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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess the impact of the School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) process on bullying behaviors in an elementary school. Participants completed a pre and post-bullying assessment (Safe School Survey adapted from the Canadian Public Health Association and the National Crime Prevention Strategy; Totten, Quigley & Morgan, 2004) to assess the impact of bullying in their school system. Additionally, existing school data (e.g., office referrals, behavioral infractions, in-school suspension, and buddy rooms) and direct observations conducted within targeted settings were used to measure intervention impact. Specifically, the study (a) focused on the process the SWPBS team went through and (b) explored the SWPBS team’s efforts at Tier I, II, and III levels of student support through pre-post -surveys, school team observations, on-going analysis of school data, and a multiple-baseline-across-students design with students who engaged in bullying behavior through data triangulation. Post-assessment data were collected and used to measure the impact of each strategy to decrease bullying behaviors in their school system. Analyses include mixed methods with qualitative and quantitative data. Qualitative data highlighted the school counselor’s and SWPBS team’s positive outlook on collecting and using bullying data in the future. Quantitative data revealed non-significant outcomes in decreasing bullying behaviors when using standalone programs.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Bullying behavior is a serious problem in our society today. Felix and Furlong (2008) reported that many students are bullied at school on a daily basis, leading to an approximately 160,000 students missing school each day due to fears of being bullied (National Education Association, 1995). According to Carney and Merrell (2001), bullying occurs at all ages but is most common in late childhood through early or middle adolescence, with the peak period being between the ages of nine and fifteen, and declining at the high school level. Feinberg (2003) reported that approximately 15% to 30% of children nationwide are either bullies or victims.

In response to the challenge of bullying in schools, the Center for Mental Health in Schools (The CHMS; 2011) reported that schools have increased prevention efforts over the past 25 years. Swearer, Espelage, Vaillancourt, and Hymel (2010) emphasize the importance of implementing school-wide bullying prevention programs that help all children. They indicate that since approximately 10-20% of students engage in bullying behaviors, more efforts should focus on creating separate interventions for those who bully rather than making every student participate in the same level of bullying prevention.

School age children and youth spend more than 14,000 hours in school across grades K-12 providing an opportunity for educators to take a large role in shaping the social development of children and adolescents (Sugai, Horner, & McIntosh, 2008). Students learn important social skills by interacting with their peers and participating in school activities. However, as Sugai et al. emphasize, one of the prominent concerns of
educators and society is “lack of student discipline and behavior control” (p. 765). So while educators are presented with multiple opportunities to promote healthy peer social interactions, educators are unfortunately not prepared to do so and continue to struggle with managing difficult behaviors including bullying behavior.

An increasing number of schools are focusing their efforts on creating a more positive school environment that allows schools to embed selected team strategies (e.g., bullying & academic) with existing features, to help children succeed in and outside of the school setting (Horner et al., 2009; Horner, Sugai, & Anderson, 2010; CHMS, 2011). In particular, schools are working towards a more proactive approach known as School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS), which “is a process for creating safer and more effective schools by structuring the learning environment to support the academic and social success of all students” (n.p., www.pbismissouri.org, 2008). Key features within SWPBS are the explicit teachings of social skills, providing pre-corrections, and behavioral progress monitoring (Sugai et al, 2008); According to Sugai et al. this process is supported by research and has been found to be effective in prevention efforts and can be applied universally to improve behavior problems and ineffective disciplinary practices of the school (Horner, Sugai, & Anderson, 2010).

What is unique about this school-wide problem solving process is that it is a systems approach rather than a designated curriculum. Schools create their own SWPBS team that works together to create an individualized action plan for their school based on within school data. Sugai et al. describe SWPBS as “(a) theoretically and empirically sound, (b) based on evidenced-based practices, (c) culturally and contextually relevant, and (d) considerate of the organizational and systematic supports that affect “real”
accurate and sustained implementation” (p. 767). The five main features of SWPBS include prevention efforts; behavioral theory and applied behavior analytic foundations; an instructional approach; evidenced-based interventions and procedures; and a systems perspective (Sugai et al., 2008; Sugai & Horner, 2006; www.pbismissouri.org, 2008).

Schools using SWPBS have the potential to successfully integrate bullying prevention strategies and thereby lead to improved, seamless outcomes. For example, the Illinois SWPBS initiative reports higher reductions in bullying behavior over schools not implementing SWPBS with one elementary school (Illinois PBS Network, 2010). Moreover, Ttofi and Farrington (2009) stressed that stand alone interventions are not the most effective approach in preventing bullying behaviors. The CMHS (2010) stressed that “many researchers (e.g., Olweus, Limber, Espelage, & Swearer) have also long emphasized bullying reduction requires a comprehensive and integrated approach at an early age, that includes strong leadership and commitment, competence (strong focus on personnel development and enhancing culturally sensitivity), and parent and community involvement” (p. 10).

Data reported by the Illinois SWPBS have provided several case studies on the integration of SWPBS and bullying focused interventions (Illinois PBS Network, 2010). For example, at the end of the school year in 2010, an Illinois elementary school discovered that 57% of their office referrals were a result of bullying behaviors. To face this issue, the school decided to integrate their PBS strategies with a bullying curriculum (Bullying-Prevention in Positive Intervention and Support (BP-PBS); Ross et al., 2008). According to the Illinois PBS Network (2010) school staff were trained on how to implement the curriculum at the beginning of the 2010 school year, and parents were
introduced to the integration of SWPBS and BP-PBS strategies. Because of this approach, school officials were able to put interventions in place not only school-wide, but also for children falling in the tier II level (i.e., groups of children needing extra support with managing their disruptive behaviors). All children were monitored and positive changes were noted, specifically decreases in bullying related behavior prompting full implementation of SWPBS and BP-PBS state-wide in Illinois starting in the 2011-2012 school year.

The present investigation (a) focused on the process a SWPBS team went through and (b) explored the SWPBS team’s efforts at Tier I, II, and III levels of student support through pre/post surveys, school team observations, on-going analysis of school data, and a multiple-baseline-across-students design with students who were categorized as “bullies” through data triangulation. Post-assessment data was collected and used to measure the impact of each strategy and the processes the SWPBS team went through to decrease bullying behaviors in their school system.

Need for the Study

Schools need reliable bullying strategies to create a healthy learning environment for all children. This investigation will help schools, teachers, students, parents, communities, and mental health professionals to intervene and prevent bullying from escalating to a more severe level within a comprehensive school-wide approach. In the past few years, Willard (2007) pointed out that a new form or “vehicle” of bullying has emerged, cyberbullying, and as a result, tragic events have taken place (e.g., school shootings, suicides). She emphasized that cyberbullying, or any bullying behavior must be addressed. This study will add to the professional literature on effective bullying
strategies by expanding the focus to integrating bullying strategies with existing school wide systems of behavioral support. According to Carney and Merrell (2001), all individuals involved with the school, including parents, students, teachers, administrators, and support staff, must be aware of what is going on in the school in order for anti-bulling programs to be effective. By building in specific strategies focused on bullying within SWPBS, this study will increase bullying awareness in schools, assess the severity of bullying, and intervene across the continuum of supports to create healthy environments for children and youth.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this investigation was to collect pre-assessment data by identifying bullying behaviors via assessing students and teachers school-wide and developing hypothesis statements so that the SWPBS team could embed bullying strategies within their universal strategies. Existing school data (e.g., office referrals, problem behaviors that reflect bullying behaviors and teacher nomination/referral), interviews and observations were also collected and reviewed to add to the pre-data. The researcher provided the SWPBS team a structured action plan that targets multiple intervention points built on the SWPBS logic. In particular, the study (a) focused on the process the SWPBS team went through during the study and (b) explored the SWPBS team’s efforts at Tier I, II, and III levels of student support through pre/post surveys, school team observations, on-going analysis of school data, and a multiple-baseline-across-students design with students who were categorized as “bullies” through data triangulation. Finally, post-assessment data was collected and used to measure the impact of each strategy and the processes the SWPBS team went through to decrease bullying
behaviors in their school system. Bullying behaviors were assessed in grades first through fifth, with students and teachers in the spring semester for the 2011-2012 school year; follow-up data collection and analysis will continue through the fall 2012-2013 school year. The study sought to answer the following research questions:

**Research question one.** Will SWPBS and targeted universal support action planning reduce overall levels of bullying behaviors?

A dependent t-test was used to compare the mean scores of the pre and post-scores on the bulling assessments, pre-post frequency counts for observations, and pre-post archival data to determine if there was a significant reduction on reported bullying behaviors.

**Research question two.** Can SWPBS teams develop and put in place Tier I, II and III support for students who engage in high rates of bullying behavior?

Descriptive analyses were used to analyze the integrity and social validity checks. Interview data, process notes, and results from teacher-ranked student nominations were combined and reviewed.

**Research question three.** Do targeted Tier II / III interventions within the context of SWPBS reduce rates of bullying behavior among students who engage in high rates of bullying behavior?

Visual analysis of the graphed data within the multiple-baseline design was conducted. The level, trend, variability, immediacy of effect, and the consistency of data patterns in similar phases were analyzed.
Procedural Overview

Participants were first through fifth grade students and teachers from one elementary school in Mid Missouri who were implementing SWPBS with fidelity. The researcher oversaw data collection, provided minimal technical assistance to the school counselor throughout the four phases, and guided the SWPBS Tier II-III team’s decision to use a specific intervention, and school personnel was responsible for administering the classroom wide bullying assessments and implementing their assigned bullying strategies.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The present investigation will focus on assessing bullying behaviors in one elementary school, while collecting process data during School Wide Positive Behavior Supports (SWPBS) team meetings to help guide SWPBS team decisions in implementing Tier I, II, and/or III interventions. The goals of the study will be to (a) assess pre- and post-bullying behaviors in schools using bullying assessments, archival school data, and direct observations and (b) measure the impact of Tier I, II, and/or III bullying intervention/strategies within the SWPBS framework.

History of Bullying

Bullying is a serious problem in our society today, and as such, significant attention has recently been focused on this issue, especially targeting bullying within the school systems. While bullying has been a problem for many years, specific work to address bullying began earnestly in the 1970’s (Felix & Furlong, 2008). It was not too long after when Dan Olewus, a professor in Psychology at the University of Bergen, Norway, began conducting bullying research in Northern Europe. In particular, Olewus published bullying studies in Sweden and then conducted prominent research in Norway (Roland, 2000).

Wide scale preventative efforts started in Norway as a result of tragic deaths of students being bullied (Roland, 2000). In particular, the Norwegian Ministry of Education began the first bullying campaign in 1983 soon after two individuals committed suicide apparently from being victims of constant bullying (Roland, 2000). The main focus of the Ministry of Education was to help schools recognize that bullying was a problem and
assist them with figuring out how to prevent these behaviors. Similar systemic preventive steps to reduce bullying in the United States did not occur until the late 1990’s.

Felix and Furlong (2008) reported that the United States did not really start focusing on this issue until after the school shootings of the 1990s. Similar to the tragic deaths of two youth in Norway, two young adolescents in Colorado were also victims of bullying and in addition to ending their own lives; they ended the lives of some of their school peers. Therefore, in efforts to prevent bullying, certain states took action and created specific laws and policies to address this matter. Specifically, as of 2003, 15 states created anti-bullying laws, while 13 other states addressed bullying in a different manner under a separate heading like harassment or assault (Furlong, Morrison, & Greif, 2003; Limber & Small, 2003). However, because of the severity of bullying behaviors over the recent years, there are currently, as of 2010, 44 states that have anti-bullying laws, 30 specifically include “electronic harassment” and five specifically include cyberbullying in their laws, and 42 states require schools to have anti-bullying policies (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010).

**Bullying Defined**

Bullying has many definitions with some being more complex than others. Because bullying is a national problem in and outside of the school system, it is important that everyone has a concrete definition of bullying and understands the differences among the different forms of bullying (see Table 1 for key definitions and distinctions of bullying behaviors).
Table 1  
**Key Definitions and Distinctions of Bullying Behaviors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>Olewus’s (1993) widely used definition states that bullying is repeated negative behaviors or aggression intended to hurt or harm someone who is perceived by peers as being less physically or psychologically powerful than the perpetrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms of Bullying:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Physically hitting, pushing, kicking, punching, spitting, tripping, or slapping the victim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Spreading rumors, gossiping, excluding, isolating, or name calling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyberbullying</td>
<td>“The willful use of computers or computerized machines as tools to intentionally and repeatedly cause harm or discomfort through verbal or relational aggression that targets a specific person or group of persons” (Cook, Williams, Guerra, &amp; Tuthill, 2007, p. 1). It might be in a text, e-mail, instant message, or on the internet (i.e., Facebook, MySpace, Twitter, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teasing</td>
<td>To annoy or pester; make fun of; mock playfully (The Free Dictionary, 2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Smith and Brian (2000) describe bullying as a persistent social problem in which the bully uses his/her power imbalances in order to dominate and hurt others physically, socially, or emotionally. For example, a student who is physically stronger or more popular in school might bully a child who is physically weaker or unpopular; an interaction that is recognized as a power imbalance between the bully and victim.

Similarly, Carney and Merrell (2001) defined bullying as frequent acts of aggression or
intimidation against a victim who is weaker than the perpetrator in terms of physical size, psychological/social power, or other factors that result in a notable power difference. Nansel et al. (2001) elaborate, stating that “this asymmetry of power may be physical or psychological, and the aggressive behavior may be verbal, physical, or psychological” (p. 2094). According to Shore (2006) bullying differs from a single episode of teasing and play; “it is actually an abuse of power” (p. 2). For instance, the bully is reinforced by reactions from the victim (e.g., yelling, crying, running away), and peers (e.g., laughing or observing), and as a result, the bully becomes even more domineering as his/her power increases.

**Prevalence of Bullying**

Research has found bullying to be an international problem (Carney & Merrell, 2008; Crothers & Kolbert, 2008). Nansel et al. (2001) reported prevalence rates of bullying, as measured by victim report, in the United States to be approximately 30%. In other western nations, similar rates have been reported: 38% in England (Boulton & Underwood, 1992), 25% in Australia (Slee, 1995), and 15% in Norway (Olweus, 1993). In Australia, Rigby (2004) reported that 22.1% of girls reported being bullied by only boys, and 3.4% of boys reported being bullied solely by girls. Research indicated that even though both girls and boys engage in bullying behaviors, usually girls are more likely to bully indirectly (e.g., spreading rumors, gossip), while boys bully directly (e.g., hit, punch, kick) (Sawyer, Bradshaw, & O’Brennan, 2008). Furthermore, Nansel et al., (2001) reported that in America, White and Hispanic students reported more victimization than Black youth, while another study revealed that 85% of lesbian, gay,
bisexual, and transgender youth reported experiencing some form of bullying or harassment while at school (Kosciw et al., 2008).

Felix and Furlong (2008) reported that many students are bullied at school on a daily basis, with approximately 160,000 students missing school each year due to fears of being bullied (National Education Association, 1995). According to Carney and Merrell (2001), bullying occurs across ages but is most common in late childhood through early or middle adolescence, with the peak period being between the of ages nine and fifteen, and declining at the high school level. Nansel et al. (2001) indicated that 8% to 14% of youth were concerned about peer bullying, and 28% of elementary and 34% of junior high students reported being worried about being bullied (Hendershot, Dake, Price, & Lartey, 2006). Ericson (2001) reported that one study, conducted by the National Institute for Child and Health and Human Development, found that 17% of students in grades six through 10 reported being bullied and 19% reported bullying others “sometimes” or “weekly.” Bullying research also reports that 14% of teens between the ages of 12 and 18 reported being bullied in the past six months (Ferguson, Miguel, Kilburn Jr., & Sanchez, 2007).

Researchers have also found rates of bullying to be situational specific (Carney & Merrell, 2001; Swearer, Espelage, Vaillancourt, & Hymel, 2010), suggesting that bullying behaviors are reported at varying rates in different areas throughout the school (e.g., hallway, classroom, playground, cafeteria). For example, Parault, Davis, and Pellegrini (2007) researched bullying behaviors with middle school students across three less-structured school venues, which were the cafeteria, hall/locker room, and the monthly school dance. In order to get accurate study observations, Parault et al. (2007)
created separate groups, categorizing five bullying (e.g., rough play with a peer, teasing a peer, or physical/verbal aggression with a peer) and seven non-bullying (e.g., playing a game without interacting a peer or playing alone) behaviors together. Parault et al. (2007) found different rates of bullying across school environments with more teasing and taunting observed in the cafeteria rather than the school dance or hall/locker room. Although many teachers were present in the cafeteria, students were not allowed to sit wherever they desired, but instead they were required to sit in an assigned seat. Students were allowed to wander and socialize with their friends at the dance and in the hall/locker room, which could have helped with preventing some of the bullying behaviors. Also, because these locations were completely different socially and physically, other possible explanations were that the bully or victim did not attend the dance, supervision was stricter at the dance and hall/locker room, or the students had more autonomy at the dance and hall/locker room than in the cafeteria. It is also important to point out that students attend the cafeteria more frequently, almost daily, than a school dance that is usually held two to three times a year. In general, students usually have a choice about whether or not they want to attend their school dance, and might not have as much autonomy about eating in the cafeteria.

In general, bullying is a worldwide problem that negatively impacts students of all ages, races, genders, sexual orientations, and ethnicities. Bullying behaviors have also been observed at different locations within the school setting, with less structured areas having more problems with bullying behaviors. Because this is a serious problem, it is important for school professionals, students, and parents to know what bullying means and looks like so that everyone can work together to prevent these harmful behaviors.
Bullying Behavior

Direct behavior. Bullies who use physical force choose to kick, hit, push, choke, or force someone to act against their will (Ando, Asakura, & Simons-Morton, 2005). This direct behavior is overt and easier for adults and children to witness as it is directly/physically affecting the victim. Ando et al. (2005) reported that the bully is intentionally trying to hurt his or her victim, and is more visible than indirect bullying. Individuals observing this type of bullying either directly see or hear the abuse taking place. According to Jeffery, Miller, and Linn (2001) boys are more likely to be the victims of direct bullying behaviors; they are more likely to engage in hitting, kicking, pushing, punching, tripping, and spitting behaviors. Similarly, Nansel et al. (2001) analyzed a data set that included survey responses from sixth through tenth grades during the spring of 1998. They found both physical and verbal bullying to be common for males, whereas females were more likely engage in verbal bullying (taunting and sexual comments) and spread rumors.

Glew (2008) studied 5,391 seventh, ninth, and eleventh grade students. He compared survey responses of bullies, victims, and bully-victims to bystander responses and found that bullies were three times as likely as bystanders to say that it was “not wrong to beat up someone who starts a fight” and they were also more likely to say that it was “not wrong to pick fights and to “cheat at school.”

Indirect behavior. Unlike direct bullying, indirect bullying is exhibited through acts of “relational aggression” and verbal harassment or intimidation (Merrell, Gueldner, Ross, & Isava, 2008). Merrell et al. (2008) described relational aggression as excluding others in social situations or purposely ruining their reputation, while harassment is
described as threatening, name calling, maliciously teasing, or spreading nasty rumors. According to Yoon, Barton, and Taiariol (2004) “relational aggression is associated with a number of short- and long-term adjustment difficulties and it is a manifestation of a complex interplay between individual characteristics of victims and perpetrators and the contexts of family, peer, and school” (p. 310). The taunting, name calling, offensive comments regarding one’s race, gender, religion, or disability can be hurtful and have long-term negative effects on a person.

Indirect bullying also includes purposefully ignoring their victim, and that girls were more likely to engage in this type of bullying (Ando et al., 2005; Jeffery et al., 200; Nansel, et al., 2001). Although both boys and girls engage in direct and indirect bullying behaviors, in most cases girls are more likely to intentionally talk negatively about other girls, trying to ruin the victims’ reputations.

**Cyberbullying.** Cyberbullying, a relatively recent form of bullying behavior similar to direct and indirect bullying but transmitted in a different manner, and is defined as “the willful use of computers or computerized machines as tools to intentionally and repeatedly cause harm or discomfort through verbal or relational aggression that targets a specific person or group of persons” (Cook, Williams, Guerra, & Tuthill, 2007, p. 1). The harassment might be in a text, e-mail, instant message, or on the internet (e.g., Facebook, MySpace, Twitter, etc.), with the internet capitalizing on this type of bullying through the various websites and means of communication.

Cyberbullying may include posting humiliating pictures of classmates on the internet, displaying online polls to identify the “ugliest” classmate, or creating websites to ridicule other children (Shore, 2006). According to Shore (2006), this form of bullying
allows the perpetrator to use the anonymity of the internet to torment their victims without being affected by the victims’ feelings or negative reactions (e.g., crying, yelling, retaliation, etc.). However, if the bully continues to torment his/her victim via the internet, email, or by text messaging, then the bully’s behaviors are somehow being reinforced; even though the bully cannot physically see his/her victim’s feelings or negative reactions, there is something maintaining the bullying behavior.

Cook et al., (2007) found studies that revealed 90% of children ages five to 17 in the U.S. use computers, 59% (31 million) have access to the internet (DeBell & Chapman, 2003), and nearly 80% of adolescent aged students own and operate cell phones (USA Today, 2005 as cited in Cook et al., 2007). Shore (2006) reported 43% of teenagers have experienced some form of cyberbullying. In another survey conducted by I Safe America, an internet safety organization, 1,500 middle school students were surveyed about cyberbullying. Results indicated that 37% of students reported being bullied or threatened online (Shore, 2006). Furthermore, four out of five teens think bullying online is easier to get away with or to hide from their parents than bullying in person, and over half of cyberbullying is not reported to adults at all (2006).

Li (2006) surveyed 264 students from three junior high schools about the nature of cyberbullying. Results indicated that about half of the students reported being bully-victims, over half of the students knew someone who had been cyberbullied, over a quarter had experienced cyberbullying, and one in six students had cyberbullied others. The majority of the students experiencing cyberbullying or knew about someone being cyberbullied failed to inform an adult, and one-third of the participants did not feel like
the adults tried to stop it when informed about the situation. Froese-Germain (2008) emphasized that:

Cyberbullying is one of those complex educational conundrums that will require a coordinated approach by the whole school community. Involving different prevention and intervention strategies (including legal, educational, policy, program) and a host of educational and non-educational partners (including the legal community, social workers, mental health professionals, and technology service providers) (p. 47).

Although Froese-Germain discussed effective intervention efforts to prevent cyberbullying, he failed to mention that cyberbullying is another form or “vehicle” of bulling behavior.

**Individuals Involved in Bullying**

Given that bullying is a social behavior, it is important to understand the interactions currently studied. In general, the bully is the victim’s tormentor and the bully-victim is someone who started as a victim of bullying and eventually became a bully or was a bully who ultimately became a victim. According to Nansel et al. (2001) approximately 30% of students are involved in bullying in one role or another. Thus, a student who is not the perpetrator or victim, but the bystander instead, scrutinizing the bullying, is still involved. The individual who is not involved in bullying incidents is known as a non-participant (Kõiv, 2006).

**The bully.** According to Ragozzino and O’Brien (2009) bullying is influenced by many factors, some of which include individual, peer-level, school-level, and family and community levels. They report that social theories, homophily theory, dominance theory, and attraction theory are some of the theories the field has postulated to describe how and why a child might become a bully. For instance, homophily theory suggests that friends
are similar in nature, so bullies tend to hang out with other bullies. The dominance theory suggests that children start to bully when they are trying to become popular or to “fit in” with other students. According to Shore (2006) “some may bully in an effort to gain recognition and status from peers, something that they might not get in other ways” (p. 13). Moreover, the attraction theory indicates that some children are more attracted to aggressive behaviors at certain time periods in their lives. However, some children might be attracted to these behaviors because they have learned from a young age that in order to get what they want they have to use direct force, or if they have difficulty expressing themselves then they might use their fists rather than words (Shore, 2006). In general, Ragozzion and O’Brien (2009) explained that peers, social status, and developmental levels are just some of the possible explanations to why a child bullies.

In addition to the aforementioned theories, social learning theory is a theory that was proposed by Albert Bandura and integrates theories of learning and personality (Rotter, 1954). According to Bandura, the observing and modeling of others’ behaviors, attitudes, and emotional reactions are the key features of this theoretical approach (Schmidt, & Willis, 2007). Craig and Pepler (1995) reported that through social learning theory, bullying is viewed as a didactic process that develops through the interaction between a bully and victim. For example, peers may imitate the bullying behaviors and victims reinforce the bully’s behavior by demonstrating signs of distress.

Rotter (1954) highlighted four variables used within the social learning theory to help explain human behaviors. Behavior potential is the first variable, which “refers to the probability that an individual will act in a certain fashion relative to alternatives” (p. 125, Schunk, Pintrich, & Meece, 2008). For example, each bully will act differently in a
given situation, but their behaviors are maintained by the attention they are receiving from their actions, which is known as expectancy, the second variable. According to Schunk and colleagues the person engaging in the behavior is expecting that a reinforcer will occur. A bully may believe that it is funny when he/she bullies another student, even if observers are not laughing. Reinforcement and the psychological situation are the remaining variables that comprise social learning theory. Rotter indicated that people will behave in a certain way if they know that the outcome is reinforcing and if the outcome is desirable. For example, a bully will most likely not enjoy bullying someone who does not react to the bullying behaviors, because the reaction is what is maintaining the bully’s behavior.

In addition to theoretical orientations that help explain why some children bully, researchers have identified the characteristics of typical bullies. For example, bullies are typically bigger, stronger, aggressive individuals who provoke harm on others (Carney & Merrell, 2001). They are usually thought of as active aggressors towards other individuals. According to Carney and Merrell (2001) “bullies will systematically identify and capitalize on victims of any age, size and status if they perceive that their actions will have little or no chance of carrying repercussions or consequences with them” (p. 369). Even if there is no consequence, the bully is still gaining peer attention (e.g., reinforcement) from the potential reaction of his or her victim. According to Shore (2006) they often feel no sense of remorse and show little sympathy; a lack of empathy is a common characteristic of a bully.

Carney and colleagues (2001) also found that bullies often are raised in homes where corporal punishment is used. The bully usually has very little parental
involvement in his or her life, so their acting out behavior might be a need for more attention than what they are receiving (Merrell et al., 2008). Overall, bullies are domineering and impulsive, usually getting what they want because they look at violence in a positive way.

Glew, Fan, Katon, Rivara, and Kernic (2005) administered a bullying survey to 3,530 students in third through fifth grades. Some of the questions focused on bullying, victimization, whether or not the students felt safe at school or belonged at school. Results showed everyone involved in bullying (bully, victim, bully-victim) were significantly more likely to be suspended or expelled and to endorse cheating if they could get away with it compared to bystanders. Glew et al. also reported “bullies were more likely than bystanders to endorse carrying guns to school, beating up someone who started a fight and smoking cigarettes” (p. 1029).

**Social, emotional, psychological, and behavioral correlates of the bully.** Severe social, emotional, and behavioral correlations for the bully, victim, and bully-victim are also reported. More specifically, Merrell et al., (2008) reported that bullies typically have more trouble in school with poorer social skills and grades than their classmates. Also, bullies are at risk for depression, anxiety, and conduct problems (Ando & Asakura, 2005; Felix & Furlong, 2008; Nansel et al., 2001). Furthermore, bullies often times lack empathic skills, have cognitive distortions and social perception biases related to perceived threats in their environment, and are typically overly aggressive due to the lack of insight they have when it comes to effectively solving problems (Carney & Merrell, 2001; Felix & Furlong, 2008; Merrell et al., 2008). For example, a bully might overact in a situation when someone accidently bumped into him/her, and instead of accepting the
apology the bully perceives the situation as intentional. Because bullies often demonstrate inappropriate problem solving skills, they could be at more risk for substance use and have induced criminal behavior. In one study, 60% of the boys identified as bullies, in sixth through ninth grades, had at least one criminal conviction by age 24 and 40% had three or more arrests (Olweus, 1991).

**Victims.** Carney and Merrell (2001) described victims as either being innocent or provocative. They might act in a hesitant way (e.g., shy, secluding themselves from other peers, etc.), which usually leads to the power imbalance between the victim and bully. According to Carney and Merrell, submissive victims (most common type) are those who have increased anxiety levels, demonstrate insecurity, and are very emotional when attacked by a bully (i.e., cry, withdraw, break down). Another less common type of victim is someone who is provocative. For the most part, these victims are typically viewed negatively by their peers, cause frustration, and are irritable (Carney & Merrell, 2001). For instance, these types of victims do not take the time to be nice to their peers because they already have a notion that nobody likes them, thus, they are generally teased; rarely does anyone intervene to stop the bullying in these cases. In general, Glew and colleagues (2005) reported victims to (a) be lower achievers in math, reading, and listening than bullies and bystanders, (b) feel unsafe, (c) like they did not belong, and (a) feel sad or depressed.

**Social, emotional, psychological, and behavioral correlations of the victim.** The victims of bullying are at risk for being affected socially, emotionally, psychologically, and behaviorally. Nansel et al. (2001) reported victims to have poorer psychological functioning, increased levels of insecurity, anxiety, depression, loneliness, unhappiness,
physical and mental symptoms, and low self-esteem. In one study, 237 junior high school
students completed a questionnaire on bullying as it relates to victim and to perpetrator
status, suicidality and biographical data (Ivarsson, Broberg, Arvidsson, & Gillberg,
2005). Results indicated that the victims reported higher levels of psychiatric problems.
In particular, victims had high internalizing, externalizing, and social problem scores.
They reported concerns in the area of their thought processes (e.g., odd behaviors,
delusions), social problems, and self-destructive identity problems.

Victims are often less likely to attend school and other social situations because they are either afraid of what is going to happen to them, or are just “fed up” with
found that victims often see themselves as ugly, stupid, worthless, and blame themselves
for the bullying attacks. Carney and colleagues reported victims as often having very few
to no friends to support them, and were more likely to bring weapons to school to use to
protect themselves.

Herba and colleagues (2008) explained that although there have been cases when
the victim takes his or her life as a result of bullying they are rare when compared to the
rates of children being bullied at school. Herba et al. (2008) surveyed 1,526 Dutch
children about their parental psychopathology and feelings of rejection at both their home
and the school settings. In particular, Herba et al. (2008) examined whether these factors
made victims of bullying more susceptible to suicide ideation. They found that parental
internalizing disorders and feelings of rejection at home support the idea that victims of
bullying are more susceptible to suicide. Thus, having a proactive approach over a
reactive approach to bullying problems will help alleviate some of these concerns in the school system.

**The bully-victim.** Solberg, Olweus, and Endresen (2007) described a bully-victim, or aggressive victim, as one who plays a double character; portraying a bully during one instance and a victim on other occasions. The theory is that the victim gets tired of being picked on and starts to take the bully role, but when a more dominant bully comes along, he/she is pushed back into the victim role. According to Solberg et al. (2007) the research behind the bully-victim varies, with no clear characteristics describing these individuals. Although it is difficult to identify who a bully-victim is, research has found that they seem to face many more problems in life socially and emotionally; children who are bullies and victims of bullying are more likely to be bullied and/or be victimized by siblings, and are more likely to have parents who lack emotional warmth and are overly permissive with their parenting style (Ragozzion & O’Brien, 2009).

**Social, emotional, psychological, and behavioral correlations of the bully-victim.** Individuals who bully and also are victims are at risk for developing social, emotional, psychological, and behavioral problems. In fact, Cunningham (2007) reported that bully-victims appear to have more severe psychological and social problems than bullies or victims. Cunningham (2007) described these individuals as highly emotional, impulsive, and anxious with poor social skills.

Glew et al. (2008) revealed that bully-victims were more than two and a half times more likely than bystanders to “feel unsafe at school” and to say that at times they “felt no good at all.” They were also twice as likely to be male and reported being sad
more days than what bystanders indicated. Glew et al. (2008) found that bully-victims were more likely to endorse carrying a gun to school and to cheat at school if they could get away with it.

**The bystander.** The individuals who witness the bullying taking place, but are not directly involved, are called “bystanders” (Carney & Merrell, 2001). Frey et al. (2005) reported that “observations showed bystanders were involved in more than 80% of bullying episodes and generally reinforced the aggression” (p. 479). Thus, bystanders may be contributing to the bullying problem by indirectly reinforcing the bully to keep doing whatever it he or she is doing to the victim. According to Swearer et al. (2010) bystanders who are aware of the bullying can have a positive or negative impact on the situation.

**Social, emotional, psychological, and behavioral correlations of the bystander.** Shore (2006) explained that bullying can also affect students that witness the negative behaviors. For instance, bullying can increase bystanders’ fear and anxiety in school, which can affect their academic performance. Shore (2006) also described a study that revealed that approximately 10% of students are afraid of bullying throughout most of the school day, and in another survey children rated bullying as one of worst parts of their childhood. Overall, individuals who are directly/indirectly involved in bullying situations (e.g., witnessing someone be bullied or being bullied) are more likely to be affected socially, emotionally, or psychologically in one way or another than those who are not involved in bullying. Overall, all forms of bullying are extremely harmful and understanding bullying prevalence are keys to successful prevention/intervention efforts.
Prevention/Intervention

Current research in bullying prevention/intervention differs across schools settings and levels. For instance, bullying interventions will look different at the universal, targeted, and intensive levels and across age groups and grade levels. Although there are promising results in the bullying research, there needs to be more consistency in preventing this pervasive problem.

The Olweus Bully Prevention Program. The Olweus’s Bully Prevention Program (Olweus, 1994; OBPP) has been found to be effective in reducing bullying behaviors when implemented with fidelity (e.g., Bauer, Lozano, & Rivara 2007; Olweus 1993). This anti-bullying program originated in Bergen, Norway and involves parents, teachers, and students within the program. An anti-bullying approach is employed, which focuses on individual or small groups of victims and bullies, classroom-level interventions targeting teachers and other adults, and school-level interventions designed to build a more positive environment for the school (Crothers, Kolbert, & Barker, 2006). According to Crothers et al. (2006) everyone identifying the problem looks through the same lens, because each person is educated on the facts and myths of bullying.

One Olweus study found a 50% reduction in victimization in both boys and girls, and a 16% decrease in aggression (Crothers et al., 2006). Ttofi et al. (2008) conducted a meta-analysis on the effectiveness of 30 different bullying programs; the 30 programs were carefully selected by studies that focused on reducing school bullying, clearly defining and measuring the problem, included both experimental and control groups, effect sizes and samples sizes that exceeded 200. Experimental schools implementing the OBPP reduced bullying victimization by approximately 20% when compared to the
control schools (Ttofi et al., 2008). According to Ttofi et al. (2008) the reductions in bullying were supported by parents being trained, playgrounds being supervised, discipline methods/classroom rules being more effective, increasing the home-school communication, and more effective training for everyone. However, Ttofi et al. (2008) indicated that Olweus’s larger scale studies (i.e., implementation of Olweus’s bullying program in the United States) were not found to be as effective as the smaller scale studies in Europe. Hence, there is still work to be done regarding bullying problems in America.

Bauer et al. (2007) conducted a non-randomized control trial with ten middle schools, grades sixth through eighth. Because a statewide mandate required all middle schools to implement anti-bullying policies and measures, the administrators had the power to decide how they would fulfill the mandate. Seven of the schools decided to implement the OBPP while the three remaining schools implemented their own less formalized bullying strategies. To learn about the prevalence of bullying, the non-Olweus schools combined existing school climate survey questions with questions from Olweus’s survey. Schools decided to use the final survey for pre and post measures to measure the impact of the chosen intervention on bulling behaviors. Results indicated that nearly one third of the sample reported being a victim of relational bullying in the past couple of months. Furthermore, the seven schools implementing Olweus’s program revealed that there was no overall effect of the OBPP on student-reported victimization; however, when ethnicity was taken into consideration White students were less likely to report bullying over the two year period, and in the intervention schools, sixth graders were 21% more likely to feel emphatic towards victims.
Although the OBPP has shown to be effective, Swearer et al. (2010) found mixed results among different studies using this program (e.g., Olewus, 1993, 1994; see Roland, 2000). In particular, Swearer et al. (2010) reported that Roland’s studies with the OBPP resulted in reported increases in bullying behaviors among boys and victimization among boys and girls, whereas Olewus’s studies resulted in decreases in bullying and victimization. Bauer et al. (2007) found promising results with lower reported rates of bullying among White students, but there was no overall effect of the OBPP with other ethnic groups. According to Olweus and Limber (2010) schools in the United States have had difficulty with implementing the OBPP because of time constraints regarding training and implementation, buy-in from the entire school, and not implementing the intervention with fidelity (e.g., choosing certain pieces of the intervention to implement). Hence, there is still work to be done regarding bullying problems in the United States with Olweus’s program.

**Steps to Respect.** *Steps to Respect: A Bullying Prevention Program* (Committee for Children, 2001) is a universal, school based program that is used in elementary schools and designed to address bullying at various levels. Felix and Furlong (2008) reported that it promotes pro-social beliefs and social-emotional learning through 11 classroom lessons. According to Frey et al. (2005), the program is designed to decrease school bullying by increasing awareness and responsiveness across school professionals, promoting socially responsible beliefs with students, and teaching social-emotional skills to counteract bullying and to create healthy relationships.

Frey et al. (2005) implemented a controlled study of the *Steps to Respect* program and looked at bullying in six different elementary schools, focusing on third through sixth
grades. Direct observation data were collected on the playground. They found that the students who received the intervention self-reported that they were less accepting of bullying and that they were more likely to intervene if they witnessed their classmates being bullied. Frey and colleagues (2005) found the program to have positive effects with respect to observed bullying behavior, social interaction, and attitudes associated to bullying. Overall, bullying behaviors decreased in students who engaged in bullying prior to the intervention.

Low, Frey, and Brockman (2010) recently studied the effects of the Steps to Respect program in six elementary schools through a randomized control design. In order to participate, 80% of all the staff had to be in agreement and principals could not implement any other interventions while this study was taking place. Approximately ten to twelve students were randomly selected to be observed on the playground and 610 pre-test observations were collected prior to the intervention. School teams in the experimental group created policies and procedures for reporting bullying incidents and teachers attended two days of training. The intervention lasted 10 weeks and teachers completed fidelity measures throughout the study to ensure high quality implementation. The main measure of the intervention and control school was direct observation on the playground. Results indicated that “group differences in gossip reduction were substantial, amounting to projected reductions of approximately 234 fewer instances of gossip and 270 fewer instances of being targeted for gossip” (Low et al., 2010, p. 546). Although, Low and colleagues (2010) contributed to the prevention research by showing that the Steps to Respect program reduced observed relational aggression, the researchers did not take into consideration the time, cost, and effort it takes schools to
implement a randomized control study with observers who were trained extensively on using a coding system.

**Bully Busters.** *Bully Busters* takes more of a preventive approach in reducing bullying by focusing on teachers (Newman-Carlson & Horner, 2004). This program requires teachers to be a part of psycho-educational workshops so they can try to stop the problem before it starts. For example, teachers are trained on how to increase awareness of bullying among students, prevent bullying in the classroom, build personal power, recognize who the bullies/victims are, choose appropriate interventions, and teach relaxation and coping skills (Felix & Furlong, 2008). The reasoning behind this notion is that it is easier to prevent bullies from victimizing another child than it is to try and change the bullies’ learned behaviors that are meeting their instrumental needs (Felix & Furlong, 2008). Felix and colleagues (2008) found promising results with this anti-bullying intervention in elementary and middle school students, as well as teachers’ beliefs on implementing the intervention. Specifically, the researchers reported a 40% reduction rate in self-reported aggression and a 19% decrease in self-reported victimization in younger elementary school children. This study demonstrates that students and teachers who discuss the issues surrounding bullying might feel as though bullying behaviors decreased in their school via self-reports and not through observations or other methods of measuring the impact of the intervention in decreasing bullying behaviors.

Newman-Carslon and Horne (2004) studied the effectiveness of *Bully Busters* with 30 sixth, seventh, and eighth grade middle teachers through a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest control group design; 15 teachers were placed in both the control and
experimental groups. Teachers were trained through a psycho-educational design that focused on specific goals. Teachers met once a week for three weeks, for 2 hours each training session. The experimental team was divided into two groups, so that they could provide support to each other throughout the study. Various measures were completed by the teachers to assess their perceptions of the intervention and its components, their self-efficacy regarding their teaching and ability to work with children with behavioral problems, and the data surrounding their office referrals. Results indicated that teachers gained knowledge in bully intervention skills, intervening with the bully, aiding the victim, assisting the bully and the victim, using resource-related interventions, and increasing students’ awareness of bullying and victimization and helped with the reduction of bullying behaviors in their classrooms. However, teachers did not feel confident in reducing bullying behaviors if external factors were affecting the students’ lives (e.g., home environment, family background).

As indicated in the above intervention studies, many schools are concerned about bullying behaviors as they are trying their best to implement an effective intervention that reduces reported and observed bullying behaviors while at the same time trying to get teacher buy-in. However, many studies have shown inconsistent results and schools continue to struggle with deciding upon the most effective bullying intervention to implement which may result in decreased bullying behaviors across all levels.

**Integrating bullying strategies with existing programs.** The above reviewed anti-bullying programs all demonstrated promising results; however, they required days of training, “buy-in” from school personnel, and funding to support the training and program materials. Instead of spending more money, time, and resources on
implementing individualized anti-bullying programs, research suggests that schools move
to more comprehensive approaches by integrating existing programs and resources with
bullying strategies (The CHMS, 2011; Ross & Horner, 2008; Ryan & Smith, 2009;
Swearer et al., 2010).

Felix and Furlong (2008) suggest that schools develop a whole school policy in
reducing bullying. For instance, everyone in the school should be trained on how to
identify bullying behaviors, stop them from reoccurring through intervention/prevention
efforts, and work together to create a healthy school environment. Schools can increase
adult awareness, help teachers improve classroom management, and most importantly,
plan for resistance from unsupportive staff and parents (e.g., present data that shows
positive intervention effects). If policies are in place and bullying is still occurring, then
another option is for schools to integrate existing behaviors strategies with bullying
strategies. Although integrating strategies and comprehensive school-wide preventions
programs have been found to decrease bullying as much as 50% (Shore, 2006), schools
often struggle with creating comprehensive systems. In particular, schools have difficulty
implementing and sustaining both prevention/early intervention and have difficulty with
connecting targeted interventions (Ferguson et al., 2007, Ryan & Smith, 2009; Swearer et
al., 2010).

**Best Practices in School Wide Bullying Prevention**

Feinberg (2003) and Davidson and Demaray (2005) suggest that schools follow
specific guidelines and build capacity in order to create healthy school environments.
Feinberg (2003) emphasized the importance of laying the groundwork, building a school-
wide foundation, making early interventions, and providing individual interventions; he
believes that in order for bullying programs to be successful, they should incorporate five recommendations based on the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (see Table 2).

However, Feinberg (2003) failed to offer research based strategies to accomplish these recommendations. For instance, some schools might be implementing some of these strategies to the best of their abilities; however, not having the research to support their strategies or to make them more effective decreases the likelihood of maintaining and sustaining their preventative efforts.

Table 2

Feinberg’s (2003) Five Recommendations in Building Capacity for Bullying Programs

1. Lay the groundwork
   a. Coordinate with other schools in your district
   b. Assess the extent of the problem
   c. Establish a coordinating team
   d. Involve the entire school community

2. Build a school-wide foundation
   a. Develop a code of conduct
   b. Establish and consistently enforce consequences for bullying
   c. Build students’ sense of responsibility for the school community
   d. Distinguish between “ratting” and “reporting”
   e. Train all school personnel
   f. Ensure cultural competence
   g. Increase adult supervision
   h. Conduct school-wide bullying prevention activities

3. Make early interventions
   a. Teach specific skills and values in the classroom
   b. Teach conflict resolution and peer mediation
   c. Hold parent meetings

4. Provide individual interventions
   a. Establish a protocol for intervening in or investigating a bullying incident
b. Determine the impetus for the behavior  
c. Reinforce alternative behaviors  
d. Work with parents  
e. Address off-campus bullying

In addition to building a school-wide foundation, Davidson and Demaray (2005) indicated that a three-tiered approach can be applied to anti-bullying interventions. The first tier (Tier I or Universal Level) focuses on protection and prevention at the universal level. For instance, all students, school staff, parents, and the community are involved in bullying prevention efforts; they are implementing interventions or integrating bullying strategies that are affecting everyone. The second tier (Tier II or Secondary Prevention) focuses on students who are categorized as being “at-risk” or students who need extra supports as they are reported bullies or victims. These efforts can be individualized or in group settings. Finally, Davidson and Demaray (2005) recommend that children with severe needs receive tier III services. These students are generally repeat offenders for bullying behaviors or being the victim of repeated bullying. Davidson and Demaray (2005) emphasize that all three tiers are important and that it is crucial all three tiers are supported by evidenced-based research.

In general, most schools try to reduce bullying through social control strategies, bullying prevention programs, assemblies, staff training, and policy (Ferguson et al., 2007; Ryan & Smith, 2009; Swearer et al., 2010; The CHMS, 2011). Most schools focus their time and efforts on focusing only on the bully or with students who fall into certain age groups (e.g., elementary or middle school students). In other words, most schools do not involve all students (e.g., bully, victim, and bystander) in bullying prevention. Schools are having a difficult time tackling the issue because of the complexity of the
problem; lack of training or evidenced based programs; and some school professionals believe that they have very little time to go through the training process that teaches them how to implement an intervention with the highest fidelity (CHMS, 2011).

Sustaining School Wide Evidenced-Based Interventions

In dealing with this complex problem, researchers suggest that one of the most important aspects in planning universal and targeted interventions is for school officials to accurately assess bullying (Felix & Furlong, 2008). Many studies have used self-reports (e.g., type of bullying, who bullies, age group, gender), whereas others have directly observed for patterns (Frey et al., 2005). In general, schools do not use multiple methods to assess bullying or measure the impact of an intervention (e.g., surveys, self-assessments, observations, interviews, and existing school data), which makes it difficult to intervene and prevent this issue.

Multi-method approach to preventing school-wide bullying behaviors. In addition to the evidenced based three-tier approach, Davidson and Demaray (2005) also discussed key strategies schools can use in regard to preventing bullying, in which they adapted from the National Association of School Psychology Communiqué, a “non-peer reviewed” article that contains evidenced-based research. They suggest that before schools assess their bullying prevalence, they need to create teams with knowledge regarding mental health issues, bullying and violence prevention, and overall educational best practices. Secondly, Davidson and Demaray (2005) suggest that all the stakeholders should be in agreement about the intervention or prevention plan. Having consistency during the decision making process would possibly make things run more smoothly if all school professionals collaborated with administrators who were recognized as being
strong and supportive school leaders. According to Davidson and Demaray schools with administrative support for budget/communicative assistance, and support from teachers/staff/parents/community members will most likely result in successful implementation and overall buy-in. Finally, after a team is created, the focus should be on a needs assessment.

Many researchers support the multi-method technique in assessing the level of severity of bullying behaviors in school systems (Davidson & Demaray, 2005; Feinberg, 2003; Ryan & Smith, 2009). For instance, schools are encouraged to use multiple sources of data including office referrals, self-report measures, surveys, questionnaires, observations, and interviews. These data will guide teams in deciding on which intervention to implement in their school (e.g., a pre-packaged program or a program designed by the school team). Additionally, if teams review data periodically throughout the year (e.g., quarterly or monthly), this multi-method approach will help with evaluating the effectiveness of the program (Ryan & Smith, 2009).

Although the multi-method approach can be complicated, Crothers and Levinson (2004) also emphasize the importance of using multiple sources of information to assess bullying behaviors. One of the simplest methods they describe in their article is unstructured observations. During unstructured observations, researchers talk with teachers and students to find out where bullying is most likely to occur (e.g., playground, the lunchroom, the restroom, buses, locker rooms) and then pick varying times during the day and week so that a realistic picture of bullying can be captured. According to various researchers (e.g., Crothers & Levinson, 2004; Swearer et al., 2010), interviews are a crucial part of the qualitative data collection phase as it adds different viewpoints and
pieces of information that might have been captured through surveys or questionnaires. In addition, a second method that is useful in the data collection phase is interviewing the school community, which includes administrators, teachers, students, parents, and other school professionals. Crothers and Levinson (2004) reported that “interviews have been used to establish the incidence of bullying behaviors, the impact on student development, and the effectiveness of anti-bullying interventions” (p. 497). They believe that students will be more open to discussing the issues surrounding bullying with individuals outside of the school. Furthermore, the interviews can be transcribed so that the researchers can create themes and make connections regarding bullying behaviors and preventative steps.

A third method suggested by Crothers and Levinson (2004) includes collecting information by administering questionnaires and surveys. These tools are useful when schools want to plan school-wide interventions as they are quick and easy for schools to conduct; however, schools do have difficulty with this method as it can be costly and it takes time to collect and analyze the data (Olweus & Limber, 2010). Teacher ratings are another method schools can use to collect data about bullying behaviors (Ryan & Smith, 2009). Crothers and Levinson (2004) suggest using teacher interviews when time and effort are factors in school systems. Self-reports and instruments can also be used to assess bullying behaviors in school settings. In general, “bullying assessment should be a systemic effort that is carefully planned and implemented by a team of professionals including administrators, counselors, teachers, and psychologists. Issues of time, manpower, and cost must be considered when planning and establishing a bully assessment program” (Crothers & Levinson, 2004, p. 501).
Felix and Furlong (2008) suggest that schools use multiple methods when measuring the impact of bullying, and emphasized that bullying assessments should be brief in nature, and rather than measuring “bullying” itself, measure the elements of bullying which include purposeful, chronic, and power imbalance. In particular, measures should include questions that focus on the duration of the bullying behavior, potential reasons for the bullying behavior, and demographic information about the bully and victim to get at the “power imbalance” piece. However, Felix and Furlong (2006) failed to provide evidence on how to effectively measure the perception of a young student completing a survey about measuring the elements of bullying (e.g., power imbalance). Felix and Furlong (2008) also recommended a measure, created by Thomas and colleagues that distinguishes the differences between victimization and bullying among peers, which then could guide the intervention. More specifically, Felix and colleagues (2008) explained that school officials can use a Gate 1 survey (i.e., a screener that assesses the problem at the full school level) or Gate 2 interview (i.e., interview the students who pass cutoff on the initial screener), in order to help distinguish bullying from the normal conflicts students face in school (Felix & Furlong, 2008). Felix and Furlong (2008) further suggest discussing all of the survey results with appropriate stakeholders in the school, so everyone is on the same page and working together to prevent bullying.

Besides school officials working together as a team, students should be involved in this process as well. Crothers, Kolbert, and Barker (2006) studied the intervention strategies students would like school officials to implement when being bullied by peers. Crothers and colleagues (2006) found that middle school students reported they would
like teachers to be more involved with intervening in bullying situations, suggesting that teacher involvement is scarce. Felix and Furlong (2008) suggest monitoring the entire school at higher rates, especially the hot spots (e.g., playground, cafeteria, restroom), and training appropriate staff in identifying bullying situations. These data would help school systems look at bullying situations at the school-wide and individual levels, which would help guide schools in creating appropriate interventions at all three levels (i.e., Tiers I, II, & III).

Researchers recommend that teachers use guidance lessons, such as role playing (e.g. acting out scenarios), watching videos, and reading books as a means of addressing bullying in the classroom (Crothers & Kolbert, 2008; Shore, 2006). These types of lessons provide children with the appropriate language to identify and talk about the problem and can be implemented across the entire school or individual classrooms. For younger children, Crothers et al. (2006) advise teachers to use puppets when acting out scenarios, and that older children should create their own scripts that depict bullying and use puppets to act out the scenarios. In addition to puppets, videos and books have also been effective in providing children with information on bullying (Crothers et al., 2008). These materials explain the issue in greater detail and inform children on how to deal with the problem and emphasize the need to seek help from adults.

In summary, school systems are trying to follow research-based bullying prevention/intervention guidelines to some extent, but might be having difficulty with implementing interventions with integrity, not collecting data appropriately, or not having the necessary training (Olweus & Limber, 2010). Schools also have difficulty with conducting rigorous research due to lack of funding, training, time, support, or leadership
Therefore, schools would benefit from an evidenced-based bullying prevention approach that can be integrated within what their existing efforts and resources to ensure fidelity, buy-in from all school professionals, and to increase overall intervention effectiveness.

**Using process data to prevent school-wide bullying behaviors.** In addition to utilizing a multi-method approach to preventing bullying behaviors, process data and process use can improve intervention implementation and evaluation (Patton, 2008). According to Patton (2008), “process use refers to and is indicated by individual changes in thinking, attitudes, and behavior, and program or organizational changes in procedures and culture that occur among those involved in evaluation as a result of the learning that occurs during the evaluation process” (p. 155). For instance, the process helps an individual make changes in their behavior, attitude, and overall way of thinking.

Patton (2001) indicated that it is appropriate to collect process data for qualitative research. In particular, process data includes detailed descriptions of how people interact with each other, experiences of everyone involved in the study, cannot be summarized on a single rating scale at one point in time, and include perceptions of participants during the study as a crucial piece of data during the process. Cappella, Reinke, and Hoagwood (2011) indicated that keeping track of the steps involved in process research may help school professionals “build and install programs that allow more children to succeed in school” (p. 460).

Verlaan and Turmel (2010) highlighted the importance of using a multi-method approach and process data to develop, implement, and evaluate a program that raises awareness of indirect and relational aggression in elementary school children and
teachers. Two schools with approximately 188 fourth through sixth grade students participated in the study. Verlaan and Turmel (2010) developed the program using a participatory action research approach to assist the translation of research findings into action and to ensure that the intervention meets the needs of school systems. During the initial implementation phase, Verlaan and Turmel (2010) administered questionnaires to the children and teachers and conducted semi-structured interviews with school professionals to collect process data. At the conclusion of the study, participants completed a questionnaire and satisfaction survey. The researchers also administered a pre-post survey that focused on knowledge about relational aggression, and they had the students complete a revised Olweus bullying/victimization questionnaire. Although Verlaan and Turmel (2010) found no clinically significant differences in students’ knowledge on relational aggression or a reduction in reported bullying behaviors, the process data helped the researchers create important recommendations for future practices.

**School-wide Positive Behavior Support**

Many children are in school systems from ages 4 to 17 and spend a significant amount of time with school professionals learning not only about academics, but they also work with teachers to meet developmental milestones (Sugai, Horner, & McIntosh, 2008). For instance, important life skills are taught and socializing with peers in the classroom and through extracurricular activities is crucial in developing age appropriate social and problem solving skills. Although many schools have well trained and dedicated educators, Sugai et al. (2008) emphasize that one of the prominent concerns of educators and society is “lack of student discipline and behavior control” (p. 765). Even
though children and adolescents learn these important human aspects, schools are still struggling with managing difficult behaviors negatively affecting the learning environment. Therefore, school systems across America are moving to a more positive approach to create healthier learning environments for all students.

An increasing number of school professionals are focusing their efforts on creating an overall social culture and intensive behavior supports that is needed to achieve academic and social success for all students (Horner et al., 2009). A proactive approach over one that is reactive in nature is what schools are hoping to accomplish for their school environment. For example, schools across the nation are implementing an approach known as School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS), which “is a process for creating safer and more effective schools by structuring the learning environment to support the academic and social success of all students” (www.pbismissouri.org, 2008). The core of SWPBS emphasizes social skills instruction, pre-corrections, and behavioral progress monitoring (Sugai et al, 2008). Research reports that this process is supported by evidence and has been found to be effective in prevention efforts and can be applied universally to improve behavior problems and ineffective disciplinary practices of the school (Horner et al., 2009; Sugai et al., 2008).

This systems-approach is unique in that schools create their own SWPBS team that collaborates while they create an individualized action plan for their school. According to Sugai et al. (2008) SWPBS teams should base their team decisions on theory and research and they should be sensitive to changes during this process. A systems focus is also extremely crucial in order for this approach to be effective (Horner et al., 2009; Sugai et al., 2008; Sugai & Horner, 2006). For example, the action plan
should focus on the entire school across all grade levels. SWPBS also has five main features that include prevention efforts; behavioral theory and applied behavior analytic foundations; an instructional approach; evidenced-based interventions and procedures; and a systems perspective (Sugai et al., 2008; Sugai & Horner, 2006; www.pbismissouri.org, 2008).

The prevention piece of SWPBS promotes a three-tiered approach that includes the primary/universal level; tier II/targeted level; and tier III/intensive level. According to Sugai et al. (2008) the universal level supports all children; the targeted level helps groups of children who need some extra behavioral support whose behaviors are not usually responsive to primary supports; and the tertiary level supports students’ behaviors that are intense and not responsive to the first two levels of support. The following three tiers are highlighted in more detail.

Sugai and Horner (2006) highlighted the universal focus of the Tier I level that affects all students across all levels in the school. Families and community members are also welcomed to join in with their school’s positive behavior approach at the Tier I level. According to Lewis and Sugai (1999) at this level of prevention children are taught age appropriate social skills and are reinforced for demonstrating appropriate school-wide expected behaviors over the behaviors that are discouraged. Because Tier I efforts are not sufficient for every student, extra support (e.g., function based strategies) is supplied to students falling in the Tier II level (Crone & Horner, 2003). For instance, Tier II level interventions are more intense and generally require more adult attention and monitoring (Sugai & Horner, 2006). Lastly, if children are not making adequate progress in Tiers I or II, then they will experience more intense, individualized support. According to Sugai &
Horner (2006) school professionals should have the skills to develop team-based and comprehensive behavior intervention plans for students falling outside of the primary and secondary levels.

Bradshaw, Mitchell, and Leaf (2010) used data from a five year longitudinal randomized controlled effectiveness trial of SWPBS conducted in 37 elementary schools to study the impact of implementation fidelity, discipline patterns (e.g., suspensions and office referrals), and academic achievement. Participants for both the control and experimental group were similar across ethnicity, family background, and had the similar number of behavior problems. Administrators from the control group were required to sign an agreement stating that they would not implement SWBPS or receive training in SWPBS during the study, whereas schools in the experimental group attended state level SWPBS trainings. Bradshaw et al. (2010) used the School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET; Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd, & Horner) and the Effective Behavior Support Survey (EBS; Sugai, Todd, & Horner, 2000) to measure implementation fidelity, and used schools’ existing data (e.g., discipline referral data) to measure student outcomes. Results indicated that the schools trained in SWPBIS implemented the model with high fidelity and experienced significant reductions in student suspensions and office discipline referrals.

The main goal for success at the school level is having strong leadership or a SWPBS team that prioritizes behavioral supports in their school (Ross & Horner, 2009; Sugai & Horner, 2006; Sugai et al., 2008). According to Sugai et al. (2008) in order for schools to successfully implement SWPBS, the SWPBS leaders should be diverse. For instance, leaders from all grade levels should be represented and everyone should be
focused on creating and supporting a school-wide process that involves active administrative, community, and student support. Moreover, it is important for schools to have clear knowledge regarding appropriate and inappropriate behaviors and it is crucial that teams work collaboratively in order to achieve their goals. Specific details for the team/school to consider include having measurable and achievable outcomes; using evidence-based practices to make key decisions; evaluating the effectiveness at different periods of the school year; and getting the necessary systems support to keep SWPBS running smoothly and effectively (Bradshaw, Mitchell, & Leaf, 2010; Horner et al., 2009; Sugai & Horner, 2006).

Lewis, Jones, Horner, and Sugai (2010) reported that students with challenging behaviors who are not succeeding at the universal level in schools who are implementing SWPBS often require multiple sources of support to help them succeed in the school setting. Students needing these extra levels of support also do not receive them from school personnel on a consistent basis (Lewis et al., 2010). Lewis and colleagues (2010) reviewed studies that supported the Tier II and III levels of support in SWPBS with at-risk and identified children. In particular, research supports a self-monitoring intervention with children at the Tier II level. For this intervention, children check in and out throughout the school day at a chosen location with key individuals involved with the child. According to Lewis et al. (2010) this evidenced based intervention has resulted in decreased problem behaviors and increases in attendance, work completion, and academic performance. Further, if students are continuing to struggle at the Tier II level, then Tier III supports are strongly suggested.
Regarding Tier III supports, students needing these intensive services will most likely benefit from individualized and specially designed interventions that match their needs (Bradshaw et al., 2010; Horner et al., 2009; www.pbismissouri.org, 2008). Specifically, trained school professionals are encouraged to conduct Functional Behavioral Analyses (FBA) to create Behavior Intervention Plans (BIP; Horner et al., 2009; Lewis et al., 2010). Students should be observed across multiple settings and interviewed along with other forms of data collection. For example, after the behavior team figures out what is maintaining the child’s behavior (e.g., attention from the teacher) then they should create appropriate behaviors to replace the disruptive behaviors (e.g., ignore yelling and praise raising a quiet hand) that are still meeting the needs of the child.

Overall, SWPBS is being implemented in more than 18,000 schools across the nation, and has been researched and found to be effective in reducing problem behaviors while increasing positive alternative behaviors (Bradshaw et al., 2010; Lewis et al., 2010; Sugai et al., 2008; Sugai & Horner, 2006; www.pbis.org, 2012).

Integrating SWPBS and Bullying Strategies

Tofti and Farrington (2009) stressed that stand alone interventions are not the most effective approach in preventing bullying behaviors. Also, because bullying behaviors have continued to be a problem over the years, schools are trying their best to implement the most effective bullying prevention programs/strategies (The CHMS, 2011). Swearer, Espelage, Vaillancourt, and Hymel (2010) emphasize the mixed results in effective bullying programs and the importance of implementing school-wide bullying prevention programs that help all children. The CHMS (2011) also suggested that “moving to more comprehensive approaches by embedding bullying interventions into
other school initiatives designed to address barriers to learning and teaching and those that promote social and emotional learning are the route to healthier school environments” (p. 10). Glew et al. (2005) suggests that “bullying may be a barrier that impedes effectiveness of teaching, the primary mission of school personnel, yet one recent study (Dake et al., 2004) found that evidenced based whole-school approaches to bullying are rarely implemented in elementary schools” (p. 1031). According to Glew et al. (2005) if schools implement anti-bullying interventions in the younger years, before bullying behaviors become a part of the school culture, then schools might be able to accomplish their educational mission by devoting school time to learning and creating a safe environment for everyone. In addition, Rigby (2002) suggests similar recommendations of those provided by Swearer et al. (2010) in that schools should use a multi-method approach in their bullying prevention efforts that builds school awareness and focuses on the systems level. Students should also feel empowered after participating in the chosen bullying strategies and schools are encouraged to collaborate with families through these prevention efforts.

With a lack of a systems focus, Swearer et al. (2010) pointed out five critical reasons why anti-bullying programs are struggling:

(1) many intervention studies have solely relied on self-report indices of bullying and victimization, which may not be sufficiently valid and accurate in detecting behavior change; (2) most anti-bullying programs are not well grounded in a guiding theoretical framework that would inform program development and evaluation; (3) most fail to direct interventions at the social ecology that promotes and sustains bullying perpetration, such as peers and families; (4) many of these programs do not account for the changing demographics of communities and fail to incorporate factors such as race, disability, and sexual orientation; and (5) school wide programs are designed to reach all students, when in fact a relatively small percentage of students are directly engaged in bullying perpetration (typically 10-20% of students bully) (p. 42).
In general, schools need to focus their bulling efforts at the systems level.

Ross, Horner, and Stiller (2008) explain that schools have difficulty measuring bullying behaviors, lack the appropriate maintenance of the intervention, and need to include bystanders in their anti-bullying efforts. Similar to what other researchers are saying, Biggs, Vernberg, Twemlow, Fonagy, and Dill (2008) stressed that when stand-alone bullying curriculums are implemented, it is important to get buy-in from administrators and teachers as they may view them as one more task to complete. For example, Biggs et al. (2008) studied teachers and their students from three elementary schools who were implementing the *Creating a Peaceful School Learning Environment* program (CAPSLE; see Twemlow, Fonagy, & Sacco, 2001) referred to as “a whole school approach to school violence prevention in elementary schools” (p. 534). Although Biggs et al. (2008) found teachers to be overwhelmed with more tasks, teachers who implemented the curriculum with fidelity ended up having students who were seen by peers as more helpful to victims of bullying when compared to students in other classrooms. Teachers who implemented the intervention with integrity also had students who were more empathetic, had peaceful attitudes, and were less aggressive bystanders at the conclusion of the study. Biggs et al. (2008) suggest surveying teachers’ attitudes about an intervention as their sense of empowerment or ownership is important for assessing system readiness prior to launching an intervention effort, such data could be informative for determining ways to increase implementation in projects that are already underway.

In general, more bullying prevention efforts should then focus on integrating Swearer et al.’s (2010) five areas of concern or other evidenced-based anti-bullying
strategies, which is what many schools across the country are trying to accomplish. For instance, because a more comprehensive-systematic approach is supported by research, school systems across the nation are implementing School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS). This approach is being used to reduce disruptive behaviors while increasing appropriate behaviors, to address internalizing concerns and to create a healthy learning environment for everyone; some are also integrating anti-bulling strategies with their existing SWPBS efforts (Horner et al., 2009; Ross & Horner, 2009).

The CHMS (2010) states that “many researchers (e.g., Olweus, Limber, Espelage, & Swearer) have also long emphasized that bullying reduction requires a comprehensive and integrated approach at an early age that includes strong leadership and commitment, competence (strong focus on personnel development and enhancing culturally sensitivity), and parent and community involvement” (p. 10). Although SWPBS involves promoting a healthy school environment for all children, not every school focuses their school-wide efforts on decreasing bullying behaviors; bullying is a focus only if it is a target of the school. SWPBS does focus on improving clearly defined behaviors that are measurable and observable, which is important for data-based decision making. Furthermore, “this approach is based on a team that leads a comprehensive action plan and has activities related to achieving organizational capacity for political support, funding, visibility, training, coaching, evaluation, and exemplar demonstrations” (Sugai & Horner, 2006, p. 255). Thus, schools using SWPBS may have more success with integrating bullying prevention strategies than schools not implementing SWPBS.

Bradshaw, Mitchell, and Leaf (2010) also emphasize that schools should use a three tiered approach to undertake bullying behaviors, or integrate prevention efforts with
their own existing programs and supports. Bradshaw and colleagues (2010) highlighted this area of research because they found studies providing evidence that on average, schools use about 14 different strategies or programs to prevent various forms of school violence (Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 2001), which could be costly and daunting for school officials. According to Bradshaw et al. (2010) schools could benefit from a proactive approach that focuses on preventing problems before they start. Bradshaw and colleagues (2010) recommend that schools develop a long-term, sustainable prevention plan that addresses multiple student concerns through a set of well integrated programs and services.

Rigby (2002) further emphasized that external anti-bullying support (e.g., consultants outside the school district) in school systems is not always necessary in reducing bullying. Outside help can sometimes hinder the anti-bullying efforts inside the school. Instead, supporting evidence suggests that in order for bullying behaviors to decline, commitment of the staff in implementing the bullying program is crucial. He believes that “it may be that the process by which an anti-bullying program is developed and the extent to which members of the school community become engaged in its implementation is at least as important as the content of the program” (Rigby, 2002, p. 18).

**Integrating bullying strategies at the universal level.** *Bully-Prevention in Positive Behavior and Support* (BP-PBS) “was designed by blending school-wide positive behavior support, explicit instruction regarding the 3-step response to problem behavior, and a reconceptualization of the bullying construct” (Ross, Horner, & Stiller, 2008, p. 38). In regard to SWPBS, this program helps students build the necessary skills
to decrease the inappropriate bullying behaviors while increasing appropriate ones. Ross et al. (2007) observed selected students to evaluate the effectiveness of the program, and found a 55-69% reduction in inappropriate bullying behaviors. Ross and colleagues also noticed the inconsistencies across the different outcomes for bullying studies, and similar to Ross et al., Swearer et al. (2010) found “that the majority of school-based bullying prevention programs have had little impact on reducing bullying behavior” (p. 43). This conclusion led Ross et al. to create a bullying program that fits within a system of PBS and focuses on clear bulling definitions, program maintenance, school-wide implementation, and involves bullies, victims, and bystanders.

BP-PBS focuses on prevention, is research based, supports the students, and takes a systems approach to create an overall healthy school environment. In general, Ross et al. (2008) created a bullying program that fits into the mold of PBS and requires fewer resources from schools and staff, with the length of implementation is left to the schools’ discretion. The main focus of this program is for students at the tier II and III levels. Ross et al. (2008) reported that “the conceptual framework for Bully-Prevention in Positive Behavior Support lies in an effort to identify the most efficient procedures for achieving durable reductions in violent and disruptive behavior” (p. 45). Ross et al. (2008) specifically wanted a program that focused on systems change and prevention. Below are Ross et al. (2008) six, research-based (Bradshaw et al., 2010; Ross & Horner, 2009), key features that match with PBS efforts (see Table 3).
Table 3

**Six Key Features of Bully Prevention in Positive Behavior Support**

1. The use of empirically-tested instructional principles to teach expected behavior outside the classroom to all students.

2. The monitoring and acknowledgement of students for engaging in appropriate behavior outside the classroom.

3. Specific instruction and pre-correction to prevent bullying behavior from being rewarded by victims or bystanders.

4. The correction of problem behaviors using consistently administered continuum of consequences.

5. The collection and use of information about student behavior to evaluate and guide decision making.

6. The establishment of a team that develops, implements, and manages the BP-PBS effort in a school.

Ross and Horner (2009) studied the effectiveness of the BP-PBS program through a single-subject multiple baseline design across six students and three elementary schools. Schools selected for the study had to be kindergarten through fifth grade and had to be implementing SWPBS with adequate fidelity (e.g., meeting an 80% criterion on the School-wide Evaluation Tool). After the schools were selected, administrators nominated two students from each school who were verbally or physically aggressive towards their peers as rated by their teachers using the Social Skills Rating System (Gresham & Elliott, 1990). Implementation fidelity was measured by asking students every two weeks about whether or not they knew the three step response (i.e., stop, walk, talk) and playground supervisors completed integrity checklists based on different components of the BP-PBS bullying program. Ross and Horner (2009) defined problem behaviors as either physical
(e.g., hitting, biting, kicking) or verbal aggression (teasing, taunting, threatening). Victims were observed to indicate whether or not they used the three step response method to bullying and bystanders were observed to see if they helped the victims. To ensure acceptability of the program, all school officials involved were assessed on the social validity of the intervention. After implementing BP-PBS for eight to 12 weeks, the researchers found promising results. In general, reduction rates were found with the number of incidents, variability, and trend of problem behavior across the six students, and observed increases in appropriate bystander and victim responses were noted. Promising results were paired with positive faculty and staff attitudes regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of the bullying program.

Therefore, because of the inconsistency in the bullying research, severity of the problem, and the need for more integrative, school-wide approaches to preventing bullying behaviors, the current study hopes to research the process SWPBS teams go through in using data to guide their decision to integrate an anti-bullying intervention and/or strategies with their existing SWPBS strategies.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this investigation is to collect pre-assessment data by identifying bullying behaviors via assessing students and teachers school-wide and developing hypothesis statements so that the SWPBS team can embed bullying behavior within their universal strategies. Existing school data (e.g., office referrals, problem behaviors that reflect bullying behaviors and teacher nomination/referral), interviews and observations will also be collected and reviewed to add to the pre-data. In addition, the researcher will provide the SWPBS team a structured action plan that targets multiple
intervention points built on the SWPBS logic. In particular, the study will (a) focus on the process the SWPBS team goes through during the study, (b) explore the SWPBS team’s efforts at Tier I, II, and III levels of student support through pre/post surveys, school team observations, on-going analysis of school data, and a multiple-baseline-across-students designs with students who are categorized as “bullies” through data triangulation. Post-assessment data will be collected and used to measure the impact of each strategy and the processes the SWPBS team goes through to decrease bullying behaviors in their school system. Bullying will be assessed in grades first through fifth, with students and teachers in the spring semester for the 2011-2012 school year. The study seeks to answer the following research questions:

**Research question one.** Will SWPBS and targeted universal support action planning reduce overall levels of bullying behaviors?

**Research question two.** Can SWPBS teams develop and put in place Tier I, II and III support for students who engage in high rates of bullying behavior?

**Research question three.** Do targeted Tier II / III interventions within the context of SWPBS reduce rates of bullying behavior among students who engage in high rates of bullying behavior?
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Overview

The above research questions were answered through the use of a quasi-experimental design with a nested single subject study and conducted through the following phases: (1) Phase I: School-wide Assessment and Tier I Planning: Pre-assessment data included identifying bullying behaviors via assessing students and teachers school-wide and developing hypothesis statements so that the SWPBS team could embed bullying behavior within their universal strategies. Existing school data (e.g., office referrals, problem behaviors that reflect bullying behaviors and teacher nomination/referral), interviews and observations were also collected and reviewed to add to the pre-data. (2) Phase II: Targeted Intervention: The researcher provided support to the SWPBS team to identify evidence-based anti-bullying strategies to incorporate into their efforts based on the baseline data collected, (3) Phase III: School-Wide Implementation: Collected data while the SWPBS team implemented strategies, and (4) Phase IV: Post Assessment: Post-assessment data were collected and used to measure the impact of each strategy to decrease bullying behaviors in their school system. The overall purpose of the study focused on (a) the process the SWPBS team went through to identify need and implement bullying prevention and intervention strategies and (b) the SWPBS team’s specific efforts at Tier I, II, and III levels of student support. Research questions were answered through the use of pre-post-surveys, school team observations, on-going analysis of school data, and a multiple-baseline-across-students design with students who engaged in bullying behavior.
Participants and Setting

The study took place in one elementary school in Mid Missouri that was implementing universal School-Wide Positive Behavior and Supports (SWPBS) with fidelity. Fidelity was measured using the School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET, Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd, & Horner, 2001). A total scale score of 80% or better indicates that universal strategies are in place; the current school achieved a SET score of 96.4% for the 2012 school year. The administrator and SWPBS team were informed about the study and agreed to participate during the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years. This study surveyed all third through fifth grade students and all teachers. First (N=29) and second grade (N=42) students were not surveyed because of difficulties with reading level of the survey and complexity of the constructs (e.g., social vs. verbal bullying). See Table 4 for a summary of school demographics and Tables 5 and 6 for a summary of participant demographics.

Measures

The current study included both qualitative and quantitative data as is commonly recommended in the literature (Crothers & Levinson, 2004; Davison & Demaray, 2005; Ryan & Smith, 2009). Also included in the study were bullying assessment surveys, interviews, direct observations, integrity and social validity checks, process notes, and schools’ existing archival data (i.e., office referrals, school suspension and expulsion records, and demographic data).
Table 4
Total Student and Teacher Summary of School Demographics for spring 2012 and fall 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=294</td>
<td>N=19</td>
<td>N=299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Ethnicity (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
*Summary of School Demographics for spring 2011 and fall 2012 Student Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=118</td>
<td>N=125</td>
<td>N=135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
*Summary of School Demographics for spring 2012 and fall 2012 Teacher Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=15</td>
<td>N=19</td>
<td>N=13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-1st</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Bullying assessments.** The teacher bullying assessment, *Anti-Bullying/Harassment Program Survey for Teachers/Other Adults in School* (Totten, Quigley, & Morgan, 2004) was adapted from the Canadian Public Health Association and the National Crime Prevention Strategy. The student bullying assessment, *Safe School Survey*, was the companion scale developed by the same authors (see Appendix B & C for sample instruments). The teacher and student surveys were designed to address the severity and impact of bullying in schools. Totten, Quigley, and Morgan (2005) highlight that these assessment tools provide a standard way to measure the nature and prevalence of “school peer relationship problems, standards for quality programs, and the impact of school-based programs” (p. 40). In general, these assessment tools provide a foundation for best practice standards (Totten, Quigley, & Morgan, 2005).

Black, Weinles, and Washington (2010) emphasize the importance of refining instruments in order to develop the most accurate form of measurement possible. Therefore, changes made to the *Safe School Survey* included condensing the scales from 5 ratings scales (e.g., “never in 4 weeks”, “once or twice”, “every week”, “many times a week”, “don’t know”) to 4 rating scales excluding “every week.” The original survey was created for grades fourth through seventh, so the changes for the present study were made so that first through fifth grade students could have a simpler form of rating their views regarding bullying behaviors. Questions that were not relevant for the current study or perhaps were difficult for students to understand were also eliminated from the survey (e.g., “what language do you speak”, “how many years have you lived in Canada”, and “have you been bullied for some type of disability”). Although the reading level was on target for first and second grade students after making modifications, the constructs were
still too complex for them. For instance, first and second grade students were able to read the items to the researcher and teacher; however, they had difficulty understanding the different types of bullying behaviors. Thus, first and second grade students were excluded from the current study. Modifications made to the teacher bullying assessment included adding more questions to gather specific information about the locations in the school where bullying behaviors were most likely to occur. Another statement that was added indicated that schools did not have an anti-bullying program in place, so if this question was answered they could skip the last three questions. These changes did not appear to impact the construct validity as the surveys provided the necessary information for the study.

The Safe School Survey consists of 18 questions regarding bullying and how students feel about their school environment. The teacher bullying assessment consists of 21 questions regarding bullying behaviors and prevention efforts in their school. Teachers were asked to complete the teacher bullying assessment and were assisted by the researcher in reading aloud the instructions and questions of the Safe School Survey to all the students in their classroom. To ensure accurate data collection, the examiner attended a school-wide faculty meeting to review the study, to discuss specific procedures for data collection, and to inform teachers what their roles would be in the study. Through email and brief face-to-face discussions, teachers were informed how to conduct the class-wide bullying assessment to provide assistance on how much additional information they provide or how to respond to student questions. Teachers had the option of having their students complete an online or paper version of the bullying assessment. The Teacher and Student assessments took approximately 30 minutes to complete.
**Archival school data.** Archival school data (e.g., office referrals and problem behaviors that reflect bullying behaviors) were examined by the researcher and SWPBS team to triangulate where, when, who, and what possible types of bullying behavior had been occurring over the past school year. In addition, archival data, along with other data sources (e.g., teacher nomination/referral data), were used to identify students who engage in bullying behavior to provide targeted intervention. During the spring 2012 semester, teachers and the school counselor were provided with an operational definition of bullying behavior so that they could clearly refer students engaging in bullying (See Appendix A). After creating a list of students categorized as bullies, the school counselor assisted the teachers while they rank ordered the most severe cases to receive intervention, which resulted in three students who participated in the multiple-baseline-design study. Teachers focused only on students in their classroom.

**Direct student observation.** Direct observation data on bullying behavior rates in non-classroom settings were conducted with the intent of gathering specific information on recurring bullying behaviors within identified school settings (i.e., those noted in the survey and archival data reviews). This information was used to help identify the types of problem behaviors occurring in each school setting and provided an additional estimation of the rate that these behaviors occurred beyond the survey and archival data.

Direct observations were conducted by the researcher and five trained observers from the University of Missouri. Training included three 30 minute training sessions prior to collecting observation data. The observers were trained on how to use the observation log and were given clear operational definitions of the targeted bullying behaviors (see Table 7). Final target behaviors, operational definitions, and examples
were determined once pre-assessment data had been collected and reviewed to insure data collection captured specific issues within the school (see Appendix D). In addition to bullying behavior, observers were also trained in identifying and recording pro-social behaviors. See Appendix E for examples of pro-social behaviors. Using the final target behaviors and operational definitions, observers joined the researcher on the playground and cafeteria to ensure inter-rater reliability before collecting baseline data. Observers required at least an 80% Inter-rater Observer Agreement (IOA) prior to conducting observations. A frequency count procedure was used to record the targeted bullying behaviors. Observations were conducted for 40 minutes to collect observed instances of bullying behavior (i.e., 20 minutes during recess and 20 minutes during lunch). See Appendices D and E for examples of the observation logs.

Table 7

*Operational Definitions of Bullying Behaviors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name Calling</td>
<td>Verbal or written name calling such as “dumb, loser, freak,” etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>Not talking with, not sitting with, and alienations from group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Punching, slapping pushing, kicking, hitting, or other personal injuries and damage to personal property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Brandau, Lyons, O’Donnell, & Propheter, 2006
**SWPBS team notes/observation form.** SWPBS team notes and observations were collected across the study (see Appendix F). The purpose of the team notes and observations were to track how the team engaged in the problem solving process using the provided bullying data. The notes focused on the amount of time spent on each topic in the agenda and other key steps in the SWPBS problem solving process. Universal and Tier II and III fidelity measures developed by the OSEP Center for Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports were also gathered monthly (for *Team Implementation Checklist* and a modified *Benchmarks of Advanced Tiers* see Appendix G). Final results of these assessments were summarized and shared at SWPBS team meetings.

**SWPBS team final interview.** Beginning spring 2013, a final interview, adapted from Maras (2008), was conducted with the school counselor (See Appendix H). The interview captured her prior familiarity with bullying data collected in the school, perceptions of the amount she learned during this process, and perceptions about how that learning occurred. In general, the main purpose of the final interview was to discover what learning took place, how this experience changed her perceptions of data and data usage, and how she will use data in the future. The researcher met with the school counselor for approximately one hour while taking detailed notes. Themes were created by the researcher concluding the interview process.

**Social validity survey.** Social validity survey questions were adapted from Biggs et al. (2008; see Appendix I) and asked questions focusing on the teachers’ perceptions of the intervention, how helpful it was for them in reducing disruptive behaviors, and how often they demonstrated and used the anti-bullying strategies. For the current study, teachers were asked similar questions regarding bullying strategies their SWPBS
team/school counselor implemented (e.g., Tier I, II, and/or III strategies). An Importance Scale was added to the Biggs survey. The Importance Scale was added based on the work of Davidson and Demaray (2005) emphasizing the importance of teacher “buy-in” and their involvement in the chosen bullying intervention, thus, their level of involvement and how important it is to them could be an underlying factor regarding the impact on bullying behaviors. Teachers completed the survey at the conclusion of the study in the fall of 2012. Scores for the survey scales were computed by averaging responses across items (Biggs et al., 2008). The 5-point (0-4) response set for Usage was Rarely/never, Few times/month, Few times/week, Almost daily, and Daily. The 5-point (0-4) response set for Helpfulness was Not at all helpful, A little helpful, Somewhat helpful, Generally helpful, and Greatly helpful. The 5-point (0-4) response for Influence was Not at all, A little, Somewhat, Quite a lot, and Greatly. The 5-point (0-4) response set for Importance was Not at all important, A little important, Somewhat important, Generally Important, and Greatly Important.

**Teacher/school counselor integrity checklists.** To ensure that the interventions/strategies were being consistently implemented, a teacher and school counselor integrity checklist (Windram & Gibbons, 2011; see Appendix J) was used to measure the degree to which strategies were being implemented correctly by school professionals. Teachers and the school counselor were asked to complete a checklist during the spring 2012 and fall 2012 semesters. The researcher collaborated with the school counselor to ensure the checklists were successfully completed with at least 80% implementation accuracy.
Phase I: School-wide Assessment and Tier I Planning

**SWPBS plus universal action planning.** During Phase I, pre-assessment school-wide bullying data were collected and analyzed to determine if universal modifications were necessary. The SWPBS team used the data and assistance from the researcher to guide the process in implementing universal strategies and teacher nominations were then added to identify students who engaged in high rates of bullying behavior (Phase II).

The SWPBS team used initial bullying survey and archival data to identify Tier I interventions and supports and to create data-decisions rules to identify students who might not respond to Tier I supports alone and therefore would be appropriate candidates for additional Tier II or III level supports. During spring 2012 all teachers and students completed the school bullying survey to assess the impact of bullying behaviors. In addition to survey and office referral data, direct observations by the researcher and trained students of the University of Missouri were conducted on the playground and in the cafeteria with the intent of gathering specific information on recurring bullying behaviors. After the Pre-assessment data collection phase, aggregated results were shared with the SWPBS team during a spring 2012 meeting to target specific universal modifications. At the same meeting, the school’s data coordinator shared office discipline referral and other discipline data related to bullying behavior across the school year as well as the general findings from the direct observation data collected in across non-classroom settings. As a team, they looked for peaks where “peer aggression” was frequently happening, talked to teachers about bullying in their classrooms, and discussed the survey data with the researcher. The goal was to provide the SWPBS team a
structured action plan that targeted multiple intervention points built on the SWPBS logic (Lewis, 2010); however, due to time constraints within the school, the researcher suggested to the team that they implement BP-PBS to a few targeted students in spring 2012 and targeted universal strategies fall 2012. The team agreed that it would be more effective to provide supports across all grade levels and school settings while working with students categorized as “bullies.” Therefore, they made the decision to integrate BP-PBS strategies with their “cool tools” (e.g., monthly universal character trait social skill lesson) and existing SWPBS strategies at all three levels.

Following Phase I, the researcher shared a definition of “bullying” behavior with the team to use for purposes of teacher referral in addition to survey and archival data to identify at-risk students. Teachers were then asked to complete a student nomination form to identify at least three students within their classroom who were currently engaging in high rates of bullying behavior. Teachers were given a brief description of bullying behavior along with summaries of archival data to assist them in identifying possible students to receive individualized intervention. The researcher attended a meeting with the school counselor and SWPBS team to identify at least three students who needed extra behavior support, and used a multiple-baseline-across-students design to examine the effects of the chosen Tier II or III interventions on reducing bullying behaviors (see Phase II).

**Phase II: Targeted Intervention**

Prior to starting Phase II, parents/guardians of students being directly observed or receiving Tier II or III interventions, were sent letters explaining the study as well as a request to allow their child to participate using an IRB approved consent form. After
receiving IRB and school approval, all three students participating in the study returned their signed informed parental consent forms. Phase II focused on a nested multiple-baseline-across-student design with teacher nominated students who engaged in high rates of bullying behavior. Direct observation data were used to determine the functional relationship between individual student interventions and rates of bullying behavior within the multiple baseline design. The researcher provided technical assistance throughout the study, helped with pre- and post-data analysis, social validity and integrity checks, observations, and interviews. The researcher frequently communicated through email and attended meetings with the school counselor and SWPBS team to guarantee intervention strategies were being implemented with fidelity.

**Spring 2012: Tier II/III interventions for students who engaged in bullying behavior.** During Phase II and following the pre-data/universal modification phase, teachers were asked to complete a teacher nominated form that was used to identify students who engaged in bullying behavior. For this study, Olweus’s (1993) widely used definition was used to guide the teachers in deciding upon students who required extra behavior support. According to his definition, bullying is repeated negative behaviors or aggression intended to hurt or harm someone who is perceived by peers as being less physically or psychologically powerful than the perpetrator (see Appendix A). Teachers also nominated students engaging in bullying behaviors based on the Table 4 definitions. Teachers were also given a summary of archival data of when high rates of bullying behavior were noted. Nomination criteria were created due to the high number of students meeting decision rules, teacher nominations, and reported high rates of bullying.
behavior on the playground. Thus, after reviewing the definitions and compiling the data, teachers met with the school counselor to discuss potential students.

After finalizing the list and narrowing the students to three, the researcher met with the team to discuss intervention ideas and next steps. As previously mentioned, time constraints within the school prompted the researcher to suggest to the SWPBS team and school counselor to implement BP-PBS with the individual students as this evidenced-based intervention has shown to decrease bullying behaviors while increasing pro-social behaviors (Ross, Horner, & Stiller, 2008); however, this was the first known study to implement BP-PBS with individual students instead of with students school-wide. Once students started the Tier II/III intervention, the impact of targeted intervention within the continuum of SWPBS was evaluated using a multiple baseline across subjects design.

Participants who received Tier II/III levels of support included three first grade students in the general education classroom who were 7-years-old. The following demographics for students participating in Tier III level interventions were as follows: Student 1: African American, female; Student 2: African American, male; and Student 3: African American, male. Although first and second grade students were removed from the study due to comprehension difficulties, the school counselor and first grade teacher created their own decision rule to categorize students as “bullies” and chose first grade students for targeted interventions. While survey data and initial universal supports were targeted for grades 3-5 only, the team felt the three students fit the definition and were in need of additional supports to try and alter the trajectory of deviant behavior. Based on pre-data, the top two places where bullying behaviors were most likely to occur
(playground and cafeteria) were observed by the researcher and researcher’s assistants during the multiple-baseline design data collection phase in spring 2012.

Prior to collecting observation data, the researcher met with the observers three times to train them on how to accurately identify bullying behaviors. Meetings consisted of discussing definitions of bullying behaviors (e.g., social, verbal, and physical) while reviewing examples/non-examples of each of these behaviors (See Appendices D & E for final bullying definitions). After reviewing definitions, the researcher and assistants used the observation log during recess and lunch time approximately 10 separate occasions until at least 80% inter-rater reliability was met. During this training period, the researcher and assistants decided upon a specific location on the playground to observe (e.g., basketball court), focused on students who were engaging in “high” rates of bullying behaviors, and eventually focused on one student so that all observers were ranking the same behaviors. The observation log was modified so that observers could easily add the date, location, type of bullying behavior, and any notes. In addition to observing bullying behaviors, pro-social behaviors were observed and collected simultaneously (e.g., playing nicely with others and saying “thank you”). On average, researchers observed each student four times a week both on the playground and in the cafeteria for 20 minutes each. The researcher collected weekly observation log data using a frequency count, and reliability data were collected for the first month of the intervention phase (See Table 8 for specific variables coded). Baseline data were collected prior to beginning the individual-staggered interventions.
Table 8

Direct Observation Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Bullying</td>
<td>VB</td>
<td>Verbal or written name calling such as “dumb, loser, freak,” etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Bullying</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Not talking with, not sitting with, and alienations from group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Bullying</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Punching, slapping pushing, kicking, hitting, or other personal injuries and damage to personal property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher met/check-in with the SWPBS team and/or school counselor during meetings or through email, to collect data on the process they and the school counselor went through in implementing the selected bullying prevention strategies and to evaluate measures they used. The three students who participated in the study met with the school counselor/home-school coordinator and received BP-PBS lessons for six weeks. Students 1 and 2 were observed four times across two days during baseline, while Student 3 was observed nine times before starting the intervention. The school counselor and home-school coordinator introduced the intervention to the students across a staggered baseline. They noted some minor changes they made to some of the BP-PBS lessons largely through the recommended activities to reinforce the core lesson (e.g., instead of using a candle during lesson 1 they used a balloon and changed how they used the “Stop” signal) to fit the needs of individual students as this intervention was not intended to be implemented solely with individual students but reflects a common
response in schools to use manualized interventions or packages to address challenging behavior.

The researcher met with all teachers during a mandatory faculty meeting to teach them strategies from BP-PBS to use with their students in their classrooms to enhance intervention efforts. The researcher monitored the team’s process they went through and evaluated the impact of the interventions in spring and fall of 2012. Additional integrity checks were gathered across the multiple-baseline design focusing on implementation of the targeted interventions, with the school counselor and home-school coordinator. Integrity checklists were gathered two times during spring 2012, to ensure that the interventions were being implemented correctly. Following Phase II, the school counselor and researcher met to discuss next steps for implementing universal strategies.

**Phase III: Pre-Survey and School-Wide Implementation**

Beginning fall 2012, the school counselor and researcher set up a meeting to discuss final steps and plans for the semester. During the meeting, the school counselor informed the researcher that she would create an online bullying survey for the students and upload the pre-and post-surveys to her school website and assist the students in completing the online assessment. She further noted that she would implement BP-BPS with each grade level and co-lead with teachers during one of the lessons to ensure they understood how to use the bullying strategies with their students. After having the opportunity to implement BP-PBS with individual students during spring 2012, the counselor informed the researcher that she felt more comfortable and confident in implementing with all students in a classroom setting.
The school counselor monitored the third through fifth grade students while they completed the online-survey to third through fifth grade students in September 2012 while the counselor started implementing BP-PBS lessons in October 2012. The counselor had the luxury of meeting with classes for 50 minutes, so she was able to complete each lesson while adding an activity. For example, students drew pictures and shared how they would stand up for someone being bullied. The counselor also co-led with the classroom teachers during one of the lessons so the teachers would have the skills to continue using the “stop, walk, talk” strategy with their students during bullying situations. Teachers were taught how to go through each bullying strategy with a student being bullied. All lessons were completed by December 2012. The researcher also attended two meetings with the school counselor to collect integrity and social validity forms completed by the school counselor and teachers. The counselor detailed notes for each lesson including any modifications, challenges, and successes.

**Phase IV: Post Assessment**

During Phase IV post data were collected, social validity and integrity checks were summarized, and a final interview with the school counselor was completed. Following the 8-week long intervention, the school counselor and researcher collected post-intervention results. Post-student-survey responses were collected on iPads that were provided by the school and suggested by the school counselor. Responses were uploaded to and easily accessible through Google database. In addition, post-teacher survey responses were collected through Qualtrics and office referral data were summarized and combined with post-data. After the 3-month long study was finalized (September 2012 to December 2012), the researcher interviewed the school counselor and completed final
data analyses (January 2013). A summary was shared with the SWPBS team after completion of the study in the spring of 2013.

Beginning spring 2013, a final interview, adapted from Maras (2008), was conducted with the school counselor. The interview captured the counselor’s prior familiarity with bullying data collected in the school, perceptions of the amount learned during this process, and perceptions about how that learning occurred. In general, the main purpose of the final interview was to discover what learning took place, how this experience changed perceptions of data and data usage, and how the data will be used in the future.

**Phases I – IV: Social Validity and Integrity Checks**

Throughout the study, the school counselor and selected teachers were asked questions regarding the social validity of the bullying strategies their SWPBS team/school counselor implemented. Four teachers completed the survey at the conclusion of the study in the fall of 2012. Scores for the survey scales were computed by averaging responses across items (Biggs et al., 2008). The results section describes social validity scores in more detail.

To ensure that the interventions/strategies were being consistently implemented, a teacher and school counselor integrity checklist (Windram & Gibbons, 2011; see Appendix J) was tailored for both to reflect the strategies being implemented by the school professionals in the school. Two teachers and the school counselor completed a checklist during the spring 2012 and fall 2012 semesters. The researcher collaborated with the school counselor to ensure the checklists were successfully completed and at
least 80% implementation accuracy. The results section describes integrity check scores in more detail.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Overview

The present study was conducted in four phases: (1) school-wide assessment and
tier I planning, (2) targeted intervention, (3) school-wide implementation, and (4) post-
assessment. Student and teacher surveys were collected to determine the impact of
universal strategies through a pre-post comparison using descriptive statistics. In
addition, school-wide office referral data were also reviewed for potential impact of the
universal strategies. Direct observation data within the nested multiple baseline design
were plotted and visually analyzed to assess for possible functional relationships between
integrating targeted bullying strategies within school-wide positive behavior supports
strategies. Descriptive data, including team observations, notes, and an interview were
collected as well on the overall school process. Results are also reported on the social
validity and implementation fidelity of the intervention and inter-rater reliability of direct
observation data. Results of phases II through IV are reported in relation to the three
research questions. All statistical procedures for phases III and IV were conducted using
the SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 21.0 (SPSS Inc., 2012). Dependent t-tests were
used to analyze pre- and post- survey results for impact of universal strategies. A one-
way analysis of variance was conducted on student survey item means across the three
grade levels. Descriptive statistics were also computed to summarize universal data.

Research question one. Will SWPBS and targeted universal support action
planning reduce overall levels of bullying behaviors?
Survey results. On the student bullying survey, students were asked to rate questions related to bullying in their school. Dependent t-tests indicated that there were no statistical significant decreases in students reporting being a victim or seeing bullying, $t(124) = -.377, p = .71; t(124) = .91, p = .37$; however, there was a statistically significant decrease in students reporting being a bully, $t(124) = 3.27, p < .01$ (see Table 9). Specifically, post hoc Bonferroni tests indicated a statistically significant decrease in females reporting being a bully, $t(60) = 2.75, p < .05$ (see Table 10). When looking at the different types of bullying (e.g., physical, verbal, & social) there were no significant differences among pre- and post-student survey scores (see Table 11). To further investigate these results, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted on the pre-and post-student survey item means (see Table 12) across the three grade levels. The results were non-significant.

For fall 2012 survey completion data, percentages were 100% for teachers and 97.4% for students for pre-results and 68.4% teachers and 102.3% students for post-results. Data were also missing completely at random for reasons such as, teachers and students being sick, leaving the school district, and having other obligations that interfered with their ability to complete the surveys. There were 5 teachers that did not complete the post-survey and for student surveys, participation increased from 125 to 135.
Table 9  
*Mean Student Survey Scores for Seeing Bullying, Being a Bully and Being a Victim*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Assessment (N=125)</th>
<th>Post-Assessment (N=135)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>M  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing Bullying</td>
<td>1.94 (0.744)</td>
<td>1.83 (0.739)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a Bully</td>
<td>2.83 (0.396)</td>
<td>2.64 (0.555)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a Victim</td>
<td>2.49 (0.643)</td>
<td>2.50 (0.657)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant decrease at the $p < .05$

Table 10  
*Mean Student Survey Scores by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Pre-Assessment (N=125)</th>
<th>Post-Assessment (N=135)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>M  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>2.81 (0.393)</td>
<td>2.68 (0.533)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>2.41 (0.635)</td>
<td>2.46 (0.655)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing</td>
<td>1.86 (0.732)</td>
<td>1.80 (0.719)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>2.85 (.402)</td>
<td>2.61 (.579)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>2.57 (.644)</td>
<td>2.53 (.662)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing</td>
<td>2.03 (.752)</td>
<td>1.86 (.762)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant decrease at the $p < .05$
Table 11

*Mean Student Survey Scores for Different Types of Bullying Behaviors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Assessment (N=125)</th>
<th>Post-Assessment (N=135)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing Physical</td>
<td>1.85 (0.673)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing Verbal</td>
<td>2.03 (0.706)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing Social</td>
<td>1.82 (0.719)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Victim</td>
<td>1.53 (0.691)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Victim</td>
<td>1.65 (0.743)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Victim</td>
<td>1.54 (0.603)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Bully</td>
<td>1.30 (0.557)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Bully</td>
<td>1.27 (0.465)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Bully</td>
<td>1.18 (0.382)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped a Student</td>
<td>2.10 (0.653)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers were asked similar questions regarding bullying behaviors in their school through the use of a pre-post-survey that was administered in September and again in December 2012, and teachers were allowed two weeks to complete both. Percentages for teachers reporting that bullying behaviors are a serious problem in the school were 35% (n=7) for pre-results and 76.9% (n=10) for post-results. While the percentage of respondents increased in the post-survey, a dependent t-test indicated no statistically significant differences in teacher pre- and post-reports regarding bullying being a serious
issue in their school, \( t (12) = 1.39, p = .19 \). Teachers were also asked to report when students were most at-risk for bullying. Teachers reported that students were most at risk for bullying during non-classroom times such as recess and lunch (pre 88.9\%, \( n=13 \); post 100\%, \( n=11 \)). The next highest ranked place teachers reported bullying was likely to occur was after school, while the lowest ranked place was within the classroom. See Table 13 for a select few of related teachers’ comments.

Table 12
*Mean Student Survey Scores by Grade*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Pre-Assessment (N=125)</th>
<th>Post-Assessment (N=135)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>( SD )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>2.882 (.327)</td>
<td>2.65 (.534)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>2.38 (.652)</td>
<td>2.55 (.597)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing</td>
<td>2.03 (.717)</td>
<td>1.90 (.778)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>2.80 (.405)</td>
<td>2.60 (.580)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>2.53 (.640)</td>
<td>2.58 (.583)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing</td>
<td>1.98 (.800)</td>
<td>1.87 (.726)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>2.82 (.434)</td>
<td>2.66 (.557)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>2.53 (.644)</td>
<td>2.38 (.753)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing</td>
<td>1.86 (.722)</td>
<td>1.74 (.723)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13
Summary of Pre-Post-Survey Teacher Responses

Teacher Comments

1. “I can't imagine that the information gathered in this survey would be at all useful.”

2. “We teach them how to act but some students can't let it go. I am now thinking of all the wasted time that has been spent on these issues. It takes away learning from everyone.”

3. “There are issues with confusion about true bullying and aggressive/unkind behavior, with students and staff.”

4. “Some teachers overlook such behaviors and don't feel that some behaviors are anything to worry about. I regularly refer to the Cool Tools, if they have been taught they are an expectation for the kids.”

5. “One thing that interferes with dealing with bullying is some adults think that part of it is cultural and we should not "punish" kids for something they do not consider bullying. From conversations I have had with kids MANY of them DO feel they are being bullied. We need to understand that these kids need to learn how to function in the broader society, not just their neighborhood. Some of the behaviors that may be acceptable in one situation with one group of people will not be acceptable in others and may cause them a lot of difficulties.”

When comparing teacher and student responses, some similarities were noted. Teachers were asked where bullying is most likely to occur, and their top choices were recess, the school bus, lunchroom, and classroom. Similarly, students ranked recess, the school bus, the classroom, and lunchroom as their top choices where bullying behaviors are most likely to occur. Teachers and students were also asked if they felt safe in their school. Percentages for teachers reporting they felt safe was 94% (n=15) for pre-survey results and 100% (n=10) for post-survey results. However, the percentage of students reporting they felt safe was 77% (n=96) for pre-survey results and 64% (n=87) for post-
survey results. Additionally, students were asked if they were bullied on their way to and from school, 13% ($n=16$) for pre-survey results and 20% ($n=28$) for post-survey results reported “yes”.

**Office discipline referrals.** While “bullying” was not a stand-alone category within the school’s office discipline referral (ODR) form, related categories of behavioral infractions including “harassment,” “peer aggression,” “disrespect,” “inappropriate language,” “disruption,” and “forgery/theft” were included. For the current study, “harassment” and “peer-aggression” were used to provide an indication of related bullying behaviors. Overall, no significant decreases were noted; however, there was a decrease in reported “peer-aggression” behaviors from 9 to 5 for third grade students (see Table 14 for a summary of the pre- and post- office referral data).

Table 14
*Grade Level Total Bullying Behavior Related Office Referral Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Pre-Assessment</th>
<th>Post-Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research question two. Can SWPBS teams develop and put in place Tier I, II and III support for students who engage in high rates of bullying behavior?

During spring 2012 the researcher attended SWPBS team meetings and Tier II-III team meetings, took detailed notes during these meetings, and met individually with the school counselor to gather more information about the process the team went through in developing and putting in place Tier I, II, and III levels of support for students who engaged in high rates of bullying behavior. Process notes and descriptive statistics were used to answer research question two.

During the study, the researcher attended approximately 10 Tier II-III team meetings. Team members included the principal, counselor, school psychologist, a learning specialist, data analyst, and home-school coordinator. The data analyst was usually in charge of leading the meetings as most of the time was spent on analyzing data and the value of interventions. Typical meetings lasted an hour and consisted of summarizing previous meetings, discussing at-risk students who were usually referred for behavior-social-emotional problems by the classroom teacher and data from students who were receiving Tier II-III levels of support. Using the action planning tool developed by the MU Center for SW-PBS (Lewis, 2012), notes and observations are organized around the delineated steps (see Appendix K for a copy of the action plan).

First, the school and team needed to ensure that bullying was a problem in their school, so asking questions like “Where is bullying occurring?” and “What types of bullying are occurring?” were key components of the first step of action planning. Survey data from spring 2012 also were used to determine if bullying was a problem across all grade levels and where it was occurring. Survey data indicated both students and teachers
perceived it as a problem and it was occurring primarily across four settings. The team then examined the various roles members of the Tier II-III team assumed per recommendations from the literature and decided that the school counselor would serve well as the primary contact for the study.

A key step in the action planning process is to develop specific anti-bullying strategies to embed with existing universal SWPBS teaching and practicing opportunities based on the level, intensity and settings of reported school-wide problems. Unfortunately with the school year ending and several faculty and staff due to transfer from the school, the team did not succeed in developing their own strategies to put in place for students engaging in bullying behaviors. However the researcher provided the team with an evidenced-based curriculum, Bully Prevention-Positive Behavior Support (BP-PBS), to use within their universal support strategies. Although the team did not establish their own local strategies that were reflective of their current universal expectations and teaching and student mastery acknowledgment system, the counselor and home-school coordinator did implement the weekly lessons within all classrooms with minimal support from the researcher.

The next step was to identify which students engaged in high rates of bullying behavior and therefore might be appropriate for additional supports. Only having teacher nomination and ODR data (i.e., harassment and peer aggression) to decide which students should be considered for possible inclusion in tier II/III supports, the counselor and teachers were not confident the data at hand was sufficient. After conferring with the team, they created a decision rule that focused on students engaging in high rates of disruptive and disrespectful behavior (See Table 15 for summary of office referral data).
Based on the new decision rule, the team identified three students who were engaging in high rates of problem behaviors, largely in the classroom, with limited noted problems during lunch-time or recess, two of the top reported settings for bullying behaviors.

Table 15
*Tier II-III Level Total Bullying Behavior Related Office Referral Data for Pre- and During Intervention Implementation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Intervention</th>
<th>During Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Aggression</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Aggression</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Aggression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Summary of office referral data for students receiving Tier II-III levels of support
Other crucial steps in the action planning process included providing training to adults who would supervise high-risk locations and identifying strategies and lesson plans for “victims.” However, for the current study, the school interventionists met with the three students individually in locations not specified as “high-risk” for bullying behaviors and Tier II-III team members did not discuss lesson plans for “victims.” The school focus within this phase of the action planning process was focused solely on working with students identified as “bullies.” Furthermore, team members did not discuss replacement behaviors for students engaging in bullying behaviors. Instead, students engaging in bullying behaviors were typically sent to the principal’s office or spent time in in-school-suspension (ISS); however, students were taught the “Stop, Walk, Talk” strategy to use when they encountered bullying situations as part of their universal supports. The counselor and home-school coordinator were able to complete five of the seven lessons with the three target students, but did not create goals/objectives throughout the study and did not complete lessons 6 and 7 as intended. For instance, Lesson 6 focuses on training staff to be supervisors so they can accurately identify bullying behaviors and reward students when they use the “Stop, Walk, Talk” strategy in settings outside of the intervention so generalization can occur. Lesson 7 is also important as it focuses on following-up with faculty to ensure effectiveness of the intervention.

In general, minimal time was spent discussing and directly addressing the critical steps of the bullying SW-PBS action planning during the team meetings as other topics seemed to be higher priority on their agenda. The researcher did provide summaries of direct observation data for the three students within the targeted intervention; however, the Tier II-III levels of support for the three students were rarely discussed. Overall,
based on process notes, ODR review, and meetings with key school staff, the Tier II-III team had difficulty identifying 3 students engaging in high rates of bullying and developing strategies to put in place for these students. However, they were able to put strategies in place for the three students by completing 71.4% of the lessons with the students (see Table 16 for summary of implementation integrity data).

Table 16
Tier II-III Implementation Integrity Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student 1</th>
<th>Student 2</th>
<th>Student 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Checklist</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counselor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Lessons</td>
<td>5/7=71.4%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5/7=71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handouts</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home-School Coordinator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Lessons</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5/7=71.4%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handouts</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* n/a was used because the home-school coordinator did not work with Students 1 and 3; The school counselor did not work with Student 2.

*Process interview.* At the conclusion of the study, the counselor answered questions about her thoughts on using and analyzing data and the process she and the Tier
II-III team went through during the study. As a member of the SWPBS team for the past four years, the counselor reported that she and the team have never collected specific data related to bullying behaviors except for office referral data by behavior report. She further noted that the office referral data was looked at by the team as part of their building wide data to “identify patterns of behavior and deficits in their SWPBS practices, as well as Tier I and Tier II needs.” Some goals included “decreasing problem behavior and supporting students and teachers who might be struggling.” Based on what she and the SWPBS team have learned from the current study, she reported that there should be more school wide training and education for teachers, students and supervising staff, and more opportunities for students to talk about bullying.

In general, the counselor felt like she was fairly involved in the study, helped the researcher with the action planning steps, and felt like she received “good guidance from the researcher.” However, although the counselor helped the researcher administer the bullying surveys, she did not help with any observation of bullying and stated, “This would have been important.” When asked if she and the SWPBS team learned anything from this experience she stated, “Yes, we adopted Stop, Walk, and Talk as our school problem solving method. We also plan to address bullying more strategically as a building and with identified students, involving additional staff (not just counselors/administrators).” She further added that bullying data will be used in the future if they have an “easy, time efficient method of collecting,” and training on how to identify and report bullying behaviors will be provided to all students/teachers/staff. However, in order for this to happen the school would need more time, more help from those who are trained, and more observations to support the need.
Research question three. Do targeted Tier II / III interventions within the context of SWPBS reduce rates of bullying behavior among students who engage in high rates of bullying behavior?

During spring 2012, three first grade students participated in a Tier II/III intervention to focusing on reducing bullying behaviors. Three types of bullying behaviors were observed (verbal, physical, and social) and plotted for each student across two settings (playground and cafeteria). All bullying behaviors were collapsed into a single data point representing overall rates of bullying behavior and graphed across recess and lunch. Prosocial behaviors, like saying “thank you” or “I’m sorry”, were also observed for each student (see a full list of examples and non-examples of prosocial and bullying behaviors in Appendices D & E). Direct observation data were plotted across a multiple baseline and visually analyzed for changes in trend, level and variability across baseline and intervention phases (Tawney & Gast, 1984). Overall, clear trend and level changes were not evident for the three subjects (see figures 1 and 2). Although there was no clear functional relationship, student 3 showed a decrease in bullying behaviors during recess. It should be noted that a sufficient number of baseline data points were not obtained for students one and two due to time constraints and students being absent during baseline conditions (see limitations section for more details).

Office referral data were also collected for each student. In general, students were not referred to the office at high rates for “peer aggression” and “harassment.” Instead, “disruption” and “disrespect” were more common for each student and largely from the classroom. See Table 17 for a summary of office referral data.
Figure 1. Rate of bullying behavior during recess.
Figure 2. Rate of bullying during lunch.
Table 17

*Tier-II/III Student Frequency and Type of Office Referrals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Pre-Data</th>
<th>Post-Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Summary of office referral data for students receiving Tier II-III levels of support

*Student one.* During baseline conditions for recess and lunch, data were variable. Variability was detected by calculating the percentage of baseline data points that fell within a 15% range of the mean performance level. Data from this student did not meet the 80% threshold for stability suggested by Tawney and Gast (1984). Although baseline data were variable, the decision to intervene was made because of the severity of the bullying behaviors for the target student when compared to same age peers. There were no observed consistent changes from baseline to intervention for collapsed bullying behaviors. In general, collapsed bullying behaviors ranged from 0 to .12 during recess.
and 0 to .05 during lunch (See Table 18 for a summary of each bullying behavior category). For prosocial behaviors, no significant increases were observed (See Table 19 for a summary of students’ average rates and ranges).

Table 18

*Summary of Average Bullying Behaviors across Sub-Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

*Summary of Average Rate and Range of Prosocial Behaviors for Pre- and Post-Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0.0 - 0.1</td>
<td>0.0 - 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0.0 - 0.05</td>
<td>0.0 - 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0.0 - 0.15</td>
<td>0.0 - 0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student two.** There were no observed consistent changes from baseline to intervention for combined bullying behaviors. In general, collapsed bullying behaviors ranged from 0 to .05 during recess and 0 to .02 during lunch. For prosocial behaviors, no significant increases were observed.

**Student three.** There were no observed consistent changes from baseline to intervention for verbal, physical, or social bullying behaviors. In general, collapsed bullying behaviors ranged from 0 to .02 during recess and lunch. For prosocial behaviors, no significant increases were observed.
**Inter-observer agreement (IOA).** Overall, inter-rater reliability averaged 81.5% with a range from 50% to 100% with at least 80% accuracy being achieved. A major limitation was the percentage of IOA collected throughout the study, which was 12%. In particular, 10 out of 84 observations were gathered for IOA during baseline and for the beginning timeframe of the intervention.

**Targeted intervention integrity check.** To ensure that the interventions/strategies were being consistently implemented, the school counselor and home-school coordinator used an integrity checklist (Windram & Gibbons, 2011; see Appendix J) that was tailored to reflect the strategies they implemented. In general, the school counselor and home-school coordinator followed intervention guidelines for each lesson plan and made necessary changes as needed that did not significantly alter the lesson focus or outcomes (e.g., in lesson one the counselor used a balloon instead of lighting a candle to ensure student safety). The school counselor also altered the “Stop” signal by having student 1 make an “X” with his arms rather than make a “T” with his hands because he was having difficulty with making the “T” signal. Another strategy the school counselor and home-school coordinator used with the students was an intervention sheet (see Appendix L) to keep track of each lesson and to praise good behaviors. The sheet also combined the school’s SWPBS and bullying strategies, so that the students were reminded about being “safe” and “respectful,” but were also using the “Stop, Walk, Talk” strategies as needed. However, they did not implement lessons 6 and 7 as previously mentioned.

**Other Outcomes**

**Social validity.** The school counselor and three teachers were asked to rate ten questions under four major headings (i.e., importance, usage, helpfulness, and influence)
on a five-point scale that ranged from “greatly/daily” (4 points) to “not at all” (0 points) all related to the implementation of universal supports. All four teachers generally agreed that the strategies were important for implementing in their classroom/school, were helpful in managing bullying behaviors and promoting positive peer relationships, and agreed that children’s peer relationships influence academic achievement. All teachers also reported that on average they use bullying strategies in their classroom a few times a week (mean=3) and on a daily basis asked students to use or practice the new bullying strategies (mean=3). One teacher reported that it was of little importance for his/her school to be included in the current study and that teachers are “somewhat” influential on how students behave in the classroom, suggesting that influential means teachers have some impact on how students behave in their classroom.

**Universal Strategy Integrity Checks.** To ensure that the universal interventions/strategies were being consistently implemented, a teacher and school counselor integrity checklist (Windram & Gibbons, 2011; see Appendix J) was tailored for both roles to reflect the strategies being implemented by the school professionals in the school. In general, the school counselor followed intervention guidelines for each lesson plan and made necessary changes as needed that did not significantly alter the lesson focus or outcomes (e.g., in lesson one the counselor used a balloon instead of lighting a candle to ensure student safety). She also added supplementary activities to lessons to increase students’ knowledge and discussions surrounding different types of bullying behaviors. Additionally, the school counselor collaborated with classroom teachers to co-teach some of the lessons so that they could learn the anti-bullying strategies and praise students who were observed using them. Two teachers also
completed a brief integrity checklist that asked them about their usage of the bullying strategies in their classroom. In general, the teachers reported they taught the strategies to their students, modeled the strategies for them, allowed for the students to practice the strategies, and praised students when they were observed using the strategies. One teacher noted that she taught the strategies twice a week but admitted to them not lasting more than 10 minutes and added, “I will change that!”
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to assess the impact of the School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) process on bullying behaviors in an elementary school. Specifically, the study (a) focused on the process the SWPBS team went through and (b) explored the SWPBS team’s efforts at Tier I, II, and III levels of student support through pre-post-surveys, school team observations, on-going analysis of school data, and a multiple-baseline-across-students design with students who engaged in bullying behavior through data triangulation.

This chapter provides an explanation of major findings from the current investigation. Specifically, outcomes are discussed in relation to previous studies of bullying prevention/intervention research, additions to the existing knowledge base are examined, and limitations of the study are presented. Finally, implications for both practice and research are highlighted.

Major Findings by Research Question

Will SWPBS and targeted universal support action planning reduce overall levels of bullying behaviors?

In the current study no significant decreases in students’ reporting being a victim, seeing bullying, types of bullying, or variations across grade level were noted. However, there was a statistically significant decrease in female students reporting being a bully. Although all students were given a definition of bullying, girls in the current study might have grasped a better understanding of the meaning and different types of bullying than boys. For instance, Vaillancourt et al. (2008) studied whether or not providing a
definition of bullying to students ages 8 to 18 year-old would yield different prevalence rates in self-reported bullying. They found that after randomly providing a definition to more than 1,700 students, those students who were provided with the definition of bullying reported being bullied less and bullying others more than students who were not given a definition. Perhaps more females who reported being a bully decreased because of awareness and empathy towards the victim. In particular, Rigby (1997) revealed in his study that girls were more likely to be empathetic and supportive of victims, while boys believed that victims deserved being bullied.

Swearer et al. (2010) describe five critical features to why anti-bullying programs struggle, which may explain the lack of universal outcomes in the present study. First, they point out that self-report may not be the most accurate method in detecting behavioral change. In the current study, student and teacher self-reports and office discipline referrals were used; however, adding direct observations, beyond the nested study, and parent report might have better detected an impact on bullying behaviors. Second some anti-bullying efforts often fail to provide direct interventions across the social ecology. Perhaps if the current study had added a family and/or peer intervention component outcomes would have improved. Another important aspect Swearer et al. (2010) advocate in developing and implementing intervention is addressing specific demographic variables such as ethnicity and sociological economic status. The intervention used for the current study was based on research but perhaps was not tailored enough to account for student background. Finally, although the SWPBS team intervened at the universal and individual level, they did not effectively combine these efforts, a
noted problem with past anti-bullying work (Brown, Low, Smith, & Haggerty, 2011; Swearer et al., 2010).

Teacher survey results revealed that from pre to post intervention the amount of teachers reporting that bullying is a serious problem in the school increased. Similar to other studies, Swearer et al. (2010) highlighted that school-based anti-bullying efforts generally focus their efforts on universal programs, with the goal of increasing awareness about bullying. Thus, for the current study teachers might have increased awareness about the severity of bullying while they were co-teaching with the school counselor during one of the BP-PBS lessons or during a staff meeting when bullying data were shared. Also, novice teachers in the school system might have different views than veteran teachers. Vernberg and Gamm (2003) explained that most schools have one or more staff members who view anti-bullying interventions as “unnecessary, ineffective, or even harmful” (p. 134). They further noted that they have worked with teachers who have actively undermined intervention efforts by making negative comments in the presence of students and staff (Vernberg & Gamm, 2003). For the current study teachers shared positive and negative feelings about the study. Generally, teachers reported teaching and modeling the intervention strategies to their students throughout the week, while one teacher reported that it was of little importance for his/her school to be included in the current study and that teachers are “somewhat” influential on how students behave in the classroom.
Can SWPBS teams develop and put in place Tier I, II and III support for students who engage in high rates of bullying behavior?

In general, based on process notes, office discipline referral (ODR) review, and meetings with key school staff, the Tier II-III team had difficulty identifying students engaging in high rates of bullying behaviors and developing strategies to put in place for these students. Although the team had difficulty identifying students for the current study, they understood the importance of using data to guide decision-making and that bullying was a problem in their school. A possible reason the team had difficulty identifying students engaging in high rates of bullying behavior who would be good candidates for tier II/III supports is because they relied primarily on ODR data. The data did not have a specific category for “bullying,” instead the school used “peer aggression” and “harassment” to describe bullying behaviors. However, for the three targeted students who participated in the nested study, they all had more “disruptive” and “disrespectful” ODRs from the classroom. A possible explanation for the “high” rates also could have been due to a struggling teacher because all three students were from the same classroom. Based on direct observation data the three students did in fact engage in high rates of bullying behavior. In terms of externalizing or aggressive types of bullying, classroom ODRs for disruptive and disrespectful behavior may be a predictor, however, additional research is clearly warranted to confirm.

Like many schools, collecting direct measures of bullying behavior was also difficult for the SWPBS team and school counselor. Griffin and Gross (2004) reported that the difficulties of conceptualizing and measuring bullying result in struggling anti-bullying prevention efforts, which could be a possible reason for the findings in the
current study. Similarly, Ross and Horner (2009) stated “The broad range of physical, verbal, and social behaviors; the intent to harm; the repetition of confrontation; and the imbalance of power between the perpetrator and the victim are key features of bullying that make it difficult to recognize and measure” (p. 748). Young et al. (2009) recommended that schools use a data driven process to address bullying, a process where the administrator works with faculty and staff to implement intervention and prevention measures. Although the school administrator was a key member of the SWPBS team, he did not work with the counselor or faculty in using the data to identify students as bullies.

A key step in the action planning was for the team to develop anti-bullying strategies to embed with existing SW-PBS strategies; however, due to time constraints, the team did not succeed in developing their own strategies to put in place for students engaging in bullying behaviors. Brown, Birch, and Kancherla (2005) highlighted that many times schools do not have the resources, time, and local support to work towards change. This was certainly the case for this school even though they had a long history of implementing SW-PBS at the universal level, lack of time to develop specific universal strategies to address bullying was evident and in large part why the decision was made to implement a standardized curriculum. However, teachers did not assist with intervention implementation, as is recommended with the SW-PBS literature creating even more disconnects between intervention and classroom environments. Further, although they were able to put in place the first five lessons, leaving out Lesson 6 and 7 was critical. For instance, Lesson 6 focuses on training staff to be supervisors so they can accurately identify bullying behaviors and reward students when they use anti-bulling strategies in settings outside of the intervention so generalization can occur. Brown and colleagues
(2005) noted that within the United States, it is not clear that effective, evidenced-based interventions are widely available to train faculty and staff. Perhaps the school counselor and home-school coordinator felt limited in the amount of time and resources available to them to train school staff in identifying bullying. Lesson 7 is also important as it focuses on following-up with faculty to ensure effectiveness of the intervention. As Vernberg and Gamm (2003) recommend, schools should ideally choose a program designed to be integrated into larger goals and already existing programs so that implementation goes efficiently and is less demanding on resources. Although the current study intended for the school to integrate anti-bullying and SWPBS strategies, there were no goals created for the Tier I, II, or III levels of intervention and the lack of time affected the program from being implemented smoothly.

**Do targeted Tier II / III interventions within the context of SWPBS reduce rates of bullying behavior among students who engage in high rates of bullying behavior?**

Similar to the universal findings, there were no observed consistent changes from baseline to intervention for verbal, physical, or social bullying behaviors among the three students enrolled in the targeted intervention multiple baseline study. All three students had inconsistent trends and no clear decreases in bullying behavior, or increases in pro-social behaviors, were observed. Moreover, the lack of baseline data was a major limitation and could have impacted these findings.

The first student met with the school counselor during implementation of BP-PBS. He was described by the school counselor as the student with the “most severe behavior problems,” so starting lessons with him was important to the school. Although
small decreases were observed for some of the bullying behaviors, no consistent trends were observed. Furthermore, all discipline referral incidents occurred in the classroom with disrespect and disruption being significantly higher than reported bullying behaviors.

Observations for Student 2 were similar to Student 1; however, all bullying behaviors showed small decreases, with no reliable trends. Out of the three students, Student 2 was the only female and had the least amount of reported discipline referrals across all behaviors from pre- to post-results, with none being reported for bullying behaviors. Student 2 also worked with the home-school coordinator while the other two students worked with the school counselor, thus the difference in interventionists could have impacted her lower reported discipline referrals and observed physical and social bullying behaviors.

Last, the third student like the other two did not have a consistent trend from baseline to post-intervention; however, there was an observed decrease in combined bullying behaviors during recess. A possible explanation for all three students having inconsistent trends could be a result of the lack of universals firmly in place. Although the school was implementing activities through SWPBS (e.g., promoting a positive school environment based on respect, positive reinforcement of desired behaviors coupled with consistent discipline, and consequences for inappropriate behaviors; Ross & Horner, 2009), no specific school-wide anti-bullying strategies were being used while Tier II-III levels of support were taking place. Horner (2011) emphasized that “Schools that hope to sustainably prevent and reduce bullying despite constant demographic, administrative, and budgetary changes must learn to approach the problem
systematically” (p. 4). Another reason for these findings could be that they only intervened with the “bullies” and not the victims or bystanders. Horner (2011) highlighted that when three intervention components are implemented with fidelity they can have a tremendous impact on bullying. Specifically, Horner (2011) pointed out that universal strategies, skill development for bystanders, and function-based-individualized support for victims and perpetrators who need extra support are crucial components in bullying prevention efforts.

Overall, student bullying behaviors were not influenced when the BP-PBS lessons were introduced. This is important to highlight in the bullying research because schools often do not focus on perpetrators while simultaneously implementing school-wide strategies (Swearer et al., 2012), thus more of an impact might have been noticed if whole-school anti-bullying efforts were put into practice (e.g., Tier I, II, & III levels). Swearer et al. (2010) reported that the most promising results included establishing school-wide rules and consequences for bullying, teacher training, conflict resolution strategies, and classroom curricula and individual training. Bullying and victimization were found to be impacted more by school-wide programs than individually based classroom interventions or social skills training programs (Bradshaw et al., 2008; Olweus, 2013; Swearer et al., 2010).

The present study does extend the knowledge base in that it is the first known study to implement the BP-PBS curriculum at the Tier I and III levels, as it was intended to fit within the secondary tier of support (Horner & Ross, 2009). Although the interventionists implemented intervention guidelines for each lesson plan and made necessary changes as needed, they did not significantly alter the lesson focus or
outcomes. Unfortunately, they did not implement lessons 6 and 7 within the individual students. Lessons 6 and 7 would have added the generalization piece so the students could learn pro-social skills on the playground or during recess and teachers could have been trained on how to recognize bullying behaviors and how to reward these specific students for engaging in pro-social behaviors. Perhaps students with more intense “bullying” behaviors as identified by the school’s discipline referral system should have been chosen for the Tier III levels of support, while these three students received services that focused on reducing disruptive and disrespectful behaviors. Additionally, there might have been more of an impact if BP-PBS was implemented simultaneously with small groups of and individual students, instead of with all students.

Does following an action plan affect the SWPBS team’s perceptions of collecting and understanding bullying data, and increase their likelihood of using bullying data and other data in the future?

Although action planning and using bullying data by the SWPBS team was not explicitly posed as a question for this investigation it was identified as an important outcome from previous studies. At the conclusion of the study, the school counselor answered key interview questions that focused on her own and the SWPBS team’s perceptions of collecting and understanding bullying data.

An important finding of the interview was that this was the first time the school counselor and SWPBS team collected specific data related to bullying behaviors. Although the school collected office referral data to help define the extent that problem behaviors were occurring, they were unaware of the impact of bullying in their school. Thus, this study shed new light on how the SWPBS team can assess for bullying, use the
data to decide upon intervention strategies at different tier levels, and evaluate their efforts at all levels. In particular, the school counselor created a Google account for the student surveys and uploaded them to the school webpage; this helped the school build capacity and strengthens sustainability so that the team will continue to assess bullying and implement interventions without technical assistance. Another important finding that is similar to previous bullying prevention research is that the school counselor emphasized that there is a need for more school-wide training and education for teachers, students, and supervising staff. She further noted that they plan to address bullying more strategically as a building and with identified students, involving additional staff (not just counselor/administrators). However, a common barrier that all schools face, including the school in the present study, is the lack of time in collecting and analyzing the bullying data and implementing an intervention while evaluating the impact. Horner (2011) supported these findings by highlighting the fact that many pre-packaged universals require a significant amount of time and resources, which is why imbedding a research-based curriculum such as BP-PBS is what schools should be considering.

**Summary of Findings**

Outcomes from this study add to the existing bullying prevention/intervention research base in a number of ways. First, this is the first study to attempt to integrate anti-bullying and SWPBS strategies at Tier I, II, and III levels. Past research has shown positive outcomes when BP-PBS was implemented universally (Ross and Horner, 2009; Ross, Horner, & Stiller, 2008), but not with individual students. Ttofi and Farrington (2009) stressed that stand alone interventions are not the most effective approach in preventing bullying behaviors. Similarly, Vernberg and Gamm (2003) emphasized that
“Enthusiasm and support at the individual, school, and community level are necessary elements to fuel the implementation of any school violence prevention program. Without clear support at these multiple levels, implementation will be difficult, if not impossible, and potential benefits will be compromised” (p. 127).

Second, the study used a multi-method approach by using teacher and student surveys, office discipline referrals, observation data within a nested multiple-baseline design, and process data of the SWPBS team’s action planning. This is an important addition because many researchers support the multi-method technique in assessing the level of severity of bullying behaviors in school systems (Davidson & Demaray, 2005; Feinberg, 2003; Ryan & Smith, 2009; Swearer et al., 2010) and in understanding intervention effectiveness (Olweus, 2013; Swearer et al., 2012). An additional unique aspect of the multi-method approach used in the present study was the collection of process data. Process data showed that existing SW-PBS team structure will need additional time and technical assistance to develop effective bullying strategies. Process data also revealed that schools could use more support and training in identifying bullying behaviors and implementing anti-bullying strategies. Similar to what the school counselor discussed during the interview, Espelage (2012) stated “School administrators should find out where the bullying is happening, offer ongoing professional development opportunities (e.g., in-service trainings, classroom management coaching), and have a long-term plan for managing a positive school climate” (The Prevention Researcher, 2012; p. 18). Since research supports that schools are in need for more time, training, and resources to support bullying prevention/intervention efforts then more research should focus on this area.
Mihalic and Irwin (2003) report that characteristics of staff implementing programs, the quantity and quality of training, community support, time constraints, and strong leadership all influence the impact of intervention. On a positive note, by engaging in the research, as indicated by the exit interview, some capacity on how to collect, use, and understand bullying data on the part of the counselor was established. In particular, during Phases I and II the researcher administered hard copies of the student surveys in spring 2012, shared results with the school staff, and provided the school counselor with intervention resources as needed; however, during phase III of the study in fall 2012, the counselor took the initiative to create online student surveys on her Google account and uploaded the survey link to her school website for students to access easily. She then went to all the third through fifth grade classes to administer the surveys on iPads. Bradshaw, O’Brennan, and Sawyer (2008) suggested that researchers administer web-based surveys because Wang et al. (2005) found them to be more useful in collecting high rates of sensitive information than paper-pencil surveys. The school counselor also informed the researcher that she wanted to co-teach with the teachers during some of the lessons so that the teachers could be involved in anti-bullying efforts. Patton (2008) emphasized the importance of process data and noted that when individuals change their thinking, attitudes, and behaviors to create changes then learning has occurred. In the current study, the school counselor, along with the SWPBS team, looked at data differently and respected data usage in bullying prevention/intervention.

Limitations

As with all research, limitations within the present study existed. First, within the multiple baseline study observations were missed due to students being removed from the
playground and cafeteria due to behavioral infractions in the classroom, student absences, and end of school year activities that altered schedules. Because of missed observation opportunities and the end of the school year approaching, baseline and intervention data are limited across all three subjects. Gathering this data would have shed light on the effectiveness of the intervention being implemented with individual students for the first time, which unfortunately did not happen.

Second, having two interventionists could have impacted implementation within the nested study. Because no training occurred, each interventionist reviewed the intervention guidelines and implemented the lessons with minimal assistance. Although they informed the researcher of small modifications to some of the lessons, the researcher was unable to observe them during implementation. Therefore, more training and fidelity checks to ensure lessons are all implemented with the highest integrity needs to be researched.

Third, getting the teachers and staff involved in intervention efforts is also crucial in getting positive outcomes. Having everyone on the same page and strong “buy-in” are key components in successful intervention effectiveness. With the low participation of the school principal and heavy workload the school counselor carried during the study, emphasizes the importance of involving all key stakeholders. Thus, future researchers should focus on involving all school staff in their bullying prevention/intervention efforts.

Another limitation of the study was not implementing lessons 6 and 7 of BP-PBS. These were two important lessons of the intervention and they focused on involving all staff and training specific staff members on how to recognize when students were using the “new” anti-bullying strategies. Again, the end of the semester was approaching and
time was an issue; however, this limitation is common and could be a reason why many schools struggle with decreasing bullying behaviors.

Lastly, first and second grade students were supposed to be included in the study; however, reading and comprehension difficulties were encountered. The team did not engage in problem solving conversations or create new ideas to try and include these two grade levels. Adding these students would have added to the bullying research as they are not as commonly surveyed like third through fifth grade students.

**Implications for Research**

Despite the above limitations and absence of significant student decreases in bullying behavior, the study’s lack of findings has clear implications for future research. First, the absence of clear impact reinforces the call within bullying research to focus on working with victims, bullies, and bystanders simultaneously. While the school team had a clear structure to do so, the team clearly did not implement bullying strategies consistently across the continuum of supports. Future studies are needed over perhaps longer timeframes to examine the impact of SW-PBS when teams specifically target bullying behavior. The nested targeted multiple baseline design further confirms the need to implement interventions within a clearly connected and systemically supported school-wide system.

Second, the process data clearly pointed to the need to develop specific measures to document the overall level of bullying behavior to identify at-risk students and monitor intervention impact. The school counselor and teachers used ODR data to categorize students; however, the school’s ODR data did not have a specific “bullying” category. The school’s referral summaries are detailed enough for the team to create a “bullying”
category and sub-categories for the different types of bullying behaviors. Creating this new ODR section could increase reliability in assessing bullying and would help schools see where and when bullying behaviors are occurring.

Third, an investigation into the type and amount of training and technical assistance, along with clear implementation integrity checks across the tiered levels of support is needed. The school counselor emphasized the need for training in identifying bullying behaviors and decreasing them through intervention strategies. The researcher observed similar findings during phase II when the team had difficulty identifying students and an intervention to use with individual student “bullies.” Future studies should look at creating a “bullying protocol” for schools to use so that they can follow detailed steps on their own through this complicated process.

Finally, bullying research focusing on assessing and intervening with Kindergarten thought second grade students is scarce. Because the present study had difficulty with assessing first and second grade students, perhaps schools should try separating lower and upper elementary students during intervention. This would ensure that all students and teachers are receiving services and help with decreasing bullying behaviors for students as they progress through school.

**Conclusion**

Results suggest that stand-alone programs are ineffective, while whole-school approaches continue to be supported within bullying prevention/intervention research. These non-significant findings, although promising for future researchers, suggest that although school-based and school-wide bullying prevention efforts *can* be effective, success in one school or context is no guarantee of success in another. The present study
was designed based on recommended best practices. Specifically, the study focused on integrating anti-bullying and existing SWPBS strategies and used a multi-method approach to measure the impact of bullying. However, throughout the process the reality of applied limitations in a school were revealed. In particular, limitations such as time, lack of expertise, lack of all staff commitment, attempting to teach “universals” in isolation of classroom teachers, and the lack of the school administrator involvement impacted intervention efforts and led to no clear outcomes. Therefore, future research should be conducted over extended time with clear indicators of fluency on each component of the action plan.
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Teacher Nomination Form

Please think about the students in your classroom and identify those children, who to some degree, seem to fit the statements below.

1. Who verbally harms others (e.g., teasing, calling names, humiliating or threatening others, making others do things they don’t want to do), socially harms others (e.g., excluding from activities, spreading gossip or rumors, making others look foolish), and/or physically harms others (e.g., kicking, pushing, shoving, or damaging property)?

Please list the names of two students below.

Student:_________________________________________

Student:_________________________________________

Thank you for your time!
APPENDIX B

Teacher Bullying Assessment

Anti-Bullying Program Survey for Teachers/Other Adults in School*
Adapted from Canadian Public Health Association and the National Crime Prevention Strategy Totten, Quigley & Morgan, 2004

**COMPLETION INSTRUCTIONS**
This is an anonymous survey on bullying at your school. Do NOT put your name on it. Please mark a check for your response for each question. Place in the sealed envelope when done.

Questions on this survey focus on the behavior of students in grades 1<sup>st</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup>.

1. **What is your position? Check ONE response.**

   o Teacher/educational assistant  o Administrator/administrator assistant
   o Counselor  o Mental Health Professional (Counselor/School Psychologist/Social Worker)
   o Other (specify):________________________

2. **How long have you been at your school? Check ONE response.**

   o Under 12 months  o 1 – 2 years  o 3 years + (specify): ___ years

3. **What grade level(s) do you work with? Check ALL that apply.**

   o Primary (grades K-1)  o Junior (grades 2-6)  o Other (specify):________________________

This questionnaire asks about your school’s experiences with BULLYING.

There are many ways to bully someone. A bully wants to hurt the other person (it’s not an accident). A bully does or says the same things over and over again. Bullying is UNFAIR. Sometimes a group of students will bully another student. **There are four main kinds of bullying. Some examples are:**

- **Physical bullying** -hit, shove, kick or damage someone’s property
- **Verbal bullying** -name-calling, mocking, hurtful teasing, threatening, or making people do things they don’t want to do
- **Social bullying** -excluding others from the group, spreading rumors or gossip, socially isolating others
- **Cyberbullying** – using computer, e-mail, phone or cellular phone text messages to:
  - hurt someone’s feelings, make someone look bad, or threaten someone

Based upon the Anti-bullying Program Survey (Smith, Cousins, & Stewart, 2003) and WVSD Safe School Survey (Hymel, White, & Ishiyama, 2003).

*Based on the Anti-Bullying Program Survey, an unpublished instrument, University of Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, created by Smith, J. D., Cousins, B., and Stewart, R. (2003) and the Safe School Survey, created by the West Vancouver School District, West Vancouver, BC, in consultation with Dr. Shelley Hymel, UBC, Dr. Aaron White, West Vancouver School District Psychologist, and Dr. Ishu Ishiyama, UBC (2003).
4. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about bullying at your school. *Check ONE response for each statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullying is a serious problem among students at our school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree of bullying at our school is greater than the average level in Missouri schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicating time and resources to solving the problem of bullying is one of our highest priorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative to other priorities, we commit a substantial amount of time and resources to solving the problem of bullying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of time and resources we commit to anti-bullying initiatives is sufficient to effectively deal with these problems at our school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Indicate the extent to which each form of bullying is brought to the attention of your school administrators. *Check ONE response for each statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Bullying</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing/Damaging personal belongings of another student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cyberbullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Where does bullying occur? *Check ONE response for each statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunchroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the way to and from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoors around school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off School Campus (mall, park, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas (please describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Where are the top three places bullying behaviors occur most often? Rank from 1 (most often) to 3 from your choices from question 6.

1.  

2.  

3.  

8. When are students most at risk for bullying? *Check ONE response for each statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During breaks, such as lunch or recess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Add any other comments that will assist us in understanding the scope of problems related to bullying at your school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On the weekends</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Indicate the degree to which the following interventions have been implemented in your school. Check ONE response for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-bullying committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School assemblies, newsletters, etc., that address bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective supervision of students outside classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School policies and rules related to bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training related to bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganizing physical space (e.g. classrooms, playground) to reduce potential of bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify):__________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSROOM</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular classroom discussion on topics surrounding bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of anti-bullying curriculum materials (e.g., videos, books)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class exercises such as role plays, writing Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and posting of class rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify):__________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER</td>
<td>Peer-led interventions (e.g., peer mediators, helpers, buddies)</td>
<td>Involvement of students in anti-bullying committee</td>
<td>Student-led activities (e.g., presentations, conferences)</td>
<td>Other (specify): ______________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL</td>
<td>Individual counseling for children who have bullied</td>
<td>Individual counseling for children who have been victimized</td>
<td>Group counseling for children who have bullied</td>
<td>Group counseling for children who have been Victimized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialized workshops for an individual or small group of individuals (e.g., assertiveness training, martial arts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other (specify): ______________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENTS</td>
<td>Provide information to parents (e.g. Newsletters, literature)</td>
<td>Invite parents to school for presentations, seminars, etc.</td>
<td>Have parents participate directly in school anti-bullying program(s)</td>
<td>Other (specify): ______________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>Convene meetings with community leaders and organizations</td>
<td>Encourage local media to cover school’s efforts</td>
<td>Engage community organizations and leaders in school’s anti-bullying program activities</td>
<td>Other (specify): ______________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Who are the primary recipients of your anti-bullying program(s)? Check ALL that apply.

- Individual students
- Groups of students
- Families
- Individual classes
- Individual grade levels
- Whole school divisions (e.g., all primary grades)
- Entire school
- Parents
- Classroom teachers
- School administrators
- Members of surrounding community
- Non-teaching staff (e.g., cafeteria staff, bus drivers)
- We don’t have an anti-bullying/harassment program (skip 12, 13, & 14 if you do NOT have an anti-bullying/harassment program)

Check ALL that apply for each question.

12. Who participated in planning the anti-bullying program(s) in your school?

- Students
- Classroom teachers
- School administrators
- School professionals (e.g., guidance counselors, social/youth/childcare workers)
- Non-professional support staff (bus drivers, cafeteria staff)
- Parents
- School Board personnel
- Ministry/Department of Education personnel
- Professional consultants
- Personnel from Community Service agencies (including police)
- Community volunteers
- Other (specify): _____________
13. Who is involved in delivering the anti-bullying program(s) in your school?

- o Students
- o School administrators
- o Classroom teachers
- o Non-professional support staff (bus drivers, cafeteria staff)
- o Parents
- o School Board personnel
- o Ministry/Department of Education personnel
- o Professional consultants
- o Personnel from Community Service agencies (including police)
- o Community volunteers
- o Other (specify): _____________

14. People play various roles in creating and/or solving the problem of bullying. On the list below, indicate the people whose roles are addressed in your anti-bullying program(s). Check ALL that apply.

- o Individuals who bully
- o Individuals who facilitate or encourage the bullying
- o Individuals who intervene to stop bullying
- o Parents
- o Classroom teachers
- o School administrators
- o School professionals (e.g., guidance counselors, social/youth/childcare workers)
- o Non-professional support staff (bus drivers, cafeteria staff)
- o Peers not involved in bullying
- o Members of surrounding community

15. If you have any additional comments on the nature of the anti-bullying programs at your school, add them on the lines below.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
16. Use the scale provided to answer the Questions below. *Check ONE response for each question.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Much more</th>
<th>A bit more</th>
<th>About same</th>
<th>A bit less</th>
<th>Much less</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In comparison to 1 year ago, how much anti-bullying programming does your school offer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In comparison to 5 years ago, how much anti-bullying programming does your school offer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Indicate the extent to which you agree that each of the following are impacts of your antibullying program(s). *Check ONE response for each question.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School personnel use more effective strategies to stop bullying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students use more effective strategies to stop bullying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is greater understanding about the nature of the bullying problem at our school among internal stakeholders (e.g., staff, administrators, trustees, students).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is greater understanding about the nature of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bullying/harassment among external stakeholders (e.g., parents, community members).

More internal stakeholders (e.g., staff, administrators, trustees, students) are directly involved in solving the problem of bullying at our school.

More external stakeholders (e.g., parents, community members) are directly involved in solving the problem of bullying at our school.

The number of students who bully others has decreased.

The number of students victimized by others has decreased.

The severity of reported bullying incidents has decreased.

The atmosphere at the school is generally more positive and peaceful.
18. Use the scale provided to answer the Questions below. Check ONE response for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Much more</th>
<th>A bit more</th>
<th>About same</th>
<th>A bit less</th>
<th>Much less</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compared to 3 months ago, how much bullying is occurring at your school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to 1 year ago, how much bullying is occurring at your school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to 5 years ago, how much bullying is occurring at your school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Describe any other intended or unintended consequences of the anti-bullying program(s) currently offered at your school in the lines below.
________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________

20. Do you feel safe in your school?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

21. Do you feel comfortable in implementing an anti-bullying program?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

Please put this completed questionnaire in the envelope provided, seal it, and give it to the designated school staff. Thank you for participation.
APPENDIX C

Student Bullying Assessment
SAFE SCHOOL SURVEY
FOR STUDENTS IN GRADES 1-5

Name of School: __________________________ Date: __________

Schools need to be safe places for students to learn. The purpose of this survey is to find out about student safety at your school.

Do not put your name on this survey.
We want to know what students, as a group, tell us.
This is your chance to let us know what things are like at your school.

Here is how you mark your answers:
For most questions, you will need to pick one or more of the possible answers given. There are no right or wrong answers. We just want to know your honest thoughts and feelings.

1. For some questions, you will need to tell us how often something happened during this school year. You need to circle one of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or Twice</th>
<th>Many times a week</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Many of the questions are sentences or statements. For each one, decide if the statement is true or not true for you by choosing “yes” or “no”, or you can choose “some” if the statement is sometimes true.

Circle “no” if the sentence is not at all true or never true.
Circle “sometimes” if the sentence is sometimes or somewhat true.
Circle “yes” if the sentence is definitely true or always true.

- **Bullying:** is aggressive behavior that is intentional, repeated over time, and involves an imbalance of power.
- It can be physical, verbal, and emotional (teasing, hitting, pushing, name calling, spreading rumors, sending mean text messages, facebook posts, or emails).

If you have questions or don’t understand something, please ask.
1. What grade are you in?

   Check one: □ 1st □ 2nd □ 3rd □ 4th □ 5th

2. Are you a boy or girl?

   Check one: □ Boy □ Girl

3. Are you active in any groups? (Please check all the groups that you have been active in)

   □ School Sports
   □ School club(s)
   □ Religious organization
   □ Youth groups (out of school clubs, scouts, etc.)
   □ Artistic group (music or art)
   □ Any others? (please describe) ____________________________

4. Has your teacher or school counselor talked to you about bullying during the past 12 months? (check any that you have participated in)

   □ Class discussions/assemblies
   □ Counseling
   □ Workshops or seminars
   □ School activities (such as posters, art, poetry, plays, etc.)
   □ Other (please describe) ____________________________
   □ I have not participated in any programs

5.) How safe do you feel? Safe means feeling comfortable, relaxed, and not worried that something bad could happen to you.

   Please check one box for each answer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I feel safe</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>I don’t feel safe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe on my way to and from school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe in my neighborhood or community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section asks about **BULLYING**.

There are many ways to bully someone. A bully **wants to hurt the other person** (it’s not an accident). A bully does or says the same things **over and over again**. Bullying is **UNFAIR**. Sometimes a group of students will bully another student.

**There are four main kinds of bullying. Some examples are:**

- **Physical bullying**  
  - when someone hits, shoves, kicks, spits, or beats up another person  
  - when someone damages or steals a student’s property

- **Verbal bullying**  
  - name-calling, mocking, hurtful teasing  
  - humiliating or threatening someone  
  - making people do things they don’t want to do

- **Social bullying**  
  - excluding others from the group  
  - spreading gossip or rumors about others  
  - making others look foolish  
  - making sure others do not spend time with a certain student

- **Cyberbullying** – using computer, e-mail, phone or cellular phone text messages to:  
  - hurt someone’s feelings  
  - make someone look bad  
  - threaten someone

---

6.) **WHEN YOU ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS, THINK ABOUT THIS SCHOOL YEAR.**

Circle “**no**” if the sentence is **not at all true** or **never true**.

Circle “**sometimes**” if the sentence is **sometimes** or **somewhat true**.

Circle “**yes**” if the sentence is **definitely true** or **always true**.

Please check one box for each question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am bullied at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am bullied on my way to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am bullied on my way from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I bully others at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I bully others on the way to and from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see other students being bullied at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see other students bullied on the way to and from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have stayed home from school so I would not be bullied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It bothers me when students get bullied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| How often have you been physically bullied by other students?        |
| Examples: hit, kicked, pushed slapped, spat on or hurt in any physical way |

| How often have you been verbally bullied by other students?          |
| Examples: said mean things to you, teased you, called you names, threatened you or tried to hurt your feelings |

| How often have you been socially bullied by other students?          |
| Examples: left you out on purpose, refused to play with you, said bad things behind your back, got other students to not like you |

<p>| How often have you been cyberbullied by other students?              |
| Examples: used Internet, e-mail, phone or cellular phone text messages to threaten you or make you look bad |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or twice a week</th>
<th>Many times a week</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often have you <strong>physically</strong> bullied other students? Examples: hit, kicked, pushed slapped, spat on or hurt in any physical way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you <strong>verbally</strong> bullied other students? Examples: said mean things to you, teased you, called you names, threatened you or tried to hurt your feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you <strong>socially</strong> bullied other students? Examples: left you out on purpose, refused to play with you, said bad things behind your back, got other students to not like you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you <strong>cyberbullied</strong> other students? Examples: used Internet, e-mail, phone or cellular phone text messages to threaten you or make you look bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you seen or heard students <strong>physically</strong> bully other students Examples: hit, kicked, pushed slapped, spat on or hurt in any physical way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you seen or heard students <strong>verbally</strong> bully other students? Examples: said mean things to you, teased you, called you names, threatened you or tried to hurt your feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you seen or heard students <strong>socially</strong> bully other students? Examples: left you out on purpose, refused to play with you, said bad things behind your back, got other students to not like you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you seen or heard students <strong>cyberbully</strong> other students? Examples: used Internet, e-mail, phone or cellular phone text messages to threaten you or make you look bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.) For this school year, how often have you tried to help another student who was being bullied at school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or twice</th>
<th>Many times a week</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8.) For this school year, how often have you been left out or treated badly…

- a) …because of your religion?
- b) …because of the color of your skin?
- c) …because you are a boy or girl?
- d) …because you do well in school?
- e) …because school is hard for you?
- f) …because of your weight?
- g) …because of the way you look, your height, or your body shape?
- h) …because of how you dress?
- i) …because of how little money you have?

9.) Where does bullying happen? (Circle the TOP 3 choices and put a 1 by where it happens most)

- o Classrooms
- o Hallways
- o Library
- o Computer room
- o Gym
- o School Bus
- o Lunchroom
- o Recess
- o Malls or stores
- o At home
- o Other places (please describe where): _____________________________
10.) **When** does bullying happen? *(Circle **TOP 3** choices and put a 1 by when it happens most)*

- Before school
- During classes
- Between classes
- During lunch
- During recess
- After school
- On the weekends

11.) Think of the last time that **you saw or heard** another student being bullied. **What did you do?** *(Check any that are true for you.)*

- I ignored it
- I told my parents about it
- I told my brother/sister about it
- I told an adult at school about it
- I told an adult outside of school about it (such as the babysitter, coach, neighbor, police, etc.)
- I told another student about it
- At the time, I helped the person being bullied
- Later on, I helped the person being bullied
- I stood and watched
- I joined in with the bullying
- I got someone to help stop it
- I got back at the bully later
- I have not seen or heard another student being bullied

12.) Think of the last time **you saw** someone being bullied. **If you did not do anything, what was the reason?** *(Check one only)*

- I did not want to get involved
- I was afraid or felt threatened
- I did not know what to do or who to talk to
- Nobody would do anything about it if I told someone
- The bullying wasn’t so bad
- The person being bullied deserved it
- I have not seen or heard another student being bullied

13.) Think of the last time that **you were bullied.** What did you do? *(Check any that are true for you.)*
o I ignored it
o I told my parents about it
o I told my brother/sister about it
o I told an adult at school about it
o I told an adult outside of school about it (such as the babysitter, coach, neighbor, police, etc.)
-o I told another student about it
o I did not go to school for one or more days
o I fought back
o I got someone to help stop it
o I stood up to the person who was doing it
o I got back at them later
o I have not been bullied

14.) Think of the last time that you were bullied. If you did not do anything, what was the reason? (Check one only)

o I was afraid or felt threatened
o I did not know what to do or who to talk to
o Nobody would do anything about it if I told someone
o The bullying wasn’t so bad
o I have not been bullied

15.) What do you think about these things…
Read each sentence and decide if you think it is true or not true.

Circle “no” if the sentence is not at all true or never true.
Circle “sometimes” if the sentence is sometimes or somewhat true.
Circle “yes” if the sentence is definitely true or always true.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullying is just a normal part of being a kid.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very different from other students here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to report bullying to adults at school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this school, I feel like I am a success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did something kind for another student at school this week.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am treated with as much respect as other students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is up to me to deal with bullying at school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I belong in this school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my group of friends, bullying is okay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I saw another student do something kind for someone at school this week.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is hard for people like me to be accepted in this school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other students try to help you when you are being bullied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many students get bullied because they deserve it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I matter in this school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults at this school are very helpful if I have a problem with other kids.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What do you think your school can do to prevent or reduce bullying?**

---

If you are having problems with other people at school, please ask for help.

You can talk to any adult that you trust at school such as a counselor, a teacher, a coach, a youth worker, the janitor or the bus driver.

**THANK YOU FOR DOING THE SURVEY!!**

**You are helping to make this school safe for all students.**
APPENDIX D
Operational Definitions of Bullying Behaviors

**Bullying:** A bully wants to hurt the other person (it’s not playful or an accident). A bully does or says the same things over and over again. Bullying is UNFAIR. Sometimes a group of students will bully another student.

- **Physical bullying** - when someone hits, shoves, kicks, spits, or beats up another person
  - when someone damages or steals a student’s property
- **Verbal bullying** - name-calling, mocking, hurtful teasing, yelling
  - humiliating or threatening someone
- **Social bullying** - not talking with, not sitting with, and alienations from group

**It is bullying if it appears to be intentional, repeated, and a power balance; the victim appears to be upset and hurt by the bully’s actions**

---

**Examples:**

- Student hits or pokes peers next to him/her (*code physical bullying*)
- Student shoves another student while standing in line (*pb*)
- Student throws a ball or another object at another student (*pb*)
- Student knocks books or papers off peer’s desk (*pb*)
- Student throws pencil, paper, eraser, or a similar object at peer across room (*pb*)
- Student calls another student a mean name (dumb, stupid, ugly, fat) (*vb*)
- Student teases another student based on their clothes, hair, body, race, gender (*vb*)
- Student yells at another student. (*vb*)
- Student puts another student down for their athletic skills, academic performance (*vb*)
- Student tells another student he or she cannot play with them at recess (*sb*)
- Student does not let another student sit with him/her during lunch (*sb*)
- Group of students walk away from another student, socially isolating him/her from the group (*sb*)

**Nonexamples:**

- Student shoves or trips another student on accident (says sorry or appears to be sorry)
- Student accidently knocks off another student’s books or papers from their desk
- Student says a mean name one time is not bullying
- Student yells at another student one time is not bullying
- Student threatens another student one time is not bullying

**Code bullying as one discrete event (two or more students bullying is one event and one student bullying one event).**

**Some incidents of bullying will be difficult to recognize, therefore, *any behavior that appears to look like bullying and fits the definition, mark as a bullying incident.***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bullying incidents can occur more than once at as setting:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count each incident of bullying as separate. For example, if a student teases or pushes another student mark it as one incident; if this happens again in the same setting it will be two incidents and so on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student hits another student at recess is marked as one incident at recess; if the same student trips the student in the hallway after recess, it is marked as one incident in the hallway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *If the student says sorry for pushing a student or calling names then it is NOT bullying
Bullying Behavior Observation Form

*Note: final behaviors and operational definitions were based on pre-assessment*

Student Initials: _________________ Date ______

Observer_____________________

Beginning Time_______________ Ending Time ______________

PB  = Physical Bullying; VB = Verbal Bullying; SB = Social Bullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location &amp; Bullying Behavior</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________
APPENDIX E
Pro-social Behaviors

Prosocial behavior, or "voluntary behavior intended to benefit another", consists of actions which "benefit other people or society as a whole, such as helping, sharing, cooperating, and volunteering. These actions may be motivated by empathy and by concern about the welfare and rights of others.

Example:

- Student helping another student pick up toys, books, or other things at school
- Student says “thank you” or “I’m sorry” to another student
- Student does not interrupt and raises his or her hand to ask a question
- Student allows another student to sit with him or her at lunch time
- Student allows another student to play with him or her at recess

Non-Example:

- Student sits quietly during teacher instruction
- Student talks to another student
- Student plays with other students at recess
Prosocial Behavior Observation Form

Student Initials: _________________ Date ____________

Observer ________________________

Beginning Time _________________ Ending Time _________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location &amp; Target Behavior</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX F
SWPBS Team Notes

Meeting #_____ Date___________ Time__________

Members
Present______________________________________________________________
APPENDIX G

PBIS Team Implementation Checklist Version 3.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School:</th>
<th>Date of Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District:</td>
<td>County:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The EBS team should complete both checklists monthly to monitor activities for implementation of EBS in the school. Completed forms can be faxed or emailed by the first of each month to: 

**PBS Team Members:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establish School-wide Expectations:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention Systems</strong></td>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 3-5 school-wide behavior expectations are defined.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. School-wide teaching matrix developed.</td>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Teaching plans for school-wide expectations are developed.</td>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. School-wide behavioral expectations taught directly &amp; formally.</td>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. System in place to acknowledge/reward school-wide expectations.</td>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Clearly defined &amp; consistent consequences and procedures for undesirable behaviors are developed.</td>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Behavior Support Systems</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Team has completed a school-wide classroom systems summary</td>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Action plan in place to address any classroom systems identified as a high priority for change.</td>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Data system in place to monitor office discipline referral rates that come from classrooms.</td>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Establish Information System</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Discipline data are gathered, summarized, &amp; reported at least quarterly to whole faculty.</td>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Discipline data are available to the Team at least monthly in a form and depth needed for problem solving.</td>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Build Capacity for Function-based Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Personnel with behavioral expertise are identified &amp; involved.</td>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. At least one staff member of the school is able to conduct simple functional behavioral assessments.</td>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Intensive, individual student support team structure in place to use function-based supports</td>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Observations/Comments/Questions:**
Benchmarks for Advanced Tiers (BAT)

The Benchmarks for Advanced Tiers (BAT) allows school teams to self-assess the implementation status of Tiers 2 (secondary, targeted) and 3 (tertiary, intensive) behavior support systems within their school. The BAT is based on factors drawn from the Individual Student Systems Evaluation Tool (I-SSET), and is designed to answer three questions:

Are the foundational (organizational) elements in place for implementing secondary and tertiary behavior support practices?

1. Is a Tier 2 support system in place?
2. Is a Tier 3 system in place?

School teams can use the BAT to build an action plan to delineate next steps in the implementation process. If schools choose to use the BAT to assess progress over time, then scores on each area can be tracked on a year-to-year basis.

School: District: State: Date of Completion:

Team Coordinator: Team Members:

INSTRUCTIONS: The BAT is to be completed by the team(s) involved with Tiers 2 and 3 behavior support, and reflects the consensus (or majority) of team members. Team members should first be trained in use of the BAT by someone familiar with the measure. The BAT can be completed by the team as a group or by each member independently. If completed independently, the team reconvenes to review scores on each item. Items in which there is disagreement are discussed and the team comes to consensus on the score. If there is not a team in a school focused on Tiers 2 and 3 supports, then the BAT should be completed by gathering the individuals with the most knowledge and involvement in supports at Tier 2 and Tier 3.

Each item is rated “2” fully in place, a “1” partially in place, or a “0” not yet started.

After completion of the BAT, use the Action Plan template to develop a timeline for moving forward on targeted and intensive interventions.

Benchmarks for Advanced Tiers; May 2011 Anderson, Childs, Kincaid, Horner, George, Todd, Sampson, & Spaulding Educational and Community Supports, University of Oregon & University of South Florida
Appendix H
Final Interview of the Process
Adapted from Maras (2008)

Process and Data
1. How long have you been a member of the SWPBS team?
2. Before this year, what did you know about bullying data collected by your school?
   a. Why was it collected?
   b. How was it used (e.g., what happened after the data was collected? Did your school get the results? What happened to that information?)?
   c. What was the purpose of the process you and your team went through?
   d. What were some of your goals during this process?
3. Can you tell me about what you learned from the bullying data?
4. Given what you and your team has done with and learned from this study, what’s next? What are the next steps?
5. Tell me a little bit more about how you were involved in this process? For example, did you help with analyzing the data, choosing an intervention, and/or help with intervention implementation? Would you say you were very involved, somewhat involved, not involved at all?
6. Did you and/or your team learn anything from this experience?
   a. If so, what specific part of the process do you think led to this change?
7. What did you think about data before this project? What do you think about it now?
8. Do you think the bullying data or other data will be used differently in the future? Why or why not?
   a. Do you think you, your team or school will do anything different with the bullying data or other data in the future?
   b. If it were up to you, what would you like your school or SWPBS team to do with the bullying data or other data in the future?
   c. What would make it easier or more difficult for that to happen?
9. Do you think you’ll do anything different related to bullying/other data in the future?

Evaluation of the Researcher (As a team, please complete these questions)
1. How would you describe Jenny’s role at your school?
   a. What did Jenny do well?
   b. What were some of her weaknesses?
   c. What can Jenny (or other researchers/students supporting Jenny) do better in the future?
   d. What can the school do to help?
   e. Given the role that Jenny had in facilitating this project this year, what do you think will happen next year when the bullying data is collected again?

Concluding Thoughts
1. Is there anything I didn’t ask you about that you want to share with me?
APPENDIX I
Social Validity Survey
Adapted from Biggs et al., (2008)

**Importance:**
How important is it to you for your school to be included in this bullying study?

0 1 2 3 4
Not at all Important A little Somewhat Generally Greatly Important

How important is implementing these bullying strategies in your classroom and/or school?

0 1 2 3 4
Not at all Important A little Somewhat Generally Greatly Important

**Usage:**
How often do you use concepts to address bullying behaviors?

0 1 2 3 4
Rarely/never Few times/month Few times/week Almost Daily Daily

How often do you use bullying strategies to recognize positive, prosocial behavior?

0 1 2 3 4
Rarely/never Few times/month Few times/week Almost Daily Daily

How often do you ask students to use or practice the new bullying strategies?

0 1 2 3 4
Rarely/never Few times/month Few times/week Almost Daily Daily

**Helpfulness**
How helpful do you find the bullying strategies in managing bullying behaviors?

0 1 2 3 4
Not at all Helpful A little Somewhat Generally Greatly Helpful

How helpful do you find the bullying strategies in promoting positive relationships among students?

0 1 2 3 4
Not at all Helpful A little Somewhat Generally Greatly Helpful
**Influence:**

In your opinion, how influential are teachers for how students behave in the classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>Greatly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your opinion, how influential are teachers for how well students get along with each other?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>Greatly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your opinion, how influential are children’s peer relationships for their academic achievement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>Greatly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J
Teacher Integrity Checklist

Teacher___________________________     Date________________

Instructions: For each step in the intervention, check the column for “Yes” if the step is completed or “No” if the step is not completed. If that step is not applicable, check the “NA” column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Sequence</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example for Check-In/Check-Out: Day 1 Completed by Jenny</td>
<td>- Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>student did not take home a sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- School professional meets with student in the morning to give him or her a behavior checklist for the day</td>
<td>- Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>student did not take home a sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher(s) meet with student after each subject and completes the behavior checklist throughout the day</td>
<td>- Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>student did not take home a sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- School professional meets with student at the end of the day to discuss if the student met his or her goal for the day</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>student did not take home a sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student takes home a sheet for parent to sign</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>student did not take home a sheet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K
Bully Prevention / Intervention Action Plan

Data Analysis

1. Is Bullying a problem? (student / staff)
2. What types of bullying are occurring? (student/staff)
   a. Are there gender differences (student/staff)
3. Where is bullying occurring? (student/staff)
4. Where do students seek help? (student)
5. Where do staff feel students should seek help? (staff)
6. What strategies do staff feel most successful to date? (staff)
7. Are staff aware of district/school policy and procedures? (staff)
8. Parent perceptions of issues and school interventions?

Intervention

1. Identify pro-social behaviors for noted types of bullying behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bullying Behavior</th>
<th>Replacement Skill</th>
<th>Link to School-wide Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Lesson plans and teaching strategies (with schedule) for each replacement skill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>By Stander Role</th>
<th>Non-Participant Role</th>
<th>Who Develop</th>
<th>Due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By-stander/non-participant role = use language of school expectation / encourage “victim” to walk away with them / do not attend to bully / report what they have seen to adults per school procedure

Establish a clear reporting procedure for students to report bullying (establish / teach / practice / monitor):

Establish a clear reporting procedure for parents to report bullying (establish / communicate in multiple formats / monitor):

Teaching Schedule (all in school must teach across all classrooms):
3. Supervision of high risk locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Current Supervision</th>
<th>Training &amp; Support Need</th>
<th>Additional Supervision Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training for supervision:

- Who will train
- Core replacement social skills and prompts for student roles
- Prompts for students to use problem-solving strategies
- High rates of reinforcement for students who do not engage/attend to bullying
- Appropriate referrals when students do not respond
4. Identify strategies and lesson plans for “victims”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bully Behavior</th>
<th>Desired Student Response</th>
<th>Lesson plans/ Strategies to teach</th>
<th>Connect Point to School-wide Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training:

- Who & when will strategies be taught to victims (small group or one:one)
- Curriculum
- Consistent and reliable contact point for victims
- Appropriate range of supports, goal to fade adult support out
5. Identify instructional strategies and consequences for bullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bully Behavior</th>
<th>Desired Outcome (get /avoid)</th>
<th>Replacement with same outcome</th>
<th>Connect Point to School-wide Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training:

- Curriculum development
- One:One (who/when)
- Practice Opportunities (including peers)
- Tier II/III supports (focus on increasing use of appropriate skills)
  - Small group social skills (“empathy”)
  - Check in/Check out or Check & Connect

Consequences

- Removal from access to peers
- Restrictions on non-supervised time
- Restitution (if empathy in place)
### Bully Prevention/Intervention

#### Action Plan Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Additional Information Needed</th>
<th>Product/Outcome</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Goal/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX L

### Intervention Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Grade Intervention</th>
<th>4/7/12</th>
<th>5/7/12</th>
<th>5/14/12</th>
<th>5/21/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NAME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe - I will control my body.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful - I will use kind words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner - I will follow directions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.troubledyouthconference.com/
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