in responding to Jamie’s behavior. This format followed the previously validated, 22-item version of the TEEM; therefore, the TEEM with two added vignettes comprised a total of 44 items (see Appendix D).

An additional measure that was used to assess variables associated with the first research question was the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Tschaannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). The TSES has been used in previous Bully Busters literature to address research questions involving teachers’ feelings of self-efficacy in intervening in bullying incidents (Bell, 2008; Bell et al., 2010). The TSES is available in both long and short versions, each consisting of the three subscales: Efficacy in Student Engagement, Efficacy in Instructional Strategies, and Efficacy in Classroom Management. The TSES (long form) is comprised of 24 items on a nine-point Likert scale. Questions assess how well teachers believe they are able to do to maintain a positive classroom environment, and range from (1) nothing to (9) a great deal. The scale score is the sum
of the item scores, and higher scores indicate greater overall teacher self-efficacy (Tschaannen-Moran & Hoy).

The present study used only the Efficacy in Classroom Management subscale of the TSES (long form), which consists of eight items assessing teacher perceptions of their behavior management skills in the classroom. This subscale was selected due to its direct relevance for this particular research study. This subscale demonstrates high internal consistency reliability (.90), as does the full version of the TSES (.94) (Bell, 2008; Bell et al., 2010; Tschaannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). This subscale of the TSES was not modified for the purpose of this research and was used as an evaluation of teacher self-efficacy on the pre-test/post-test instrument (see Appendix D).

The Teacher Inventory of Skills and Knowledge (TISK) (Newman et al., 2000) was used to assess variables associated with research question two. The TISK is a 64-item self-report questionnaire that was specifically developed as a method of evaluating the Bully Busters program (grades 6-8) (Newman et al.). This questionnaire is typically completed as a pre-test/post-test assessment both prior to and after teachers complete the Bully Busters program. The TISK contains the two subscales assessing teachers’ Knowledge and Use of the following six dimensions of the Bully Busters program (1) prevention of bullying and victimization; (2) intervention for bullies; (3) interventions for victims; (4) interventions for bullies and victims; (5) resources for bullying and victimization; and (6) awareness of bullying and victimization. For each of the TISK’s 64 items, participants are to circle their responses on both the Knowledge and Use subscales. On the Knowledge subscale, participants indicate whether they feel they are (U) unfamiliar, (S) somewhat familiar, or (V) very familiar with the technique or information. In a
similar manner, participants indicate on the Use subscale whether they (N) never, (S) sometimes, or (A) always implement the particular technique or information in their classrooms.

The TISK has been frequently employed as a method of evaluating teacher knowledge and skills related to bullying, both before and after participation in the Bully Busters program (Howard et al., 2001; Newgent et al., 2011; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). Additionally, the TISK –E, for elementary school teachers, has been used to evaluate the four-module version of the Bully Busters program (grades K-5) (see Newgent et al.). Previous psychometric evaluation of the TISK suggests that it possesses moderate to high reliability coefficients on both the Knowledge and Use subscales (Howard et al.; Newman-Carlson & Horne). Internal consistency for the six dimensions on the Knowledge subscale has ranged from .79 to .98, and from .68 to .88 for the six dimensions on the Use subscale (Howard et al.; Newman-Carlson & Horne).

In order to examine the effects of the added module, Special Consideration for Students with Disabilities, on teacher knowledge and use of module content, additional items were added to the TISK. These 11 items related to the content found in Module 5, and particularly addressed implications for responding to bullying and victimization among students with disabilities found within the literature. These 11 items followed a similar style and format to the other items on the TISK. The previously validated six dimensions of the TISK ranged from six to fifteen items each; therefore, the additional 11-item dimension fit cohesively with the standard scale (see Appendix D).

The Teacher Perception of Bullying Frequency Scale was developed specifically for the purpose of this study to evaluate the third research question. This scale consisted of 12 items rated using a six-point Likert scale. The first six items assessed teachers’ perceptions of the
frequency with which they believed bullying in a physical, verbal, and relational form occurred in both their schools and classrooms and, the final six items specifically evaluated teachers’ perceptions of bullying frequencies (physical, verbal, and relational) among students with disabilities within both their schools and classrooms. This scale was developed to evaluate the third research question related to teacher perceptions regarding the frequency of bullying among all students, including those with disabilities. Although there are currently no previously validated instruments assessing this construct, similar research studies evaluating the Bully Busters program have incorporated short questionnaires, which addressed self-reports of bullying frequencies among students and by teachers of particular students in their classrooms (Bell, Raczynski & Horne, 2010; Newgent et al., 2011).

In an effort to obtain reliable responses, a literature-derived definition of bullying was provided at the top of the questionnaire (see Appendix D). Items developed for this scale were informed by review of the related literature, as well as suggestions from Fink and Kosecoff’s (1998) guide to creating and conducting surveys. Specifically, Newgent and colleagues (2011) employed a three-item measure that evaluated the degree to which teachers believed specific students in their classroom experienced bullying. This particular measure assessed the three types of bullying (verbal, physical, and relational) on a six-point Likert scale. Therefore, this feature of the Teacher Perception of Bullying Frequency Scale of evaluating each type of bullying (verbal, physical, and relational) on a six-point Likert scale was informed by the measure administered by Newgent and colleagues (see Appendix D).
Expert Review of the Dependent Variable

An expert review was conducted to evaluate precursory content and face validity information regarding measurement of the dependent variable (i.e., a pre-test/post-test instrument comprised of the TEEM with two added vignettes, the Efficacy in Classroom Management subscale of the TSES, the TISK with added items, and the Teacher Perception of Bullying Frequency Scale) (see Appendix D). The primary advantage of conducting this type of review is that it helps researchers to identify difficulties and inconsistencies in their surveys and related materials that they may not otherwise be considered, thus helping to promote both content and face validity (Fink & Kosecoff, 1998). Content validity addresses the degree to which an instrument accurately samples all relevant content, while face validity concerns the degree to which a measure appears to be a valid measure of a given construct (Dimitrov, 2009).

For the expert review portion of this research project, six experts in the field of education were asked to review the items on the pre-test/post-test instrument. Two experts were doctoral candidates in school psychology, two held doctorate degrees in school psychology, one was a middle school principal, and one was a school counselor. This method of recruiting individuals from various educational backgrounds for expert review of program variables has been employed in recent dissertations focusing on similar content areas (e.g., Bradic, 2014; Defago, 2012).

The expert review was conducted via electronic communication, due to its many advantages including: minimal cost, greater speed, and the ability for participants to complete the survey at a distance and at their own convenience (Thach, 1995). Specifically, through email participants were asked if they were interested in serving as an expert reviewer and, if so, they were given access to both the pre-test/post-test instrument and a 7-item Expert Review of the
Dependent Variable regarding its utility and feasibility (see Appendix G). The Expert Review of the Dependent Variable was modeled from a previously developed pilot instrument, and was administered to evaluate survey format and content (Defago, 2012). Specifically, the Expert Review of the Dependent Variable asked reviewers to provide an evaluation of the following: a) the amount of time required to complete the survey, b) the degree to which the added items accurately reflected the content of the added module, c) whether items required editing and how they should be edited, and d) any additional comments or suggestions for improving the survey.

On average, participants indicated that the instrument took approximately 20 to 30 minutes to complete. All participants reported that the survey took an appropriate amount of time, was easy to understand, and accurately reflected the content as intended. Additional anecdotal information obtained through the expert review of the dependent variable resulted in minor changes in rewording; however, no suggestions for major changes were given.

**Reliability of the Dependent Variable**

Following teachers’ completion of the follow-up session of the modified Bully Busters program, data for the dependent variable were evaluated for internal consistency. Specifically, a Cronbach’s reliability analysis was employed to obtain a coefficient of internal consistency for both the Expectation and Self-Efficacy subscales of TEEM with the two added vignette items, and the TISK Knowledge and Use subscales with added items, as these scales had not undergone previous assessments of internal consistency (Dimitrov, 2009; Hinkin, Tracey & Enz, 1997). The internal consistency of Teacher Perception of Bullying Frequency Scale was also evaluated for the subscales of Physical, Verbal, and Relational Bullying, as this measure was specifically developed for the purpose of this study. Cronbach coefficient alpha scores above .70 are
considered to be at an acceptable level and are representative of moderate to strong internal consistency (Gliner & Morgan, 2000). Strong internal consistency reliability for revised and edited scales suggests that the added items measure the same constructs in the regional measure. It is argued that reliability testing is critical prior to developing inferences from revised scales (Dimitrov; Hinkin, Tracey & Enz).

Internal consistency measures on the TEEM- Expectation subscale with the added vignettes were consistent (Cronbach α = .83), as were the TEEM- Efficacy subscale with the added vignettes (Cronbach α = .94). Internal consistency measures on the TISK- Knowledge subscale with the added items was indicative of strong reliability (Cronbach α = .96), as was the TISK- Use subscale with the added items (Cronbach α = .94). The internal consistency of Teacher Perception of Bullying Frequency Scale was also high across Physical (Cronbach α = .88), Verbal (Cronbach α = .90), and Relational (Cronbach α = .94) subscales.

**Research Design**

A quasi-experimental pre-test/post-test design was implemented for the purpose of answering the three research questions. This approach occurs frequently in educational research as it involves the use of intact groups (i.e., teachers at a middle school) and does not prevent a control group from being exposed to a potentially beneficial intervention (Dimitrov, 2009; Keith, 1988). Following completion of the pre-test instrument, participants completed the modified Bully Buster program for teachers, addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities, facilitated by a doctoral candidate in school psychology (see Bell, 2008; Browning, 2004). Four weeks after the program concluded, participants completed the post-test instrument, which sought to evaluate outcomes associated with the research questions. See Table 3 for an outline of the research design. See Table 4 below for procedural details regarding phases of the
study, objectives associated with each phase, the methods used to determine completion of each objective, and the timelines associated with all phases and related activities.

Table 3

Outline of Research Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-test Instrument</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Post-test Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 teacher participants</td>
<td>Teacher Perception of Bullying Frequency Scale; TEEM- with two added vignettes; TSES-Classroom Management subscale; and TISK- with added items</td>
<td>The psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying teacher training program used for the purpose of this study</td>
<td>Teacher Perception of Bullying Frequency Scale; TEEM- with two added vignettes; TSES- Classroom Management subscale; and TISK- with added items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Project Management Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Measurement of Completion</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1: Expert Review of DV</td>
<td>1.1 Recruit 7 participants</td>
<td>Emails sent to educational professionals 7 pilot instruments, and questionnaires completed</td>
<td>1 week to contact participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Email pilot study materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 week following 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Evaluate results of qualitative review and Pilot Instrument Questionnaire</td>
<td>Dependent variable improved based on pilot results</td>
<td>2 weeks following 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: Recruit Participants</td>
<td>2.1 Email building administrator</td>
<td>Administrative approval to conduct program 15 flyers placed in teacher mailboxes</td>
<td>2 years following 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Place recruitment flyers in all teacher mailboxes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 week following 2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This study sought to evaluate the effectiveness of the four-module version Bully Busters (grades 6-8) with an added module containing study-specific content, through three research questions and four related hypotheses. Quantitative analyses were conducted to determine
whether to accept or reject the null hypotheses for each of the three research questions.

Additional Descriptive Statistics were conducted to assess the variability of responses. Results associated with the pre-test/post-test instrument were analyzed using the IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 23, 2015.

**Research Question One**

Does a psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying program for teachers addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities affect teacher participants’ self-efficacy and expectations as it relates to successfully intervening in a bully victim conflict?

**Null hypothesis 1a.** There is not a significant difference in teachers’ expectations for student behavior as it relates to successfully intervening in a bully victim conflict as measured by the Teacher Expectation and Efficacy Measure (TEEM) (Howard et al., 2001; MVPP, 2005), with two added vignettes.

**Null hypothesis 1b.** There is not a significant difference in teachers’ self-efficacy as it relates to successfully intervening in a bully victim conflict as measured by the Teacher Expectation and Efficacy Measure (TEEM) (Howard et al., 2001; MVPP, 2005), with two added vignettes.

**Null hypothesis 1c.** There is not a significant difference in teachers’ self-efficacy and as it relates to successfully intervening in a bully victim conflict as measured by the Efficacy in Classroom Management subscale of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Tschaannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).
Research Question Two

Does a psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying program for teachers addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities affect teacher participants’ knowledge and use of bullying intervention skills?

Null hypothesis 2a. There is not a significant difference in teachers’ knowledge of bullying intervention skills as measured by the Teacher Inventory of Knowledge and Skills (TISK) (Newman et al., 2000), with added items.

Null hypothesis 2b. There is not a significant difference in teachers’ use of bullying intervention skills as measured by the Teacher Inventory of Knowledge and Skills (TISK) (Newman et al., 2000), with added items.

Research Question Three

Does a psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying program for teachers addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities affect teacher participants’ perception of bullying frequency?

Null hypothesis 3. There is not a significant difference in teachers’ perception of bullying frequency as measured by the Teacher Perception of Bullying Frequency Scale.

To address the first research question, a two-tailed t-test was conducted on the Efficacy subscale of the TEEM with the two added vignettes. Likewise, a two-tailed t-test was conducted on the Expectation subscale of the TEEM with the two added vignettes. Additionally, a two-tailed t-test was conducted to evaluate pre-test/post-test scores as measured by the Efficacy in Classroom Management subscale of the TSES. This statistical procedure has been validated in previous literature assessing pre-test/post-test scores of both the TEEM and the TSES as method.
of evaluating teacher self-efficacy as it relates to the Bully Busters program (see Bell, 2008; Bell et al., 2010; Howard et al., 2001; Newgent et al., 2011).

To address the second research question, a two-tailed t-test was conducted on the Knowledge subscale of the middle school version of the TISK with added items. Likewise, a two-tailed t-test was conducted on the Use subscale of the middle school version of the TISK with added items. This statistical procedure has been validated in previous Bully Busters literature assessing pre-test/post-test scores on both the TISK (for teachers of grades 6 through 8) and the TISK-E (for elementary school teachers) (Howard et al., 2001; Newgent et al., 2011).

To address the final research question, a two-tailed t-test was conducted on the pre-test post-test scores of the Teacher Perception of Bullying Frequency Scale. As discussed, this measure was developed for the purpose of the present study and had not been validated in previous Bully Busters literature. However, studies assessing student perceptions of bullying frequencies have used this statistical procedure as a method of evaluating pre-test/post-test scores on similar measures (Bell, 2008, Bell et al., 2010). Consequently, a two-tailed t-test was determined as the most appropriate procedure for evaluating changes in teacher perceptions of bullying frequencies across each construct of physical, verbal, and relational bullying.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Overview

This study was designed to examine the effects of a psychoeducationally-based bullying program on teacher knowledge and self-efficacy in addressing bullying involving all students, including students with disabilities. Specifically, the following variables were examined; 1) teachers’ self-efficacy and expectations as it relates to successfully intervening in a bully victim conflict, 2) teachers’ knowledge and use of bullying intervention skills, and 3) teachers’ perceptions of bullying frequency (physical, verbal, and relational forms). Changes in these variables were analyzed via three research questions and four null hypotheses. These were developed to evaluate the effectiveness of the independent variable and statistical analyses were conducted to determine whether to retain or reject the null hypotheses. The statistical procedures employed to test these hypotheses were comprised of two steps: 1) Means and Standard Deviations were determined for each of the pre- and post-test scales scores and 2) a two-tailed t-test was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference between the pre- and post-test scales scores.

Research Question One

Does a psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying program for teachers addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities affect teacher participants’ self-efficacy and expectations as it relates to successfully intervening in a bully victim conflict?

Null hypothesis 1a. There is not a significant difference in teachers’ expectations for student behavior as it relates to successfully intervening in a bully victim conflict as measured by
the Teacher Expectation and Efficacy Measure (TEEM) (Howard et al., 2001; MVPP, 2005), with two added vignettes (see Table 5).

As previously addressed, the TEEM is comprised of two separate scales. The first of these evaluates a teacher’s self-report of their expectations for behavior among both bullies and victims. The pre-test distribution on the Expectation subscale of the TEEM yielded a mean of 49.57 (range = 40-63), with a standard deviation of 7.21. The post-test distribution on the Expectation subscale of the TEEM yielded a mean of 55.86 (range = 45-69), with a standard deviation of 8.35.

These results were analyzed using a two-tailed t-test to determine if measures on the TEEM- Expectation subscale were significantly different from pre-test to post-test. The self-reported expectations for student behavior on pre-test measures (\(M = 49.57, SD = 7.21\)) and post-test measures (\(M = 55.86, SD = 8.35\)) were statistically significant (\(t[13, 1] = -2.84, p = .014\)). These scores are presented in Table 5. This analysis suggests that there was a significant change with respect to the teacher-participants’ expectations for behavior change in all students, including those with disabilities, who were bullies and victims. Therefore, null hypothesis 1a was rejected.

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviation Values, and t-test Results of the Difference Between the Pre-test and Post-test as Measured by the TEEM- Expectation Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55.86</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>-2.84</td>
<td>.014*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at \(p < .05\).
*p < .05

**Null hypothesis 1b.** There is not a significant difference in teachers’ self-efficacy as it relates to successfully intervening in a bully victim conflict as measured by the Teacher Expectation and Efficacy Measure (TEEM) (Howard et al., 2001; MVPP, 2005), with two added vignettes (see Table 6).

The second subscale of the TEEM measures teachers’ reporting of their perceptions of their ability to effectively intervene with bullies and victims. The pre-test distribution on the Efficacy subscale of the TEEM yielded a mean of 102.93 (range = 74-130), with a standard deviation of 15.13. The post-test distribution on the Efficacy subscale of the TEEM yielded a mean of 115.21 (range = 87-136), with a standard deviation of 14.79.

These results were analyzed using a two-tailed t-test to determine if measures on the TEEM- Efficacy subscale were significantly different from pre-test to post-test. The self-reported feelings of effectively intervening in situations involving both bullies and victims on pre-test measures ($M = 102.93, SD = 15.13$) and post-test measures ($M = 115.21, SD = 14.79$) were statistically significant ($t [13, 1] = -4.16, p = .001$). These scores are presented in Table 6. This analysis suggests that there was a significant change with respect to the teacher-participants’ perceptions of their ability to effectively intervene in situations involving bullies and victims, including those with disabilities. Therefore, null hypothesis 1a was rejected.
Table 6

*Means, Standard Deviation Values, and t-test Results of the Difference Between the Pre-test and Post-test as Measured by the TEEM- Efficacy Subscale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>102.93</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>115.21</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>-4.16</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p <.01

**Null hypothesis 1c.** There is not a significant difference in teachers’ self-efficacy and as it relates to successfully intervening in a bully victim conflict as measured by the Efficacy in Classroom Management subscale of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Tschaannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) (see Table 7).

The TSES Efficacy in Classroom Management subscale is an 8-item scale, assessing teachers’ sense of efficacy as it relates to addressing student behavioral outcomes. This subscale has a scoring range of 8 to 72, with the higher scores indicating higher levels of perceived efficacy. The pre-test distribution on this measure yielded a mean of 60.14 (range = 44-65) and a standard deviation of 5.82. The posttest distribution yielded a mean of 62.79 (range 51-72), with a standard deviation of 6.42.

These results were analyzed using a two-tailed t-test to determine if scores on the TSES were significantly different from pre-test and post-test. The reported efficacy on pre-test measures ($M = 60.14$, $SD = 5.82$) and post-test measures ($M = 62.79$, $SD = 6.42$) were not statistically significant ($t [1, 13] = -1.76$, $p = .101$). These data are presented in Table 7. This analysis indicates that there was no measurable change as it relates to teachers’ perceptions of
their efficacy in their classroom management skills that relate to intervening in a bully/victim conflict. Therefore, null hypothesis 1b was retained.

Table 7

Means, Standard Deviation Values, and t-test Results of the Difference Between the Pre-test and Post-test as Measured by the TSES- Efficacy in Classroom Management Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60.14</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>62.791</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question Two

Does a psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying program for teachers addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities affect teacher participants’ knowledge and use of bullying intervention skills?

Null hypothesis 2a. There is not a significant difference in teachers’ knowledge of bullying intervention skills as measured by the Teacher Inventory of Knowledge and Skills (TISK) (Newman et al., 2000), with added items. This hypothesis was measured using a two-tailed t-test (see Table 8).

The TISK is comprised of two separate scales. The first of these evaluates a teachers’ self-report of their knowledge of the interventions and behavior techniques presented in the Bully Busters Teacher Training Program with the added module addressing the needs of students with disabilities. The pre-test distribution on the TISK- Knowledge subscale with the added items yielded a mean of 151.50 (range 106-181), with a standard deviation of 23.85. The post-
test distributions on the TISK- Knowledge subscale with the added items yielded a mean of 193.21 (range = 139-250) with a standard deviation of 28.32.

These results were analyzed using a two-tailed t-test to determine if measures on the TISK- Knowledge subscale were significantly different from pre-test to post-test. The self-reported knowledge of interventions and techniques on pre-test measures ($M = 151.50, SD = 23.85$) and post-test measures ($M = 193.21, SD = 28.32$) were statistically significant ($t ([3, 1] = -8.73, p = .000$). These scores are presented in Table 8. This analysis suggests that there was a significant change with respect to the teacher-participants’ self-reported knowledge of behavioral interventions and techniques accommodating all students, including those with disabilities. Therefore, null hypothesis 2 was rejected.

Table 8

Means, Standard Deviation Values, and t-test Results of the Difference Between the Pre-test and Post-test as Measured by the TISK- Knowledge Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>151.5</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>193.21</td>
<td>28.32</td>
<td>-8.73</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

**Null hypothesis 2b.** There is not a significant difference in teachers’ use of bullying intervention skills as measured by the Teacher Inventory of Knowledge and Skills (TISK) (Newman et al., 2000), with added items. This hypothesis was measured using a two-tailed t-test (see Table 9).
As previously addressed, the TISK is comprised of two separate scales. The second scale of these evaluates a teachers’ self-report of their frequency of using the interventions and behavior techniques presented in the Bully Busters Teacher Training Program. The pre-test distribution on the TISK-Use subscale with the added items yielded a mean of 145.50 (range 110-174) with a standard deviation of 19.59. The post-test distributions on the TISK-Use subscale with the added items yielded a mean of 159 (range 132-199) with a standard deviation of 22.11.

These results were analyzed using a two-tailed t-test to determine if measures on the TISK-Use subscale were significantly different from pre-test to post-test. The self-reported use of interventions and techniques on pre-test measures ($M = 145.50$, $SD = 19.59$) and post-test measures ($M = 159$, $SD = 22.11$) were statistically significant ($t [13, 1] = -4.86$, $p = .000$). These scores are presented in Table 9. This analysis suggests that there was a significant change with respect to the teacher-participants’ self-reported use of behavioral interventions and techniques accommodating all students, including those with disabilities. Therefore, null hypothesis 2 was again rejected.

Table 9

*Means, Standard Deviation Values, and t-test Results of the Difference Between the Pre-test and Post-test as Measured by the TISK-Use Subscale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>149.50</td>
<td>19.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>22.11</td>
<td>-4.86</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01**
Research Question Three

Does a psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying program for teachers addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities affect teacher participants’ perception of bullying frequency?

Null hypothesis 3. There is not a significant difference in teachers’ perception of bullying frequency as measured by the Teacher Perception of Bullying Frequency Scale. This hypothesis was measured using a two-tailed t-test.

The Teacher Perception of Bully Frequency Scale was specifically developed for the purpose of this study and is a 12 item, 6-point Likert scale. The first six items assessed teachers’ perceptions of the frequency in which they believed bullying in a physical, verbal and relational form occurs in both their schools and classrooms. The final six items evaluated teachers’ perceptions of bullying frequencies in physical, verbal, and relational forms among students with disabilities in both their schools and classrooms. Pre-test and post-test scores on the Teacher Perception of Bully Frequency Scale ranged from 12 to 72. The data were grouped into scores within the three forms of bullying: physical, verbal, and relational.

The pre-test distribution of items regarding physical forms of bullying yielded a mean of 9.07 (range = 4-18) with a standard deviation of 4.26. The post-test distributions of items regarding physical forms of bullying yielded a mean of 10.21 (range = 5-16) with a standard deviation of 3.73.

These results were analyzed using a two-tailed t-test to determine if measures on the Teacher Perception of Bully Frequency Scale for physical forms of bullying were significantly different from pre-test to post-test. The self-reported pre-test frequency measures ($M = 9.07, SD$
and post-test measures \((M = 10.21, SD = 3.73)\) were not statistically significant \((t [13, 1] = -1.198, p = .252)\). These scores are presented in Table 10. This analysis suggests that there was a not significant change with respect to the teacher-participants’ perception of physical bullying frequencies in their schools and classrooms, among all students, including those with disabilities. Therefore, null hypothesis 2 was retained.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>-1.198</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pre-test distribution of items regarding verbal forms of bullying yielded a mean of 15.71 (range = 8-24) with a standard deviation of 5.09. The post-test distribution of items regarding verbal forms of bullying yielded a mean of 15.79 (range 10-24) with a standard deviation of 4.95.

These results were analyzed using a two-tailed t-test to determine if measures on the Teacher Perception of Bully Frequency Scale for verbal forms of bullying were significantly different from pre-test to post-test. The pre-test frequency measures \((M = 15.71, SD = 5.09)\) and post-test measures \((M = 15.79, SD = 4.95)\) were not statistically significant \((t [13, 1] = -0.079, p = .938)\). These scores are presented in Table 11. This analysis suggests that there was a not significant change with respect to teacher-participants’ perceptions of verbal bullying
frequencies in their schools and classrooms, among all students, including those with disabilities. Therefore, null hypothesis 2 was retained.

Table 11

*Means, Standard Deviation Values, and t-test Results of the Difference Between the Pre-test and Post-test as Measured by the Teacher Perception of Bully Frequency Scale- Verbal Measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pre-test distribution of items regarding relational forms of bullying yielded a mean of 14.93 (range 5 - 24) with a standard deviation of 5.86. The post-test distribution of items regarding relational forms of bullying yielded a mean of 13.57 (range 8 -24) with a standard deviation of 5.59.

These results were analyzed using a two-tailed t-test to determine if measures on the Teacher Perception of Bully Frequency Scale for relational forms of bullying were significantly different from pre-test to post-test. The pre-test frequency measures ($M = 14.93, SD = 5.86$) and post-test measures ($M = 13.57, SD = 5.59$) were not statistically significant ($t [13, 1] = 0.840, p = .416$). These scores are presented in Table 12. This analysis suggests that there was a not significant change with respect to the teacher-participants’ perceptions of relational bullying frequencies in their schools and classrooms, among all students, including those with disabilities. Therefore, null hypothesis 2 was retained.
Table 12

Means, Standard Deviation Values, and t-test Results of the Difference Between the Pre-test and Post-test as Measured by the Teacher Perception of Bully Frequency Scale- Relational Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

Unique Contributions to and Comparisons with the Literature

This research study was designed to investigate the effects of a psychoeducationally-based bullying prevention program on teacher perceptions of their abilities to address bullying among all students, including those with disabilities. Multiple research studies have demonstrated that students with disabilities may be more likely to become both victims and perpetrators of bullying. Many instances of bullying and victimization occur at school; therefore, school-based bullying interventions that equip school personnel to respond to bullying instances in a meaningful way are a priority to educators (Bradshaw et al., 2007; Swearer & Espelage, 2010). Unfortunately, comprehensive literature reviews and meta-analyses reveal that many existing anti-bullying programs may not have been entirely successful in part because they failed to consider aspects of diversity and aspects of individual differences, including students with disabilities (Ferguson et al., 2007; Newgent et al., 2011; Swearer et al., 2010). Consequently, due to the high instance of bullying and victimization among students with disabilities, it is argued that this construct could prove to be an integral component of school-based bullying prevention programs (Rose et al., 2009; Rose et al., 2011).

In an effort to provide preliminary research within this area of need, this study sought to examine the effects of a modified, research-based anti-bullying program on teacher knowledge and use of bullying interventions addressing students with disabilities, as well as their self-efficacy and expectations in responding to bullying among this population. The Bully Busters program was selected as the staff training protocol due to its solid foundation of evidence and because it has been easily modified to meet the needs of diverse ecologies (Bell, 2008; Bell et al.,
Given the observed gap within the bullying literature of teacher training programs that address the needs of all students, this study sought to continue the use of the four-module version of the Bully Busters program among middle school teachers along with an added module addressing the particular needs of students with disabilities.

This study sought to expand upon our current knowledge of anti-bullying initiatives addressing the needs of diverse students. Specifically, the current study was designed to serve as an early channel in the literature examining programs addressing bullying among students with disabilities. It was devised to focus solely on teachers as key respondents, given that this work is preclusive relative to the bullying literature. Furthermore, although the use of the abbreviated version of the Bully Busters program with added module deviates from standard model, its effects on teacher self-efficacy, expectations, and knowledge and use of bullying interventions are noteworthy, and are discussed in the sections below.

**Teacher Expectations and Intervening in Bullying**

Teacher expectations for student behavior are directly related to teacher feelings of perceived success in intervening in bullying situations (Bell et al., 2010; Bell, 2008; Howard et al., 2001; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). As previously discussed, the Teacher Expectation and Efficacy Measure (TEEM) (Howard et al.; MVPP, 2005) was used to examine the variable of teacher expectations of students in their classrooms.

For the purpose of the current study, the Expectation subscale of the TEEM was amended to include two additional vignettes focusing on two students with specific disabilities (i.e., physical disabilities, intellectual disabilities, emotional disabilities, and learning disabilities). Data analysis revealed a significant increase in teacher self-reports of expectations regarding
adaptive student behavior following their participation in the modified Bully Busters program as measured via the TEEM. This increase of expectations for adaptive behavior among students has been observed in other studies in this line of inquiry. However, it is important to note that this study demonstrated a significant increase even with additional TEEM items addressing students with disabilities, which has not been used in previous research (Bell et al., 2010; Bell, 2008; Howard et al., 2001; Newman-Carlson, & Horne, 2004). Given the purpose of this study, it is salient to note that teacher expectations for student behavior increased in relation to all students, including those with disabilities. As such, one may infer that the statistically significant changes in teacher expectations yielded in this study are linked to the modified Bully Busters teacher training program with an emphasis on implications for students with disabilities. Replications of this study are needed to provide additional information about this important variable in relation to bullying in all students, including students with disabilities.

**Teacher Self-Efficacy and Intervening in Bullying**

Teacher feelings of self-efficacy in managing student behavior is also related to the likelihood that they will respond to incidents of bullying (Bell et al., 2010; Bell, 2008; Howard et al., 2001; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). The TEEM (Self-Efficacy subscale) and the Teacher Self Efficacy Scale (TSES; Efficacy in Classroom Management subscale) were both used to examine teacher perceptions of self-efficacy in managing student behavior and responding to bullying incidents. Specifically, the TEEM Self-Efficacy subscale examined teacher self-efficacy through four vignettes, two of which were added to include content addressing bullying among students with disabilities. The TSES Efficacy in Classroom Management subscale was used to assess teacher perceptions of their classroom management
abilities, which are frequently associated with their likelihood of intervening in bullying incidents (Bell; Bell et al.; Tschaannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Data from this study yielded a statistically significant increase in teacher feelings of self-efficacy via the TEEM following intervention, which has been corroborated in similar studies (Bell et al., 2010; Bell, 2008; Howard et al., 2001; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). This increase in perceived feelings of self-efficacy among teachers maintains an important implication, as the current research maintained a significant increase with the TEEM including items added to address students with disabilities that have not been used in previous research (Bell et al.; Bell; Howard et al.; Newman-Carlson & Horne). Thus, one may infer that the statistically significant increase in teacher feelings of self-efficacy via the TEEM yielded in this study are linked to the modified Bully Buster program with an emphasis on applications for students with disabilities. More research is needed to explore this important variable in relation to bullying prevention and intervention as related to students with disabilities.

Contradictory to the results associated with the TEEM, teacher self-reports on the TSES did not yield significant results following intervention. Whereas some research resulted in changes across both instruments (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004), this differentiation in outcomes across measures has been observed in previous research, in which the concept of teacher perceived self-efficacy increased via results of the TEEM, but not with regard to the TSES (Bell, 2008; Bell et al., 2010). Furthermore, previous studies using the TSES have utilized the measure in its entirety, while this research only employed the Efficacy in Classroom Management subscale of TSES (Newgent et al., 2011; Newman-Carlson & Horne).
One could argue that the general notion of classroom management as measured via the Efficacy in Classroom Management subscale of TSES, versus specific students as illustrated in the TEEM, could have been viewed by participants as an overall reflection of their own teaching skills, thus resulting in elevated scores on pre-test measures. From these results, teacher self-efficacy did not increase on both instruments. However, increases on the TEEM are suggestive of the training program’s role in promoting teacher self-efficacy in responding to all students, including those with disabilities. This study moved us toward a better understanding of this aspect of teacher perceptions regarding bullying prevention as related to students with and without disabilities. However, more research is needed to assess outcomes for applications with a variety of students, employing a variety of instruments.

**Teacher Knowledge and Use of Bullying Intervention Skills**

The TISK was specifically developed to evaluate the effects of the Bully Buster’s teacher training program (Newman et al., 2000). The TISK consists of two subscales used to measure teacher self-reports of *knowledge* and *use* of bullying intervention techniques following training (i.e., the Knowledge subscale and the Use subscale). For the purpose of this study, 11-items were added to the 64-item scale containing information and strategies found in the fifth training module, Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities.

Data analysis from this study yielded a statistically significant increase in teacher self-reported knowledge of bulling intervention strategies following training, as measured by the modified TISK. Teacher self-reported knowledge of bullying interventions and techniques following the Bully Busters program has increased in similar studies; however, in those studies, the training program did not contain the fifth module nor the added 11-items to the TISK. Based
on the outcomes associated with the TISK in this study, one may infer that teachers’ knowledge of bullying interventions and techniques addressing all students, including those with disabilities, increased as a consequence of their participation in the modified Bully Busters anti-bullying program. Again, more research is needed to further explore this particular research question.

Data analysis from this study also yielded a significant increase in teacher self-reported use of bullying intervention strategies following training, as measured by the modified TISK. Teacher self-reported use of bullying interventions and techniques following the Bully Busters program has also increased in similar studies; however, other training programs did not contain the fifth module nor the added 11-items to the TISK. Results of the current study suggest that teachers’ self-reported use of bullying interventions and techniques addressing all students, including those with disabilities, increased as a consequence of their participation in the modified Bully Busters anti-bullying program. Thus, we have addressed self-report in a manner consistent with existing literature utilizing teacher training as a vessel for decreasing bullying in schools (Bell, 2008; Bell, Raczinski & Horne, 2011; Newman et al., 2000; Newgent et al., 2011; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). Whereas self-report assessment was determined as the appropriate measure for this study due to the nature of the research questions, perhaps the next step in this line of research is to replicate this study adding a more objective measure of intervention implementation (i.e., third-party observations of treatment fidelity regarding various skills in the classroom).

**Teacher Perceptions of Bullying Frequencies**

The Teacher Perception of Bullying Frequency Scale was developed for this study to assess teachers’ perceptions of the frequency with which they believe bullying in physical,
verbal, and relational occurs within their schools and classrooms, among all students—including those with disabilities. Teacher responses were divided by the three categories of perceived bullying incidents: physical, verbal, and relational. Data analyses revealed that there were no statistically significant differences observed with regard to frequency across types of bullying incidents. This lack of significant shift in reports has also been observed in related Bully Busters studies that employed similar measures (Bell Raczinski & Horne, 2011; Newgent et al., 2011).

A careful inspection of the data revealed that teacher perceptions of frequencies of verbal and physical bullying slightly increased over time, while perceptions of relational bullying slightly decreased over time. One may conclude that a lack of statistically significant differences from pre-test to post-test may have been due to a heightened sensitivity to bullying throughout training or from a prior training (Newgent et al., 2011). For example, it may have been the case that teachers became more aware of bullying as a result of training, therefore increasing their awareness of the occurrence of bullying incidents. Addressing teachers’ perceptions of bullying may be a critical ingredient in this line of inquiry. This may be especially important in light of the observation that teachers may under- or over-report bullying in schools. Such may have implications in terms of their willingness to intervene as well as students’ sense of safety and well-being in the school environment (Holt, Keyes, & Koenig, 2011; Hoover & Stenhjem, 2003; Kochenderfer-Ladd, & Pelletier, 2008; Sawyer et al., 2007; Yoon, & Kerber, 2003). It has been argued that when students are questioned in a similar manner, post-test results often yield an artificial inflation of bullying reports (Bell Raczinski & Horne, 2011). Clearly, more research is needed to further address measurement as related to this particular variable – perhaps from multiple perspectives. For example, in an effort to gain a global and objective perspective of
school climate change following implementation of the Bully Busters program, future research could examine disciplinary referrals related to bullying over a three-year process.

Implications for Practice: Addressing the Needs of Students with Disabilities with Respect to Involvement in Bullying

As illustrated in Chapter I, bullying prevention efforts addressing the needs of students with disabilities is a deficiency in the bullying literature (Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Raskauskas & Modell, 2011; Swearer et al., 2009; Swearer et al., 2012). Given the multitude of published articles outlining the increased likelihood that students with disabilities have for involvement in bullying, it is perplexing that widely-known bullying prevention programs fail to address this area of need. In an effort to provide preliminary information on a strategy for addressing bullying among students with disabilities, this study sought to modify an existing research-based program to address this particular vacancy. Focusing on teachers’ awareness, knowledge, self-efficacy, expectancies, and skills related to anti-bullying programming was identified as an important first step in the process of addressing this critical gap in the literature.

Results of this study suggest that following training focusing on addressing bullying in students with and without disabilities, teachers’ expectations for student success in their classroom increased for all students. Furthermore, teachers’ feelings of self-efficacy in addressing bullying among all students also increased as measured by the TEEM. In addition, following training, teachers’ feelings of knowledge of bullying interventions increased, including their knowledge of interventions for students with disabilities. Finally, teachers’ self-reported use of bullying interventions addressing all students increased following training.
Outcomes associated with this study provide us with valuable information in our infancy of understanding how including information about those variables that may make certain groups of students more prone to involvement in bullying (i.e., as bullies and/or victims). This is congruent with both the spirit of and need for comprehensive bullying prevention programming. Specifically, including aspects of diversity into programs with a history of a uniform ‘one size fits all’ model may be helpful in addressing bullying in schools. Grounded in a universal program with much research to support its overall efficacy, this study sought to address the need for preliminary information regarding bullying prevention programs that address bullying among students with disabilities (Raskauskas & Modell, 2011; Swearer et al., 2010; Swearer et al. 2011).

Results of this study aid us in our understanding of how to provide in-service training to teachers about students with disabilities’ involvement in the bullying dynamic, how students with disabilities may respond differently to bullying as compared to their typically developing peers, and how training may help educators to respond more effectively. As is it our ultimate goal as educational professionals for students with disabilities to be served in their Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), it is arguably critical that all teachers, both general education and special education, feel confident to work with students with disabilities in their classrooms (U.S Department of Education, 2014).

Furthermore, encouraging and providing teacher professional development geared toward a comprehensive understanding of bullying among students with and without disabilities is congruent with a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) model for service delivery and preventive programming (Savage, 2005; Swearer et al., 2010). Specifically, schools can make
universal environmental changes, such as increasing supervision during classroom transitions, striving to facilitate a classroom structure that discourages social isolation, and designing structured activities at recess to include students with disabilities (Swearer & Doll, 2002). At the classroom level, teachers can assign students to groups instead of allowing them to choose to ensure inclusion of students with disabilities, and enlist students without disabilities to help students with disabilities successfully navigate social situations (Attwood, 2007; Cappadocia et al., 2012; Doll, Song, Champion, & Jones, 2011; Swearer & Doll, 2002).

In an effort to provide a variety of supports for students with disabilities, school psychologists serve as a valuable resource to schools in assisting with data-based decision making, program evaluation, systems change, and consultation in implementing programming across tiers of support (Bradshaw et al., 2013; NASP, 2010). Specifically, school psychologists are uniquely equipped to facilitate and evaluate teacher-training addressing implications associated with bullying among students with disabilities. School psychologists are also positioned with work with teachers to address student needs by evaluating available school resources and how those resources can serve to meet individual students. Assisting teachers and administrators to in serving students at varying levels of supports is one of the many roles that school psychologists are trained to subsume (NASP).

**Limitations**

The present study sought to examine the effects of a psychoeducationally-based bullying prevention program on teachers’ self-efficacy, expectancies, knowledge and use of bullying interventions, as well as the perceptions of bullying in their schools and classrooms. Because the
current research study was conducted in an applied setting with a combination of replicated and unique independent and dependent variables, multiple limitations apply.

This study was limited to sixth, seventh, and eighth grade teachers in a public middle school in rural central Ohio who voluntarily participated and were compensated through continuing education hours towards fulfillment of their licensure requirement (i.e., it was a quasi-experimental design using in-tact groups). Demographic data indicate that the majority of the teachers (i.e., 13 out of 14) represented 7th and 8th grade classrooms and that 11 out of 14 teachers were general education teachers. Given the pool of participants, one would anticipate that sixth-grade teachers would have accounted for 4 to 5 participants. Therefore, future research could consider ensuring that an equal representation of teachers exists across grade levels prior to data collection. Furthermore, although a majority of teachers participating were general education teachers, the representation of special education teachers is nearly equal to the percentage of special education students in the district. This suggests that the amount of special education teachers who participated were representative of the number of students they served. Additional research could seek to gain an equal representation of special education teachers to gain a larger perspective from that particular group.

In addition, demographic data indicate that approximately 12 of the 14 participants identified as European American. Furthermore, the school district was composed of a majority of European American students (95%). These characteristics of the population and setting limit the extent to which this research applies to populations who do not identify predominantly as European American. More research is needed with more diverse populations.
A primary limitation of this study is that it was limited to a middle school setting, thus making it difficult to generalize the findings to elementary and high school settings. Specifically, the modified Bully Buster’s Program was designed to address teachers who work with middle school students (grades 6 though 8). Therefore, results can only be generalized to middle school settings. Future research could examine the effects of a modified version of the Bully Busters Program, grades K-5 (Horne, Bartolomucci, & Newman-Carlson, 2003). However, the added module (i.e., Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities) would likely need to be restructured to address an elementary population.

Another limitation is that this study sought to recruit all junior high school teachers in the building as active participants and, therefore, did not employ the use of a control group. Future research could examine participant data compared to data obtained from a control group to compare differences. This research could be conducted if a randomly selected group of teacher volunteers were initially provided the interventions, with reports compared to a randomly selected control group. Following data collection, control group volunteers could be provided with the training program for ethical purposes.

Although addressed partially through having teachers bring their Classroom Interactions Awareness Charts (CIAC) to each training to discuss specific bullying incidents and logged data during grade level team meetings, there was no formal oversight to ensure that teachers were utilizing the bullying interventions covered during training (i.e. delivering classroom activities to students or working with students during bullying incidents). This study was designed to assess teachers’ perceptions in responding to bullying among all students, including those with disabilities; however, it failed to account for both self-report and direct observational data.
Research seeking to corroborate the data obtained through the modified version of the TISK-Use subscale could employ methods to observe teachers in applied settings. For example, third-party individuals might observe teachers in their classrooms to assess their ability to effectively address and respond to bullying situations. This observational data could be both quantitative and qualitative in nature, designed to provide insight into teachers’ ability to utilize the information and to execute the recommendations provided during the modified Bully Busters training program.

Whereas the limitation identified above is concerned with treatment fidelity, a related limitation is that the data collected regarding bullying frequency were highly limited with respect to context and applicability. Specifically, teacher report measures are limited in their context and in the scope of information they provide. That is, with the construct of bullying, teacher reports are limited to the teachers’ perceptions of bullying and when it is occurring (Cornell, Sheras, & Cole, 2006; Leff et al., 2011). Self-report measures are also subject to individual biases and social desirability. In order to improve objectivity, future research could employ additional informant ratings (e.g., student ratings) (Hymel and Swearer, 2015). Future research could also utilize dependent variables alternative to self-report, such as direct observation and office disciplinary referral data (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). The gathering and interpretation of reliable, valid bullying incidence data remains one of the greatest challenges associated with bullying prevention and intervention research and practice (Hymel & Swearer, 2015).

Social validity of the training program was not formally assessed in this research. The final follow up session encouraged teachers’ recall of program content, and was designed to promote social validity among participants, although it was not directly measured. (Horne et al.,
Despite lack of formal assessment, social validity was illustrated informally through anecdotal information provided by participants. Specifically, teachers continued to log their CIAC charts months following training and compared results at grade-level team meetings. Furthermore, special education teachers began to include behavioral goals in Individual Education Plans for students with disabilities, particularly addressing components of bullying and social skills training. These anecdotal reports may help to inform future research seeking to examine the construct of social validity through formal assessment.

Another limitation is that the instruments used to evaluate the three research questions incorporated some modified versions of existing measures. Although it is difficult to discern whether the original psychometric properties of modified instruments are relevant, Cronbach’s alpha reliability analyses revealed high internal consistency among all modified scales used in this study. Previous psychometric information on assessment measures has been established through teacher report only. This study also incorporated the use of experts to assess the content of the pre-/post- measure instrument. Despite these approaches to ensuring the reliability and validity of the data collection system, additional research employing these and similar measures is needed to further support this approach to pre- and post- measurement, assessment, and analyses.

Finally, the variable of time could have affected reports on measures and conclusive results. Specifically, the Teacher Perception of Bullying Frequency Scale did not specify a particular amount of time (e.g., within the last month). Additional research could examine bullying reports at the school level through examining office referrals or School Wide Information Systems (SWIS) and compare to teacher reports if given a specific time frame (U.S.)
Department of Education, 2017). Furthermore, data were collected over a four-month period at the beginning of the school year, and reports were not collected during the second half of the year. This lack of longitudinal data did not provide information on the long-term effects of the training program, and could be enacted in future research.

**Additional Recommendations and Conclusions**

Because the outcomes associated with the current study are preliminary in nature, many additional directions apply in the pursuit of developing school-based bullying prevention programming to address the needs of students with disabilities. Within the scope of this study, research was confined to the school-based setting; however, there are multiple advancements that could be applied to the current study specifically, with respect to methodology, instrumentation, and replicative studies.

Additional research could also assess student report data before and after teachers implement the Bully Busters program within their classrooms. This research may be particularly interesting to examine within the context of MTSS. As discussed in Chapter I, research suggests that students with disabilities are more likely to be both bullies and victims when they are placed in more restrictive, self-contained settings, as opposed to less restrictive, inclusive settings (Dawkins, 1996; O'Moore & Hillery, 1989; Rose et al., 2009). Therefore, examining student reports of bullying and victimization in more restrictive and less restrictive settings, before and after the modified Bully Busters teacher training program, may provide valuable insight into the program’s ability to directly affect its target population. This may offer information as to whether the modified Bully Busters Program actually decreased bullying and victimization among students with disabilities across tiers of support. These reports might seek to determine if
the modified Bully Busters program used in this study did more than simply increase teacher reports of knowledge and use of skills in addressing bullying among students with disabilities; they could assess whether increased teacher knowledge and use of strategies led to a decrease in bullying and victimization of these students within and across systems of support.

This study was designed to address the need for an anti-bullying program that accounts for unique bully-victim issues experienced by students with disabilities. More specifically, it sought to develop a research-based anti-bullying program developed to increase teacher knowledge of bullying and use of response strategies for working with students with disabilities. This research has the potential to inform future anti-bullying initiatives, as well as to improve our current abilities in addressing the needs of a diverse student populations. In attempting to prevent and reduce bullying in our schools, it may be particularly important to recognize variables that may cause victims to be perceived as vulnerable to bullies, as well as place bullies at risk for antisocial behavior (Leff, 2007; Rigby, 2006). Individual student differences such as race/ethnicity, immigration status, sexual orientation, gender identification, gender expression, and specific disability status appear to place students at a greater risk for involvement in the bullying dynamic, yet this information is vacant from a majority of school-based bullying initiatives (Bridging Refugee Youth & Children's Services, n.d.; Felix & You, 2011; Gay, Lesbian, & Straight Education Network, 2012; Islamic Networks Group, 2011; Rose, Espelage, Aragon, & Elliott, 2011; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2012). As educators, we must continue to strive to meet the needs of all students, particularly those for whom we know are at greater risk for negative trajectories. We can no longer ignore the inconvenient truth
that those who may be perceived as “different” are those who remain most in need of our rigorous and unrelenting support.
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DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
Please respond by checking one box under each question to the extent to which you feel comfortable doing so. (Note: Information will be reported in aggregate.)

1. I am:
   □ Female    □ Male    □ Other: ____________________________

2. Check all that apply:
   □ African American/Black    □ European American    □ Hispanic/Latino
   □ Asian/Asian American    □ Native American    □ Pacific Islander    □ Multiracial
   □ Other: ____________________________

3. What grade do you teach?
   □ Sixth Grade    □ Seventh Grade    □ Eighth Grade

4. What type of classes do you teach?
   □ General Education    □ Special Education    □ Other: ____________________________

5. How many years have you served in the role identified in item #4 above? _____________

6. How many years have you served in the field of education? _____________
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INFORMED CONSENT
STUDY TITLE: Evaluation of a Psychoeducationally-Based Program Addressing Bullying Among Students with Disabilities through Teacher Training

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: A. Quinn Denzer, M.Ed., doctoral candidate, Kent State University

CHAIR OF DISSERTATION COMMITTEE: Richard Cowan, Ph.D.

RESEARCHERS’ STATEMENT: You are being asked to participate in a research study conducted by Quinn Denzer, a doctoral student in the School Psychology Program at Kent State University. This research is being done for a dissertation study, in fulfillment of the student’s doctoral program in school psychology.

Further questions about this project can be directed to Quinn Denzer (adenzer@kent.edu) or to Dr. Richard Cowan, Chair of Quinn Denzer’s dissertation committee (rcowanl@kent.edu).

This project has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at (330) 672-2704.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY: The purpose of this research project is to examine the effects of a modified, psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying program on teacher knowledge of bullying among students with disabilities, as well as their self-efficacy in responding to bullying among this population.

STUDY PROCEDURES: If you agree to take part in this study, you will attend three sessions of a psychoeducationally-based anti-bullying training program, as well as one additional follow up session, totaling approximately 6 hours. During the first training session and the following up session, you will complete a questionnaire regarding bullying and victimization. You are free to withdrawal from this study at any time.

RISKS, STRESS, OR DISCOMFORT: There is no perceived risk, stress, or discomfort associated with participating in this research.

BENEFITS OF THE STUDY: Through your participation in this study, you will gain exposure to a research-based anti-bullying program for teachers seeking address the needs of all students, including those with disabilities. Your participation will further benefit the field of education through increasing knowledge about effective approaches to bullying prevention. You will also receive refreshments during training sessions and may also have the opportunity to receive Continuing Education credits for your time of participation.

PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY: No individual identities will be used in any reports or publications that may result from this study and no identifying information will be attached to your data. Your answers to the questionnaires are completely anonymous and will not be tracked.

OTHER INFORMATION: There is no cost to you for participating in the study. Your participation is completely voluntary.
STATEMENT OF CONSENT: I have read the previous information and understand how to ask for and receive any additional information I might need. If you would like to participate in this research, please check, “I agree to participate.” If you would prefer to opt out, please check. “I do not want to participate.”

I agree to participate  □

I do not want to participate  □
APPENDIX C

MODULE 5: SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
Module

5 Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities

OVERVIEW

As compared to their peers without disabilities, students with disabilities are more likely to be involved in bullying -- as both bullies and victims (Doren, Bullis & Benz, 1996; Rose, 2011a; Rose, Espelage, & Monda-Amaya, 2009; Swearer et al., 2012). This may be because these students tend to engage in fewer positive social behaviors, such as getting along with other students and initiating friendships. These types of behaviors serve as a significant risk factor for student involvement in the bullying continuum (Jimerson et al., 2006; Martlew & Hodson, 1991; Mishna, 2003; Rose, 2011b; Swearer et al., 2012). Although research has demonstrated that students with disabilities may be more likely to become both victims and perpetrators of bullying, there has been limited published research focusing on addressing this issue. Nearly all anti-bullying programs address awareness-building factors associated with bullying and victimization, but most do not address categories of diversity, such as those differences found among students with disabilities (Raskauskas & Modell, 2011; Swearer et al, 2010). Nevertheless, the related literature suggests that simply bringing awareness to adults in the schools may be an important element in reducing bullying and victimization at a foundational level. Therefore, bringing awareness to this issue may be the first step in reducing the exceedingly high rates of bullying and victimization among students with disabilities. In an effort to address this issue, this module was added to the Bully Busters program (Newman et al., 2000) and was developed based on the research discussing bullying among students with disabilities. Specifically, this module was designed to create awareness of bullying and victimization as related to students with disabilities and to outline implications related to prevention and intervention as it relates to these students.

GOALS

- To increase awareness of the heightened risk that students with disabilities have for involvement in bullying -- as bullies and victims alike

- To recognize the influence of the characteristic differences between subgroups of students with disabilities, paying particular attention to the effect these characteristics may have on involvement in bullying

To understand how bully and victim status among students with disabilities can be mediated by environmental factors, particularly a student’s classroom placement.

To highlight common myths about students with disabilities with regard to involvement in bullying.

To understand general implications for helping to decrease bullying perpetration and victimization of students with disabilities.

**BACKGROUND**

Research suggests that students with disabilities may be two- to three- times more likely than their non-disabled peers to be involved in bullying, as bullies, victims, and bully-victims alike (Rose et al, 2011; Swearer et al., 2012). Specifically, it is estimated that between 20% and 30% of students with disabilities are victims of bullying, as opposed to 10% of their peers without disabilities. Additionally, both teacher and student self-reports agree that about 14% of students without disabilities are identified as bullies; opposed to 10% of their peers without disabilities (Blake et al., 2012; Rose, et al., 2011). This research makes it clear that students with disabilities tend to have much greater risk of being bullied and bullying others than their non-disabled peers.

A study of classroom social roles, found that students with disabilities were identified in more negative roles (i.e., Bully and Victim), while students without disabilities were identified in more positive roles (i.e., Nurturer and Friend) (Specht et al., 2011). Given these perceptions of poor social skills, it is not surprising students with disabilities, may be at greater risk to be involved in bullying than students without disabilities (Doren, Bullis & Benz, 1996; Rose, 2011a; Rose, Espelage, & Monda-Amaya, 2009; Swearer et al., 2012).

**FORMS OF BULLYING AND VICTIMIZATION**

As discussed in previous modules, bullying and victimization can take different forms. The following paragraphs discuss how students with disabilities can be at a greater risk for falling under one or more of these categories.

**Passive Victims**

As discussed in Module 3, passive victims are targets of the bully’s aggression without having done anything to provoke the bully. Among students with disabilities, passive victims may be targeted due to physical size (lower height and weight), intellectual ability, or medical disorders (i.e., illnesses, chronic condition). These factors set them apart from the mainstream, and make them potentially easier targets for bullies (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). Children with disabilities usually retain their role as passive victims because: (a) they do not know of any alternatives and may lack the interpersonal skills to effectively respond to bullying, and (b) they are afraid of repercussions from reporting the bullying.

**Provocative Victims**
Also discussed in Module 3, provocative victims are those students who entice the bully through capitalizing on a bully’s triggers or being purposefully annoying. These students are viewed by peers as immature and annoying, and often engage in such behavior to receive extra attention (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). Provocative victims typically have other emotional and behavioral issues and disabilities, and lack the social skills needed to develop and maintain positive relationships with classmates.

A common characteristic that is generally possessed by both passive and provocative victim types is lack of developmentally appropriate social skills, which is frequently an issue among students with disabilities (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). Many studies have found that victims of bullying tend to have more social skills problems than non-victims (Fox & Boulton, 2005; Gini, 2006; Horne & Socherman, 1996; Johnson et al., 2002). Specifically, victims of bullying exhibit greater difficulty with social skills tasks than their non-bullied peers, suggesting that victims of bullying are more likely to experience deficits in interpreting other students’ behaviors and responding in an appropriate manner (Gini, 2006). Given that many students with disabilities tend to have deficits in interpreting others’ behavior, this may serve as a partial explanation for the increase risk that students with disabilities have to be victims of bullying.

**Aggressive Bullies**
As discussed in Module 2, aggressive bullies engage in outward physical and verbal aggression, and tend to displace responsibility for their aggression on other children and lack responsibility for their behaviors (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). Students with disabilities are more likely to engage in aggressive bullying, and this is particularly evident for students in elementary and middle school (Blake et al., 2012; Rose et al., 2009; Rose et al., 2011). Although some aggressive bullies may lack the ability to understand the effect of their behaviors on the feelings of others, many have high levels of self-esteem and may use bullying as a tactic for reinforcing their need to feel superior to others (Gini, 2006; Horne & Socherman, 1996; Johnson et al., 2002; Orpinas & Horne, 2006). These extreme antisocial behaviors are often present among students with emotional disabilities, and require structured social skills training to be remediated (Orpinas & Horne, 2006).

**Bully-Victims**
Bully-victims are students who are initially victims of bullying and develop bullying behaviors as a coping mechanism to deal with the initial victimization (Rose, 2011a; Swearer et al., 2010). Students with disabilities, particularly among students with social-emotional and behavioral difficulties, are at a greater risk for maintaining an interchangeable bully-victim status than students without disabilities (Jimerson, Morrison, Pletcher, & Furlong, 2006; Swearer et al., 2001). Correspondingly, bully-victims tend to exhibit higher levels of aggression, less frequent use of prosocial skills, and less behavioral control than students who identify only as bullies or victims (Jimerson et al., 2006). In turn, bully-victims also tend to experience more frequent social rejection, than their peers, which may be the greatest predictive factor for involvement in bullying and victimization from elementary school to high school (Schäfer et al., 2005).

DISABILITY-SPECIFIC FACTORS

Generally speaking, students with disabilities are at a higher risk for involvement in bullying; however, their risk level may be further impacted by type of disability. Understanding and addressing these differences may be particularly important when trying to reduce the risk that students with disabilities experience for involvement in bullying. The following sections explore these factors in detail. Specifically, these sections describe the literature among different disabilities and their individual rates of involvement within the bullying dynamic. The following classifications of disabilities have been used in the bullying literature: (a) Physical Disabilities, (b) Intellectual Disabilities, (c) Emotional Disabilities, and (d) Learning Disabilities.

Physical Disabilities
Students with physical disabilities tend to report greater levels of victimization than their non-disabled peers (approximately 45%, compared to 13%) (Dawkins, 1996; Sweeting & West, 2001). Examples of physical disabilities include asthma, diabetes, food allergies, vision/hearing impairments, language impairments, epilepsy, and cerebral palsy. Because of symptoms and complications associated with having physical disabilities, these students tend to experience frequent absences and physician visits, which are associated with less time spent in class and bonding with peers (Shaw & McCabe, 2008). Given this lost time developing social skills and friendships, it is not surprising that children with physical disabilities may be more likely to experience bullying. Some important issues to consider when working with these children include the following:

- Students with asthma have a similar risk for victimization as students without disabilities; however, children with asthma tend to be less preferred as playmates, and are more isolated from peers due to the physical limitations resulting from their asthma (Graetz & Shute, 1995).
- Children with type 1 diabetes report higher rates of teasing compared to their peers, which is thought to be associated with the strict medical regimen associated with this particular condition (Storch et al., 2004).
- Children with visual impairments report frequently having difficulties making friends, due to feelings of a social isolation and disconnection from their peers (Huurre & Aro, 1998).
- 79% of students with food allergies report that they experience bullying directly related to their allergy, and many of these students describe physical bullying such as having an allergen thrown at them or intentional contamination of their food with an allergen (Lieberman et al, 2010).

• Nearly half of children with language-communication disorders (LCD) report that they experience regular teasing related to their language difficulties (Hugh-Jones & Smith, 1999; Knox & Conti-Ramsden, 2003; Savage, 2005). These children are also more likely to be nominated by classmates as victims of bullying and less likely to be nominated as class leaders (Davis, Howell & Cooke, 2002).
  o Students with language and communication disorders spend less time interacting with peers and exhibit more withdrawn behaviors, which may be due to embarrassment related to their language disorder (Fujiki, Brinton, Isaacson, & Summers, 2001; Langevin, Packman & Onslow, 2010).

While those disabilities described above are physical in nature, research suggests that students whose disabilities are highly visible to others (e.g., cerebral palsy, spina bifida, and epilepsy) are at an even greater risk for being bullied than students whose disabilities are not as visibly apparent (Dawkins, 1996; Rigby, 2006; Swearer, Espelage & Napolitano., 2009). Students with highly visible disabilities may not only have physical and language barriers, they also experience negative attitudes and stereotypes related to their illness. It may be the case that assumptions are made about intellectual skills levels, given the vocal and motor impairments often observed in students with these types of disabilities. Some relevant issues to consider when working with students with highly visible physical disabilities include the following:

• Students with cerebral palsy and spina bifida report significantly greater rates of victimization, including both verbal name-calling and physical bullying related to their illness, including being pushed out of their wheelchair and being intentionally isolated by classmates (Dawkins, 1996; Nadeau & Tessier, 2009; Pivik, McComas, & LaFlamme, 2002).
• Over 70% of students with epilepsy report being bullied and teased specifically about instances of seizures at school (Hamiwaka et al., 2009; Wilde & Haslam, 1996).

Factors that may impact the risk for students with physical disabilities to be victimized include their number of friends, presence of associated academic or intellectual weaknesses, age of disability onset, and severity of disability. Specifically, students having more friends, fewer academic issues, a later onset of disability, and a less severe disability tend to experience lower levels of victimization (Dawkins, 1996; Hamiwka et al., 2009). Although students with physical disabilities are at-risk for victimization, they are not necessarily at a higher risk for perpetration of bullying (as compared to non-disabled peers). In fact, students with physical disabilities tend to be less likely to bully other students than their non-disabled peers (6% of students with visible disabilities compared to 17% of peers) (Yude et al., 1998).

Intellectual Disabilities
Students with intellectual disabilities such as cognitive delay and developmental disability may be at a higher risk for victimization than their peers due to deficits in communication skills and difficulties interacting in social situations (Chen, & Schwartz, 2012; Cummings et al., 2006; Sofronoff, Dark & Stone, 2011; Twyman et al, 2010). The intellectual and social processing deficits that are often present in students with these disabilities may place them at greater risk for involvement in the bullying dynamic (Sofronoff et al., 2011). As such, the following issues should be considered when working with children with intellectual disabilities:

- Children with intellectual disabilities are more likely to be both victims of bullying and perpetrators of bullying than their non-disabled peers (Reiter & Lapidot-Lefler, 2007; Sheard et al., 2001).
- This involvement as a victim, bully, or bully-victim is often mediated by additional behavioral variables. For example:
  - Students with intellectual disabilities who are identified by classmates and teachers as bullies or bully-victims tend to have more frequent behavioral issues such as hyperactivity, tantrums, and lying.
  - Correspondingly, students with intellectual disabilities that are identified as victims of bullying are generally more likely to have emotional issues including depression and low self-esteem (Reiter & Lapidot-Lefler, 2007; Sheard et al., 2001).

There is a much greater amount of research about bullying among students with developmental disabilities such as Autism and Aspergers Syndrome than students with intellectual disabilities. Regarding this research, the following issues should be considered when working with students with developmental disabilities:

- Children with Autism may spend more time alone on the playground to avoid high noise and activity levels, which may place them at a disadvantage for making friends and set them up as an easy target for bullying (Attwood, 2007; Chamberlain, Kasari & Rotheram-Fuller, 2007).
- Children with Autism may have interests and behaviors that may seem strange to classmates, which may further set them up as a target for bullying (Cappadocia, Weiss, & Pepler, 2012; Twyman et al, 2010).
- Children with Autism tend to experience the highest levels of victimization when compared to students with other types of disabilities (Sofronoff et al., 2011; Twyman et al, 2010).
  - Specific reports of victimization among children with Autism range from 46% to 94%; however, these variations may be due to the diversity of respondents including students, parents, classmates, and teachers (Carter, 2009; Little, 2002; Twyman et al, 2010; Van Roekel, Scholte & Didden, 2010).
• Of the students with Autism involved in bullying, research suggests that 46 to 94% are considered victims, 9 to 36% are considered bully-victims, and 14% are considered bullies (Chen, & Schwartz, 2012; Sterzing et al., 2012).

• Students with Autism are much less likely to bully other children than they are to experience victimization. However, given that children often use bullying as a means of trying to fit in with peers, children with limited social intelligence may be likely to use bullying as a mechanism for acceptance (Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Sofronoff et al., 2011).

• Of the 46% to 94% of students with Autism who are victimized, many of them experience physical victimization. Specifically, 47% of students with Autism report being hit by peers or siblings, and 15% report being sexually assaulted (Carter, 2009; Chen & Schwartz, 2012; Little, 2002).

• Unfortunately, these numbers (above) may be highly under representative of the true population of children with Autism who experience a form of victimization. Due to difficulties interpreting social interactions, children with Autism may be less likely to report victimization as they may consider such behavior to be typical play and may misinterpret bullying situations as non-bullying (Van Roekel et al., 2010).

**Emotional Disabilities**

Students with emotional and behavioral disabilities such as Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), Conduct Disorder, and internalizing disorders (e.g. depression and anxiety) are frequently commit disciplinary infractions due to difficulties negotiating needs, following rules, respecting authority, and controlling their behavior (Jimerson et al., 2006; Rose, & Espelage, 2012). These students are likely to have unique bully-victim complexes, which may be linked to the nature and severity of their emotional disability (Doren et al., 1996). Some information to consider when working with students with emotional disabilities:

• Approximately 25% of students with emotional disabilities report being victims of bullying, while teacher reports indicate that nearly the same proportion bully others students (Kumpulainen, Räsänen, & Puura, 2001; Unnever & Cornell, 2003; Wiener & Mak, 2009).

• Bullying and victimization reports among students with emotional disabilities are highly dependent on the source of information; that is, self-reports and teacher reports show significant variation. Specifically, students with emotional disabilities tend to report greater rates of peer victimization, while their teachers tend to report greater rates of bullying (Weiner & Mak, 2009).

• Boys with emotional disabilities tend to be at higher risk for involvement in bully-victim issues than girls (Kumpulainen et al., 2001; Weiner & Mak, 2009).

• Students with emotional disabilities are less likely to be involved in bullying when they follow a consistent medication regimen (Unnever & Cornell, 2003).

• Students with emotional disabilities tend to display more physical bullying of others than students with other types of disabilities (Rose, & Espelage, 2012).

---

The heightened instance of physical bullying by students with emotional disabilities may be explained by the idea that these students are also prone to lack empathy, and may be more likely to justify their use of aggressive behavior (Gini, 2006). Therefore, students who have difficulties understand the consequences associated with their actions (particularly on the feelings of others) may also be more prone to engage in antisocial behaviors (i.e. bullying other students).

Learning Disabilities
Children with specific learning disabilities are often involved in bullying in a similar manner as children with emotional disabilities, as reports of both victimization and bullying are parallel between the two groups (Kaukiainen et al, 2002; Swearer et al, 2010; Whitney, Nabuzoka & Smith, 1992). Some issues that may be important to consider when working with students with learning disabilities include:

- Students with learning disabilities are more likely to be viewed by their classmates as rejected, victims of bullying, and unpopular, and are less likely to be viewed as cooperative, or as class leaders (Kuhne & Wiener, 2000; Nabuzoka, 2003; Nabuzoka & Smith, 1993).
- Students with learning disabilities often report victimization that is directly related to their disability status or their participations in special education classes (O’Moore & Hillery, 1989; Singer, 2005).
- Differing from students with emotional disabilities, both girls and boys with learning disabilities are at an equally high risk for bullying other students (Whitney et al., 1992).
- As observed in students with emotional disabilities, it is argued that a primary factor that predicts the likelihood that students with learning disabilities will become bullies is their level of social intelligence (Kaukiainen et al, 2002; Swearer et al, 2010).
  - Students with learning disabilities who possess greater social intelligence may be less likely to be victims of bullying, but more likely to bully others (Kaukiainen et al, 2002).
  - Students with learning disabilities who demonstrate extremely low social intelligence may also be more likely to bully others (Kaukiainen et al, 2002).
  - Bullies tend to perform better on tests assessing social intelligence, than students who are not bullies (Gini, 2006). Students with learning disabilities who bully others tend to perform either very well or very poorly on tests of social intelligence. This suggests that students with learning disabilities may be at a higher risk for bullying others due to greater social intelligence (i.e. ability to manipulate others), or because of very poor social intelligence (poor social skills, leading to observing and repeating the behaviors of others without an understanding of their behaviors) (Gini, 2006; Kaukiainen et al, 2002).

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

Given that the level of risk for students to be involved in bullying may be determined in part through examining the systems which impact their lives (see Module 2), it is not surprising that risk for students with disabilities to be involved in bullying is affected by factors such as their educational placement and the school and classroom environment (Cummings et al., 2006; Doren et al., 1996; Rose et al., 2009; Rose et al., 2012). Specific school-based factors that can influence the risk for students with disabilities to be involved in the bullying dynamic include the following:

- Students with disabilities who are placed in secluded or self-contained classrooms tend to report higher levels of both victimization and bullying, as compared to students with disabilities in more inclusive settings (e.g., cross-categorical settings) (Doren et al., 1996; Norwich & Kelly, 2004; O'Moore & Hillery, 1989; Rose et al., 2009; Santich, & Kavanagh, 1997).
- Children with disabilities who have more integrated classes tend to have more developed social skills and more positive relationships with peers than those in separate classes for students with disabilities only (Santich, & Kavanagh, 1997).
- Students with disabilities tend to experience less bullying in classrooms with egalitarian structure (i.e., clear standards for students, consistent monitoring of standards, and encouraging children to develop autonomy) opposed to those with more hierarchical structure (i.e., high expectations of conformity and compliance to rules and directions, while allowing little open dialogue between teachers and students) (Ahn et al., 2010).
- Students with disabilities tend to experience greater victimization in mainstream settings when compared students in special schools designed for their particular disability. This is not surprising given that being of minority group status is highly related to likelihood that a student will experience victimization (Cook, & Semmel, 1999; Felix & You, 2011).
- Students with disabilities tend to experience a greater risk for both victimization and bullying in classrooms with low teacher to student ratios, as compared to classrooms with high teacher to student ratios (Ahn et al., 2010).

MYTHS AND MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT BULLYING AND VICTIMIZATION AMONG STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

The following statements include a series of common ‘myths’ regarding the status of bullying and victimization among students with disabilities. Corresponding literature-based ‘reality’ statements then follow these misconceptions.

**Myth:** Bullying of students with disabilities is not considered Disability Harassment.  
**Reality:** Bullying is considered a form of harassment, which is prohibited under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. According to the U.S. Department of Education, disability harassment is “intimidation or abusive behavior toward a student based on disability that creates a hostile environment by interfering with or denying a student’s participation in or receipt of benefits, services, or opportunities in the institution’s program.” Disability harassment can come in many forms; some of these include verbal harassment and physical threats, which often occur in bullying incidents (U.S. Department of Education, 2000; U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d.).

**Myth:** Bullying of children with disabilities is a “normal” part of development and socialization, and is not seriously harmful.  
**Reality:** Particularly regarding children with physical disabilities, bullying can include teasing children because of their special health needs or exposing them to substances which may be toxic to their system. In these instances, bullying is very serious, and can result in injury or even death (Lieberman et al, 2010).

**Myth:** Many children with disabilities are not even aware that they are being bullied.  
**Reality:** When asked about bullying, children with disabilities report feelings of low self-esteem and depression, which has been interpreted as the direct result of the bullying they experience due to their disability status (Davis, Howell & Cooke, 2002).

**Myth:** It is easy for adults to tell when a child with a disability is being bullied.  
**Reality:** Less than half of parents and teachers report being aware of the bullying that is reported by students with disabilities. This may be because students with disabilities who are victimized tend to be more passive in situations involving peer confrontation, which may result in failure to report bullying incidents (Hugh-Jones & Smith, 1999).

**Myth:** Organizing a group for aggressive students who bully other children to discuss bullying issues together is an effective strategy for addressing their problems with bullying other students.  
**Reality:** This intervention strategy actually tends to result in greater instances of bullying, as group members often serve as role models and reinforcers for fellow group members’ bullying behavior (GLSEN, 2004; Ttofi & Farrington, 2010).

---

Myth: Encouraging mediation between a bully and a victim is an effective strategy for dealing with a bullying issue.

Reality: Mediation may be quite traumatic for the victim and can often result in further victimization, which may be particularly true for students who already have limited social skills. Additionally, there is no evidence that suggests that mediation is an effective approach for addressing bullying (GLSEN, 2004).

Myth: Children with disabilities who are prone to aggression and anti-social behaviors will always be that way.

Reality: All children, including those who have been aggressive for a long time have the ability to learn new and more positive relationship skills. Aggression is often incorrectly viewed as an unchangeable characteristic; in fact, children are more correctly viewed as individuals who are constantly growing and changing (Orpinas & Horne, 2006).

IMPLICATIONS FOR ADDRESSING BULLYING AND VICTIMIZATION AMONG STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

The limited amount of research examining anti-bullying initiatives addressing the needs of students with disabilities creates a challenge of identifying specific evidence-based strategies for reducing bullying and victimization among these students. However, interventions related to positive behavior supports frequently apply to students with unique needs. The following section provides a compilation of recommendations from the literature for responding to bullying among all students, including those with disabilities.

Create Awareness and Celebrate Diversity

Students with disabilities have described various strategies to help decrease disability-related bullying. These include providing accurate information about disabilities and increasing teacher awareness of bullying among students with disabilities (Lindsay & McPherson, 2012). It is recommended that you seek to validate the strengths of students with disabilities, build their self-confidence, and reinforce their ability to overcome weaknesses. You can also model behavior that emphasizes equality and acceptance throughout the school (Lindsay & McPherson, 2012; Cummings et al., 2006). The following are specific strategies for promoting awareness and celebrating diversity in the classroom.

- Model and enforce tolerance and acceptance of students with disabilities among classmates. Research suggests that children’s attitudes toward their classmates who have disabilities is the most important factor in determining if they will engage with them in positive social interactions (Raskauskas & Modell, 2011; Roberts & Lindsell, 1997). Social connectedness is an important resilience factor in students with disabilities.

• Seek to create a positive school climate through teaching students to appreciate differences. You can successfully celebrate diversity by integrating differences (i.e., cultures, dialects, abilities, religions) into class projects and lesson plans, thus promoting understanding of and appreciation for others (Orpinas & Horne, 2006).

• Facilitate classroom efforts to discuss how each child is unique, and remind students that rules and expectations about bullying apply to everyone. Proving accurate information about disabilities may help to alleviate classroom issues, where some children mistake accommodation of special needs as preferential treatment (Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Raskauskas & Modell, 2011).

Promote Inclusion
Due to knowledge suggesting that classroom structure and placement can have an impact on the bullying trajectories of students with disabilities, you should recognize the importance of these factors when responding to bullying incidents. It is important to model inclusive practices in all classrooms, and to recognize the advantage these inclusive practices have on the development of prosocial skills among students with disabilities (Martlew & Hodson, 1991; Mishna, 2003; Santich, & Kavanagh, 1997). The following strategies may be used to promote inclusion in your classroom:

• Strive to facilitate a classroom structure that discourages social isolation. For example, you may construct assigned seating in classrooms to discourage isolation of students who are typically left out. You may also assign students to groups instead of allowing them to choose groups in an effort to ensure inclusion of students with disabilities (Cappadocia et al., 2012; Swearer & Doll, 2002).

• Many students with disabilities bully others due to academic insecurities. A strategy to increase academic achievement and feelings of success is to use cooperative learning groups. These groups consist of students at various skill levels who work together on in-class assignments, with each student making a contribution that is congruent with his or her relative knowledge and/or skills base. This strategy may help reduce bullies’ academic insecurities as well as promotes positive social skills and cooperative efforts (Ability Path, 2011; Orpinas & Horne, 2006).

• Increase supervision during classroom changes (including transitions), break times, and recess. You can also design structured activities at recess applicable to all students, including those with disabilities thus allowing them to participate in a meaningful way. For example, facilitate alternative groups during recess activities for students with similar interests (i.e., videogames, music) (Olweus, 1993; Swearer & Doll, 2002).

**Foster Peer Advocacy**

In addition to consistently monitoring and promptly responding to bullying, you can encourage your students to do the same (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). Empowering your students to protect those targeted by bullying allows bullying incidents to be addressed more quickly, as students are more likely than adults to witness the incidents, and peer influence is often more important than adult influence (Rose, 2011b). Specifically, social support from classmates is the most significant predictor of decreased bullying, victimization, fighting, and anger for both students with disabilities and students without disabilities (Rose, 2011b).

The following strategies can be used to foster peer advocacy among your students:

- Nominate specific students with high social status to serve as ‘defenders’ against bullying in the classroom, to stand up for others, and resolve bullying incidents. This is a strategy that has shown significant decreases in bullying (Doll et al., 2011).
- Designate a ‘peer buddy’ to a student with a disability. This may be particularly helpful for children who are perceived as having low social status, as enlisting a peer buddy with high social status may help them considerably when it comes to successfully navigating social settings (Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Attwood, 2007; Chen & Schwartz, 2012; Orpinas & Horne, 2006).

**Promote Positive Social Behavior**

As previously discussed, students with disabilities may be more prone to bullying behaviors than their peers due to poor social skills (Swearer et al., 2012). Therefore, it may be particularly important for you to promote positive social behavior among these students in an effort to decrease their involvement in bullying. You can promote these behaviors through providing opportunities for positive peer interaction, teaching new skills, and reinforcing instances of positive social behavior. General principles for behavior change are discussed extensively in Module 4; however, the following strategies may be particularly relevant when working with students with disabilities:

- Strive to promote positive expectations of students with disabilities, as this can create a positive and accepting classroom climate. Research suggests that teachers who demonstrate positive expectations (i.e., high expectations of achievement and positive behavior) in their classrooms tend have reduced instances of disruptive behavior, than teachers with the same students who did not uphold positive expectations (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). This approach may be particularly effective when working with students with disabilities, as students with academic issues may be more disruptive in class because of academic insecurities.

---

• Provide consistent consequences and use instances of bullying as learning opportunities. For highly aggressive children, particularly those with behavioral disabilities, interventions that teach student skills to replace aggressive behavior with alternative behavior may have the greatest promise of success (Doll et al., 2011). This model may be particularly affective for students with disabilities, as it provides these students with an opportunity to learn why certain behaviors are inappropriate and develop more appropriate ones (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). This is an important part of learning self-regulation.

• Provide aggressive students with multiple opportunities to practice newly-acquired social skills (e.g., one-on-one practice with teacher or role playing with peers). You may also expand practice opportunities to different environments and situations (e.g. playground, cafeteria, school bus, gym) (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). This additional practice may be particularly helpful among students with disabilities who have limited behavioral development.

Teach Strategies for Responding to Bullying
When discussing bullying in your classroom, it is important to consider ways that this information can be modified for students with disabilities (Mishna, 2003; Rose et al., 2012; Rose & Espelage, 2012). The following strategies may be used to modify anti-bullying programs designed to meet the needs of students with disabilities:

• Simplify anti-bullying program language, allow more time for comprehension, and encourage students to verbalize program content (Mishna, 2003).

• Teach students to correctly differentiate between harmful bullying and teasing among friends (Mishna, 2003).

• Provide students with specific systems for reporting bullying. Specifically, they should be taught how to report bullying, to whom they should report bullying, and what they can expect when doing so. It may be helpful to establish a signal system to use when the student finds him- or herself in a situation requiring adult intervention (Ability Path, 2011; Mishna, 2003).

• Teach students specific skills to respond to bullying incidents. Teach them to not respond with embarrassment, fear, or aggression. When victims respond with aggression or helplessness, it may serve to reinforce the bully’s behavior, potentially making the bullying worse (Orpinas & Horne, 2006).

• Provide students with concrete strategies such as a language script to use when intervening in bullying incidents. Teach students to develop a short, non-confrontational response, such as “stop that” or simply walk away (Ability Path, 2011). More specifically:
  o Instruct students to use new skill (i.e., language script) and provide them with prompts to recognize when it is appropriate to apply new skill (i.e., how to respond to a bully).
  o Provide feedback on learning progress and multiple practice opportunities across school settings.
Strategies can be learned and retained through both direct instruction and social skills training. Strategies such as social stories and cooperative learning groups can be particularly helpful to increase acquisition and retention of new strategies (Ability Path, 2011; Mishna, 2003; Rose et al., 2012).

In addition to being helpful for children with intellectual disabilities, language scripts may be particularly helpful in terms of allowing students with emotional disabilities to feel more relaxed during a bullying incident (Doll et al., 2011).

---

CONTENT REVIEW

The following statements refer to the learning goals of this module. Take a minute to think about the statements and ask yourself whether you feel confident that you can say yes to each. If not, please revisit those topics and consider ways to improve your learning.

I recognize that students with disabilities may be more likely to be involved in bullying as bullies, victims, and bully-victims than students without disabilities.  
Yes □  No □

I am aware that students with disabilities are at a particularly greater risk for maintaining an interchangeable bully-victim status than students without disabilities, as bully-victims tend to have fewer prosocial skills, and less behavioral control than students who identify only as bullies or victims.  
Yes □  No □

I understand that there are multiple factors that influence the risk for students with disabilities to become involved in bullying (e.g., type of disability, classroom placement).  
Yes □  No □

I am aware that students with autism tend to experience the greatest victimization relative to students with other types of disabilities.  
Yes □  No □

I realize that bullying and victimization reports among students with emotional disabilities may be highly dependent on the source, as self-reports often differ from teacher and peer reports.  
Yes □  No □

I recognize that level of social competency is a factor when assessing risk for students with learning disabilities to be involved in bullying.  
Yes □  No □

I understand that students with disabilities who are in more inclusive classroom settings tend to have lesser instances of both bullying and victimization.  
Yes □  No □

I know that bullying and victimization among children with disabilities is not a normal part of development and socialization, and can be seriously harmful.  
Yes □  No □

I am committed to modeling tolerance and acceptance of students with disabilities in my classroom, as I understand the importance of how my behavior may influence my students.  
Yes □  No □
I am prepared to provide students with disabilities with specific systems for reporting bullying, and simplified, concrete skills to respond to bullying incidents. 

I will establish multiple opportunities for students with disabilities to practice newly acquired anti-bullying skills in different environments and situations.
A Reminder…

CLASSROOM INTERACTION AND AWARENESS CHART

Use the CIAC to describe any bullying behavior you observe (and that students report to you, if you wish). Specific instructions for filling out the CIAC appear in Appendix D, along with a blank copy of the chart.

THE BIG QUESTIONS

Focus yourself and honestly appraise your progress by asking yourself the “Big Questions.” There are no right or wrong answers. With regard to bullying and victimization among students with disabilities:

1. What is my goal?
2. What am I doing?
3. Is what I am doing helping me achieve my goal?
4. (If not) What can I do differently?

PERSONAL GOALS FORM

The Personal Goals Form, on the next page, is designed to help you tailor the content of this module to your own students and situation. If you have not filled out the form as you worked through the information component of the module, please take a moment to do so now.

---

PERSONAL GOALS FORM

GOALS

- To increase awareness of the heightened risk that students with disabilities have to be involved in bullying, as bullies and victims alike

- To recognize the influence of the characteristic differences between subgroups of students with disabilities, and the effect these characteristics may have on involvement in bullying

- To understand how bully and victim status among students with disabilities can be mediated by environmental factors, particularly a student’s educational placement

- To highlight commons myths about students with disabilities with regarding to involvement in bullying

- To understand general implications for helping to decrease bullying perpetration and victimization of students with disabilities

1. My role in addressing bullying by and victimization of students with disabilities:

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

2. I have observed incidents of bullying by and victimization of students with disabilities in my classroom. (Please record incidents on the CIAC. Specify under “Behaviors” whether the incidents involve bullies or victims).

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

3. I will conduct the following classroom activities to help my students to continue to develop their awareness of bullying and commitment to change.

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

4. I will evaluate the effectiveness of these activities by (a) recording incidents on the CIAC to see if there is a reduction across time, (b) monitoring the extent to which students report bullying situations, and (c) recording my impressions of change in the classroom environment. (*Please indicate any other means of evaluation in the space below*).

5. I will give students feedback on their progress by (a) sharing the number and types of incidents recorded on the CIAC and (b) encouraging classroom discussion of these incidents and related issues. (*Please indicate any other means of giving feedback in the space below*).

6. I will share my experiences in applying the information in this module with members of my Support Team, other teachers, administrators, parents. (*Please specify who and when in the space below*).

---

Classroom Activities

DIVERSITY FAIR

This activity helps students to understand and celebrate each other’s differences. It is used to create an accepting classroom environment through promoting an understanding and acceptance of others.

DAY IN THE LIFE

This activity encourages students to understand how their peers spend their days; helping them to better understand and identify with one another. Through encouraging students to develop a better understanding of each other, you are fostering a classroom of acceptance and support.

COMMUNICATIONS CONNECTIONS

This activity helps to aid students’ communication skills with each other, and facilitates an opportunity for acquisition of prosocial behaviors. Through this activity, students are encouraged to recognize their ways of communicating and how it affects others, as well as to understand the intentions of others’ forms of communication.

Diversity Fair

OBJECTIVES

- To increase understanding of each student’s personal differences
- To facilitate appreciation of diversity
- To create an accepting environment where each student can be valued for his or her unique contributions

MATERIALS

- A few days before conducting this activity inform the class that they are going to organize a “diversity fair.” The purpose of this fair is to introduce the class to what makes them unique. Instruct each student to collect stories and traditions from their lives. These can include (but are not limited to) drawings, tokens, pictures, cultural traditions, favorite music, and food to share with the class.

DIRECTIONS

1. Move the students’ desks into a large circle.

2. Have students display on their desks the items they have chosen to express their diversity.

3. After students have had a chance to walk around and observe the “exhibits,” have them take their seats. Go around the circle and ask each student to share what each item means to them to the class.

4. Process the activity by conducting a class discussion.

DISCUSSION

- What did you learn from the different exhibits?
- How are the exhibits the same? How are they different?
- What new information did you learn about your classmates?
- What do you want to learn more about?
- How does gaining information about a person’s differences help you to understand that person better?

---

Day in the Life

OBJECTIVES

- To help students understand how their peers spend their days
- To help students experience what it is like to live the life of a classmate
- To encourage students to recognize the diversity and variation in other students’ daily lives

MATERIALS

- Day in the Life worksheet

DIRECTIONS

1. Give students a copy of the Day in the Life worksheet and have them complete it individually.

2. Have the class count off in groups of three. If there appears to be close friends in any group, switch them into another group to provide them with the opportunity of talking with new people.

3. Allow group members to share their answers.

4. Conduct a class discussion using the questions below.

DISCUSSION

- Have you ever thought about your classmates’ days and what they do?
- What surprised you?
- What things do you and other members of your group have in common? What things are different?
- What do you understand now about your classmates that you did not know previously?

---

DAY IN THE LIFE

1. When do you wake up? Does anyone wake you up?

2. What is your favorite thing to eat for breakfast?

3. How do you get to school?

4. Do you go with anyone else to school?

5. How do you feel about going to school in the morning?

6. Who do you look forward to seeing at school?

7. How do other students treat you throughout the day? At lunch? In the hallways?

8. How do your teachers treat you?

9. What subjects do you like? What subjects don’t you like?

10. How do you get home?

11. What do you like to do after school?

12. Do you usually have homework to do?

13. Do you have any favorite evening activities? Shows? Games? Music?

14. What time do you go to sleep?

15. What is the last thing you do before you go to sleep?

---

Communication Connections

OBJECTIVES

- To encourage recognition that what we say to others has an impact on them
- To aid students in understanding that what we mean to say is not always communicated clearly to another person
- To help students identify the intent and impact of their communication
- To help students understand when a miscommunication has occurred

MATERIALS

- Communication Connections worksheet
- Chalkboard or dry erase board

DIRECTIONS

1. Distribute the Communication Connections worksheet, one per student, and have each student complete the worksheet individually.

2. Allow students to share their responses with the class. Write student’s responses on the chalkboard or easel pad as they generate them.

3. Process the activity by conducting a class discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Have you ever said something and had someone take it the wrong way?
- What does it feel like to have your words misunderstood?
- What does the phrase “Actions speak louder than words” mean?
- Do you say things to others that can be hurtful without thinking about what you are saying?
- Have you ever wanted to give feedback but were afraid it would make the person upset or mad?

---

• How can you be more aware of the effects of your words and actions on others?
• How can you correct a situation in which you believe someone else has misunderstood what you were trying to say?
COMMUNICATION CONNECTIONS

1. Your feelings were hurt by one of your friends, although he or she doesn’t know it. What can you do to address the situation?

2. A classmate has really been getting on your nerves lately. You want to talk about it, but you are afraid he or she will get mad at you or you will hurt their feelings. How can you communicate your feelings effectively and end the conflict?

3. Although you don’t know James very well, you just don’t like him. You don’t talk to him and hardly look at him. When you do look at him, you just roll your eyes. James confronts you and asks you what the problem is. You respond that there is no problem and that you don’t even talk to him. How did James know you didn’t like him? Did you want James to know this?

4. When Kevin and Sanjay get in an argument, it always ends in a physical fight. Although neither of them likes to fight, they just don’t seem to be able to communicate effectively with each other. Out of frustration, they begin to punch and kick. How can Kevin and Sanjay communicate their feelings effectively without fighting?

5. Monica always has lots to say. She tends to have many opinions and isn’t afraid to share them with anyone who will listen. Sometimes her words are hurtful to others. You decided to keep all of your opinions to yourself because you don’t want to be like Monica and hurt anyone’s feelings. How can you communicate your opinions without hurting someone else?

6. You are a great comedian, and your classmates think you are really funny. Sometimes you tell jokes about other people. One day, when you told a joke about Jason’s new haircut, everyone started to laugh, but you noticed Jason got up and left the room. You realized at that moment that you hurt Jason’s feelings, and it can be hurtful to tell jokes about another person. How can you apologize to Jason and tell him knew you shouldn’t have made fun of him?

7. Lola is an acquaintance. She seems nice enough to you, but sometimes you are not sure you understand what she is saying about you. Today, she walked up to you and commented on your answer to a question the teacher asked you in class. You are unsure how to take her comment. What can you do to clear up the confusion you are experiencing?

---

APPENDIX D

PRE-TEST/ POST-TEST INSTRUMENT
**Definition of Bullying:**

_Bullying is a form of aggression that involves an imbalance of power between a bully and a victim, where individuals identified as bullies carry out repetitive acts of physical, verbal, and/or relational/psychological harm intended to cause harm to the victim._

*Think about how often bullying occurs for each of the following groups.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How frequently does bullying occur?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among all students in your school, (consider multiple locations- lunchroom, hallway, classroom, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among students in your classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among students with disabilities in your school, (consider multiple locations- lunchroom, hallway, classroom, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among students with disabilities in your classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please read the description below of a student you might see in your class. Then, respond to the items that follow. Indicate the progress you would expect and your level of confidence in your ability to work with this student.\footnote{The Teacher Expectancy and Efficiency Measure (TEEM) developed by Howard, Horne, & Jolliff, (2001); and used in the Multisite Violence Prevention Project (MVPP) developed by Toal, Swahn & Behrens (2005).}

Taylor is a "master of misbehavior." Taylor often gets into trouble for bullying others and disobeying school and classroom rules. Taylor is known by most of the teachers and administrators for being difficult to manage. Taylor tends to be hostile, often lashes out at someone and gets into fights frequently. Taylor often excludes and isolates other students in school activities.

For the following four items, think about the progress that you would expect to see in Taylor throughout the year. Possible responses range from 1 = Completely Disagree to 5 = Completely Agree.

**In thinking about Taylor’s behavior:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Taylor will be able to participate in my class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Taylor will be able to handle new situations well.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Taylor will be good at learning new skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Taylor will be able to carry through on responsibilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the following items, think about how confident you feel working with students like Taylor. Using a 5-point scale, select the point on the scale that indicates your level of confidence with the item. (1=Not Confident, 5=Very Confident).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Confident</th>
<th>Somewhat Confident</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. I have the skills to direct Taylor’s behavior in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am capable of helping Taylor make appropriate choices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. I am capable of consistently implementing rules and consequences with Taylor.  
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

8. I know a variety of strategies to successfully manage Taylor’s behavior.  
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Confident</th>
<th>Somewhat Confident</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. I am capable of establishing positive rapport with Taylor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am capable of helping Taylor behave appropriately in my class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am capable of helping Taylor become a successful student.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jordan** used to be a straight A student but on the last report card, Jordan’s average dropped to a C. Jordan often complains of headaches and stomachaches and is frequently absent from school, although the physician can’t find any physical reason for the apparent illnesses. On the days that Jordan is in school, Jordan is often found sitting alone during recess and lunch. Part of the time, it appears that Jordan doesn’t want to be with the other students and at other times, it seems that Jordan just isn’t accepted by peers. 

*For the following four items, think about the progress that you would expect to see in Jordan throughout the year.* Possible answers range from 1=Completely Disagree to 5=Completely Agree.

**In thinking about Jordan’s behavior:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Jordan will be able to participate in my class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Jordan will be able to handle new situations well.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from The Teacher Expectancy and Efficiency Measure (TEEM) developed by Howard, Horne, & Jolliff, (2001); and used in the Multisite Violence Prevention Project (MVPP) developed by Toal, Swahn & Behrens (2005).*
14. Jordan will be good at learning new skills. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
15. Jordan will be able to carry through on responsibilities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

For the following items, think about how confident you feel working with students like Jordan. Using a 5-point scale, select the point on the scale that indicates your level of confidence with the item. (1=Not Confident, 5=Very Confident)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not Confident</th>
<th>Somewhat Confident</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. I have the skills to direct Jordan’s behavior in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I am capable of helping Jordan make appropriate choices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I am capable of consistently implementing rules and consequences with Jordan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I know a variety of strategies to successfully manage Jordan’s behavior.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I am capable of establishing positive rapport with Jordan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I am capable of helping Jordan behave appropriately in my class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I am capable of helping Jordan become a successful student.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Casey is a student with autism. Casey sometimes has difficulty understanding and communicating with peers. Casey has very specific interests that are different than the other students in class, and seems content to play alone. You have heard Casey’s previous teachers say

---
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that they have seen Casey being shoved in the hallways; however, you have also heard others report seeing Casey shove others.

For the following four items, think about the progress that you would expect to see in Casey throughout the year. Possible answers range from 1=Completely Disagree to 5=Completely Agree."

**In thinking about Casey’s behavior:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Casey will be able to participate in my class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Casey will be able to handle new situations well.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Casey will be good at learning new skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Casey will be able to carry through on responsibilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the following items, think about how confident you feel working with students like Casey. Using a 5-point scale, select the point on the scale that indicates your level of confidence with the item. (1=Not Confident, 5=Very Confident)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Confident</th>
<th>Somewhat Confident</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. I have the skills to direct Casey’s behavior in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I am capable of helping Casey make appropriate choices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I am capable of consistently implementing rules and consequences with Casey.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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30. I know a variety of strategies to successfully manage Casey’s behavior.  
31. I am capable of establishing positive rapport with Casey.  
32. I am capable of helping Casey behave appropriately in my class.  
33. I am capable of helping Casey become a successful student.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. I know a variety of strategies to successfully manage Casey’s behavior.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I am capable of establishing positive rapport with Casey.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I am capable of helping Casey behave appropriately in my class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I am capable of helping Casey become a successful student.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jamie has both academic and social difficulties. Jamie is often described as “out of control,” and is often rejected by peers due to hyperactive and immature behavior. Recently, Jamie has been observed mimicking the behavior of more aggressive students, and although Jamie has not been known to bully other students in the past, some of Jamie’s peers have just reported a bullying incident involving Jamie.  

For the following four items, think about the progress that you would expect to see in Jamie throughout the year. Possible answers range from 1 = Completely Disagree to 5 = Completely Agree.

In thinking about Jamie’s behavior:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34. Jamie will be able to participate in my class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Jamie will be able to handle new situations well.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Jamie will be good at learning new skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Jamie will be able to carry through on responsibilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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For the following items, think about how confident you feel working with students like Jamie. Using a 5-point scale, select the point on the scale that indicates your level of confidence with the item. (1=Not Confident, 5=Very Confident).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not Confident</th>
<th>Somewhat Confident</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38. I have the skills to direct Jamie’s behavior in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I am capable of helping Jamie make appropriate choices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I am capable of consistently implementing rules and consequences with Jamie.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I know a variety of strategies to successfully manage Jamie’s behavior.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I am capable of establishing positive rapport with Jamie.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43. I am capable of helping Jamie behave appropriately in my class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I am capable of helping Jamie become a successful student.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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For the following questions, please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. 

**How much can you do?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some Influence</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) developed by Tschannen-Moran & Hoy (2001).
The following questions concern your knowledge of various interventions for bullies and victims and how often you use certain techniques and resources. Please complete every item by circling the response that most closely reflects (a) your knowledge of the intervention and (b) your use of the intervention. Note: Items marked with an asterisk (*) are common to teacher training and not unique to a bully prevention program.

Knowledge of the Intervention: U = Unfamiliar S = Somewhat familiar V = Very familiar

Use of the Intervention: N = Never S = Sometimes O = Often

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content or Intervention</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Establish a zero-tolerance policy: “No Bullying.”</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teach victims social skills (e.g. self-presentation, nonvictim body language, skills to deal with conflicts).</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teach victims physical and verbal assertiveness skills (e.g. assertive words, posture, and eye contact).</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use peer mediation (train team of students to help bully and victim work out an agreement).</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Use teacher support teams as a resource for consultation and support for bullying problems.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Use student support team as a resource for consultation and support for bullying problems.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Use consequences for undesirable acts/ misbehavior committed by bullies.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reinforce nonbullying behaviors (e.g., on-task behavior, helping behavior, assertive/nonaggressive behavior).</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Knowledge of the Intervention:  
U = Unfamiliar  
S = Somewhat familiar  
V = Very familiar

Use of the Intervention:  
N = Never  
S = Sometimes  
O = Often

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content or Intervention</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Teach social skills for entering groups, conversations, and other social activities.</td>
<td>U S V</td>
<td>N S O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teach steps of problem solving and decision making for behavior problems.</td>
<td>U S V</td>
<td>N S O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Assist victims of bullying in identifying skills and behaviors they may want to learn.</td>
<td>U S V</td>
<td>N S O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teach confidence and self-esteem building skills to victims</td>
<td>U S V</td>
<td>N S O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Highlight strengths of victim and bully (help students become aware of their strengths).</td>
<td>U S V</td>
<td>N S O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Use the “Four R’s” of bully control: Recognize, Remove, Review, Respond.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Instill an attitude of hope and encouragement in bullies and victims.</td>
<td>U S V</td>
<td>N S O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Encourage bullies to understand the victim’s point of view (help bullies develop an empathetic understanding of victims).</td>
<td>U S V</td>
<td>N S O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Conduct open discussion with bully and victim.</td>
<td>U S V</td>
<td>N S O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Teach bullies to list and prioritize behaviors that need to be changed.</td>
<td>U S V</td>
<td>N S O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Use written contracts with bullies.</td>
<td>U S V</td>
<td>N S O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Use written contracts with victims.</td>
<td>U S V</td>
<td>N S O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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22. Teach bullies nonaggressive and nonbullying behavioral alternatives.  
23. Teach coping skills to victims.  
24. Provide supports for victims (create an ‘open door’ policy).  

Knowledge of the Intervention:  
- **U** = Unfamiliar  
- **S** = Somewhat familiar  
- **V** = Very familiar  

Use of the Intervention:  
- **N** = Never  
- **S** = Sometimes  
- **O** = Often  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content or Intervention</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Teach bullies a better way of thinking (to shift from aggressive-based appraisals to assertive-based ones).</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Teach students to recognize and identify the characteristics and behaviors of different types of bullies.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Teach students to recognize and identify the characteristics and behaviors of different types of victims.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Use an invitational approach (encourage bully and victim to share their perspectives).</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Reinforce behavior, not the child (e.g., “Bob, I am proud of you for ”).</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Use praise and attention to reinforce good behaviors and accomplishments.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Use the technique of overcorrection with bullies.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Use loss of privileges with bullies.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Teach all students the lasting effects of victimization.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Use role-plays and role reversal to teach bullies what it feels like to be the victim.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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35. Conduct follow-up on bullying incidents. & U & S & V & N & S & O

36. Use the empty chair exercise to help students understand the behaviors, thoughts and feelings of the bully and victim. & U & S & V & N & S & O

*37. Establish and implement classroom rules and a code of conduct. & U & S & V & N & S & O

*38. Model decision-making, respect for others, and a positive attitude. & U & S & V & N & S & O

39. Use cooperative learning with bullies and victims (incorporate group projects/team approach into your curriculum). & U & S & V & N & S & O

Knowledge of the Intervention:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content or Intervention</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Teach bullies and victims verbal and nonverbal communication skills (e.g., sharing opinions, communicating in situations involving conflict, listening to others).</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Teach collaborative conflict resolution skills to bullies and victims (teach bullies and victims to become responsible for finding their own solutions through negotiation).</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Create opportunities for student success.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Implement a buddy system (pair reliable student with incoming student).</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Diffuse bullying situations in the classroom immediately and address the issue with the bully after class, privately.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Teach anger management strategies to bullies.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content or Intervention</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46. Teach relaxation techniques to victims and bullies.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Teach self-calming techniques to bullies.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Teach victims to find their “safe vacation place.”</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Make referral to counselor.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Consult with school counselor, school psychologist, or other professional.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Verbally correct/reprimand the bully individually to avoid reinforcing attention-seeking behavior.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Implement classroom activities to increase awareness of bullying/victimization.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Implement classroom activities aimed at bully prevention.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge of the Intervention:</strong></td>
<td>U = Unfamiliar</td>
<td>S = Somewhat familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of the Intervention:</strong></td>
<td>N = Never</td>
<td>S = Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Use group problem solving for and with other teachers.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Have students keep a log of incidents of bullying/victimization they witness.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Make a disciplinary referral</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Contact parents regarding student misbehavior via phone call, letter, conference.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Contact parents regarding positive behavior of all students.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Teacher/school provides workshops, seminars, and other opportunities for parents to seek new information and skills.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Consult with another teacher for advice.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*61. Use behavior log (record bullying incidents and interventions).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content or Intervention</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that students with disabilities understand how to recognize bullying.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that students with disabilities know how to report bullying incidents.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide victims with disabilities with concrete strategies to respond to bullies (e.g., a language script to use when being bullied).</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62. Use a consistent signal to indicate that the day’s lesson is commencing.

63. Develop a special relationship with each child.

64. Believe that you can successfully bring about a desired outcome in your students (teacher self-efficacy).

65. Model appreciation of student uniqueness, and include discussions of diversity in classroom activities.

66. Validate the strengths of students with disabilities and reinforce their ability to overcome weaknesses.

67. Implement positive behavior supports for disability groups who are prone to bullying.

68. Provide peers and other staff with accurate knowledge about disabilities.

69. Adjust existing anti-bullying policies to include students with disabilities.

Knowledge of the Intervention:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U = Unfamiliar</td>
<td>S = Somewhat familiar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of the Intervention:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73. Instruct both victims and bullies with disabilities to use newly acquired nonbullying skills and provide them with prompts to help them identify when it is appropriate to apply new skill.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Facilitate a classroom structure that discourages social isolation (e.g., make efforts to integrate marginalized students when assigning seats and developing groups for assignments).</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Design alternative structured activities at recess to include students with disabilities.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

TREATMENT INTEGRITY CHECKLISTS
Treatment Integrity Checklist: Introductory Session

Session Number: 1 Date: _____/___/____ Start Time: End Time:

Sheet Completed by:

Session Preparation Steps: Describe any preparation required for this session.

1. Informed Consent forms have been prepared
   This step took place: Y__ N__

2. Demographic and Pre-test Questionnaires have been prepared
   This step took place: Y__ N__

3. Copies of Bully Busters manuals for teachers of grades 6 through 8 have been prepared
   This step took place: Y__ N__

4. Copies of the Added Module have been prepared
   This step took place: Y__ N__

Session Activities: Describe the activities included in this session.

5. Attendees were provided with information about the time that would be required, and the objectives associated with the Bully Busters program for teachers of grades 6 through 8 with the added module.
   This step took place: Y__ N__

6. Participants provided a schedule of associated times and dates of the in-service trainings and follow-up meeting
   This step took place: Y__ N__

7. Participants’ contact information (email) was provided to researcher
   This step took place: Y__ N__

8. Participants received and signed Informed Consent forms
   This step took place: Y__ N__

9. Participants completed the Demographic Questionnaire and the Pre-test Instrument
   This step took place: Y__ N__

10. Participants provided with a copy of Bully Busters: A Teacher’s Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders for grades 6 through 8, and the supplemental document containing the Added Module
    This step took place: Y__ N__

Total Steps Completed: __ Total Steps Not Completed: __ Total Percentage of Completed Steps: __
Treatment Integrity Checklist: First Training Session

Session Number: 2  Date: _____/___/____  Start Time:  End Time:

Sheet Completed by:

Session Preparation Steps: Describe any preparation required for this session.

Session Activities: Describe the activities included in this session.

1. Participants given opportunity to address recent bullying situations they had experienced in their classrooms and engage in group discussion

   This step took place: Y__ N__

2. Participants worked through Module One: Recognizing the Bullying

   This step took place: Y__ N__

3. Participants completed materials at the end of Module One: Recognizing the Bullying (i.e. Content Review, the Big Questions, and the Personal Goals Form).

   This step took place: Y__ N__

4. Participants worked through Module Two: Recognizing the Victim

   This step took place: Y__ N__

5. Participants completed materials at the end of Module Two: Recognizing the Victim (i.e. Content Review, the Big Questions, and the Personal Goals Form).

   This step took place: Y__ N__

6. Participants given opportunity to review the issues they had addressed throughout the meeting

   This step took place: Y__ N__

Total Steps Completed: ___
Total Steps Not Completed: ___
Total Percentage of Completed Steps: ___
Treatment Integrity Checklist: Second Training Session

Session Number: 3  Date: _____/___/____  Start Time:  End Time:

Sheet Completed by:

Session Preparation Steps: Describe any preparation required for this session.

Session Activities: Describe the activities included in this session.

1. Participants given opportunity to address recent bullying situations they had experienced in their classrooms and engage in group discussion

This step took place: Y__ N__

2. Participants worked through Module Three: Taking Charge: Interventions for Bullying Behavior

This step took place: Y__ N__

3. Participants completed materials at the end of Module Three: Taking Charge: Interventions for Bullying Behavior (i.e. Content Review, the Big Questions, and the Personal Goals Form).

This step took place: Y__ N__

4. Participants worked through Module Four: Assisting Victims: Interventions and Recommendations

This step took place: Y__ N__

5. Participants completed materials at the end of Module Four: Assisting Victims: Interventions and Recommendations (i.e. Content Review, the Big Questions, and the Personal Goals Form).

This step took place: Y__ N__

6. Participants worked through Module Five (Added Module): Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities

This step took place: Y__ N__

7. Participants completed materials at the end of Module Five (Added Module): Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities (i.e. Content Review, the Big Questions, and the Personal Goals Form).

This step took place: Y__ N__

8. Participants given opportunity to review the issues they had addressed throughout the meeting

This step took place: Y__ N__

Total Steps Completed: __
Total Steps Not Completed: __
Total Percentage of Completed Steps: __
## Treatment Integrity Checklist: Third Training Session

**Session Number:** 4  
**Date:** _____/___/____  
**Start Time:**  
**End Time:**

Sheet Completed by: 

**Session Preparation Steps:** Describe any preparation required for this session.

**Session Activities:** Describe the activities included in this session.

1. Participants worked through Module Five (Added Module): Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities
   
   This step took place: Y__ N__

2. Participants completed materials at the end of Module Five (Added Module): Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities (i.e. Content Review, the Big Questions, and the Personal Goals Form).
   
   This step took place: Y__ N__

3. Participants given opportunity to review the issues they had addressed throughout the meeting
   
   This step took place: Y__ N__

---

Total Steps Completed: ___
Total Steps Not Completed: ___
Total Percentage of Completed Steps: ___
Treatment Integrity Checklist: Follow-Up Session

Session Number: 5  
Date: _____/___/____  
Start Time:  
End Time:  
Sheet Completed by:  

Session Preparation Steps: Describe any preparation required for this session.

1. Post-test Questionnaires have been prepared  
This step took place: Y__ N__

Session Activities: Describe the activities included in this session.

2. Participants completed the Post-test Instrument  
This step took place: Y__ N__

3. Participants given opportunity to review current conflicts with students, and to share ideas for response strategies based on the knowledge they had gained from their training  
This step took place: Y__ N__

Total Steps Completed: __  
Total Steps Not Completed: __  
Total Percentage of Completed Steps: ___
APPENDIX F
EXPERT REVIEW OF THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE
Directions: Please review the contents of Module Two: Recognizing the Bully, Module Three: Recognizing the Victim, Module Four: Taking charge: Interventions for Bullying Behavior, Module Five: Assisting Victims: Interventions and Recommendations, and the attached document, Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities. Following your review of these materials, please provide your opinion of the degree to which the attached document, Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities corresponds with the other four modules of the Bully Busters teacher-training manual.

Please provide your responses below.

1. Please provide your opinion on how well the format of the Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities document matches the visual structure and format of the other modules in the Bully Busters program.

   a. Please indicate how well the visual and structural format of the Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities document matches the visual structure and format of the other modules.

      □ Very well
      □ Somewhat
      □ Not at all

      Please indicate what (if any) formatting changes should be made. Please provide specific examples.

   b. Please indicate how well the type of information provided in the Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities document matches the type of information contained in the other modules.

      □ Very well
      □ Somewhat
      □ Not at all

      Please indicate what (if any) information changes should be made. Please provide specific examples.
2. Please provide your opinion on how well the language of the Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities document matches the language contained in the other modules in the Bully Busters program.

   a. Please indicate how well the reading level of the Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities document matches that of the other modules.

      ☐ Very well
      ☐ Somewhat
      ☐ Not at all

      Please indicate what (if any) reading level changes should be made. Please provide specific examples.

   b. Please indicate how well the use of citation within the Special Considerations for Students with Disabilities document matches that of the other modules.

      ☐ Very well
      ☐ Somewhat
      ☐ Not at all

      Please indicate what (if any) reading level changes should be made. Please provide specific examples.
APPENDIX G

EXPERT REVIEW OF THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE
1. How long did it take you to complete the survey? ____________________

2. What is your opinion on the amount of time it took you to complete the survey?
   - Too short
   - Appropriate amount of time
   - Too long

3. Please rate the level of difficulty of understanding the survey questions:
   - Very difficult
   - Difficult
   - Neither easy not difficult
   - Easy
   - Very easy

4. Do you think the added items (items 23-44 on scale 2) (items 65-75 on scale 3) accurately reflect content addressing bullying among all students, including those with disabilities?
   - Yes, very well
   - Somewhat
   - Not at all

5. Please note which items you feel did not accurately reflect the content and the reason why.
   (Please include specific question numbers).
   ______________________________________________________________

6. Please note which items of the added items you feel should be edited, and how they should be edited. (Please include specific question numbers).
   ______________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________

7. Please add any other comments you have regarding the survey.
   ______________________________________________________________
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