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Abstract

The purpose of the study was to further examine the potential efficacy of the Bully Prevention in Positive Behavior Support (BP-PBS) program in addressing bullying in an urban public elementary school with a large and diverse student population, implementing school-wide positive behavior support with relatively low fidelity. Specifically, the study examined the extent to which BP-PBS could decrease target students’ bullying behavior across settings and increase appropriate active response to bullying of students being bullied. Changes in the students’ perceptions and attitudes on school safety were also examined. This study involved a multiple probe design across participants targeting multiple settings for six students (three bullies and three victims) to assess the impact of the BP-PBS intervention and to examine its generalization effects to a non-targeted setting. The results indicated that the BP-PBS intervention was effective in reducing the target students’ bullying maintained by peer and adult attention and increasing active response to bullying. The intervention also increased positive perceptions and attitudes on school safety in students being bullied and the bullies. Changes in student bullying and appropriate and inappropriate responses to bullying were generalized to non-training settings and remained at intervention levels for all participants. Social validity surveys indicated high acceptability of the BP-PBS intervention by teachers.
Chapter 1:
Introduction

Research on the negative trajectories of problem behavior has led to focus on prevention and early intervention of problem behavior. Data from longitudinal studies reveal that early starting (childhood-onset) problems were linked to a chronic and escalating trajectory of behavior and worse outcomes in adulthood compared to late starting (adolescent-onset) problems (Moffitt, Caspi, Dickson, Silva, & Stanton, 1996; Shaw & Gross, 2008). Although the frequency of aggression, opposition, and property violations may decrease over the course of development (Bongers, Koot, Van der Ende, & Verhulst, 2004), the majority of individuals with early onset of problem behavior, particularly, aggression are found to continue to engage in aggressive behavior as adults (Burt, 2012).

Bullying typically falls under aggression and is quite common in children of all ages (Merrell, Gueldner, Ross, & Isava, 2008). Significant number of children in schools experience bullying severe enough to cause concern nationwide (Merrell et al., 2008). Bullying can occur in a multitude of settings and involves numerous individuals (Center for Disease and Control, 2014). The definition of bullying can vary based on the organization; however, the Center for Disease and Control (2014) has established the definition as behavior that involves (a) intent by the perpetrator to cause physical or psychological harm to the victim; (b) a power imbalance between the victim and the perpetrator; and (c) repeated negative acts.
Good, McIntosh, and Gietz (2011) discussed a survey with 512 students in 2002, which found approximately 52% of the students knew someone who would be considered a bully and 61% of the students reported that they witnessed bullying at least one time per day. Roughly, 28% of students in the United States experience bullying while in grades 6-12 and over 70% of school staff report to witness bullying by a student in the school. However, many schools struggle to develop and implement effective bullying prevention and intervention (Facts About Bullying, 2014).

Merrell, Gueldner, Ross, and Isava (2008) indicated that bullies tended to have poor academic skills and grades, lack empathy, and have a distorted view on aggression solving problems. Bullies were at a higher risk for criminal behavior and substance abuse, and tended to come from homes with poor role modeling and coercive parenting. Merrell also indicated that the victims of bullying were often smaller and or weaker than the bullies; they could be anxious, insecure, depressed, and fearful, and lack self-esteem. When individuals become victims of bullying, many engage in school avoidance, future drop out, and suicide, and are more likely to bring weapons to school as a means of revenge (Schenider, O’Donnell, Stueve, & Coulter, 2012). Given the potential damage to healthy development and significant negative impact on everyone involved, addressing bullying is beneficial to both the bully and victim to decrease their future risk.

Good and colleagues (2011) reviewed the literature on typical responses by schools when bulling was identified as problem behavior. The most common response to bullying was to have a standalone anti-bullying program implemented. A school-wide assembly was held where a speaker came in to discuss the harmful effects of bullying and to teach students to identify bullies. Punitive measures were introduced if bullying behaviors were observed. However, Good
et al. (2011) suggested that these standalone anti-bullying programs were ineffective because incidents of bullying could increase by labeling and punishing bullying behavior and the programs were more reactive than preventive and difficult to implement and sustain.

Merrell and colleagues (2008) found some evidence that supports the positive outcomes of typical bullying interventions enhancing student social competence, peer acceptance, and self-esteem, which may also enhance teacher knowledge of effective practice, responding to bullying instances, and feelings of efficacy in terms of intervention skills. A limitation to bullying interventions indicated by Merrell and colleagues (2008) was the reliance on indirect reports versus direct observation. In a meta-analysis of 16 bullying prevention studies (Merrell et al., 2008), it was found that none of the anti-bullying interventions were effective in reducing bullying.

Recently, School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) has been applied to student behavior to decrease problem behaviors including bullying and to increase academic skills (Gagnon, Rockwell, & Scott, 2008). SWPBS is a proactive, systems-level approach to support students and teachers and promote positive social and learning environments through various tools and practices (Gagnon, Rockwell, & Scott, 2008; Sailor, Dunlap, Sugai, & Horner, 2009). Several research studies have shown improvements in academic and behavioral outcomes in schools implementing SWPBS when compared to control schools (Good et al., 2011). The environment that exists in a school incorporating SWPBS would allow for effective integration of bullying prevention programs that are less resource intensive and easier to implement, if the school is already engaged in SWPBS (Good et al., 2011).

The Expect Respect, a bullying prevention program has been implemented within SWPBS, which consists of readiness checklist, staff orientation, student advisory committee,
three to four lessons, repeat and repair, fidelity checklists, and student survey (Nese, 2015). The program focuses on teaching students how to signal “stop” in the event of non-respectful behaviors, how to follow a “stopping routine” when asked to stop, utilization of the “bystander routine”, and how to engage in adult support if bullying continues (Nese, 2015; Nese, Horner, Dickey, Stiller & Tomlanovich, 2014).

Nese, Horner, Dickey, Stiller and Tomlanovich (2014) assessed the Expect Respect intervention on bullying behaviors in the cafeteria through a non-concurrent multiple baseline design across three middle schools. The study included measures of fidelity, frequency of bullying behaviors, pre-post student survey focusing on safety and respect, and immediate response of recipients and bystanders to bullying. The Expect Respect was implemented with adequate fidelity by each school. Upon implementation of the intervention, the authors observed a reduction in student aggression, both physical and verbal. The pre-post student survey found no change in report of overall school safety, being treated respectfully, or reports of treating others respectfully.

The Bully Prevention in Positive Behavior Support (BP-PBS) program (Good et al., 2011; Ross & Horner, 2009; 2014) was also designed to be implemented within a SWPBS system. BP-PBS focuses on decreasing bullying behavior and teaching appropriate responses to bullying for victims and bystanders through teaching school-wide expectations (e.g., “being respectful”) and rules and the three-step response (Stop, Walk, and Talk). Key features also include implementing pre-correction of the three-step response prior to having students engage in activities or routines that are likely to set off problem behavior, and reinforcing appropriate responses when students use the three-step response. It provides curriculum activities that train
staff on a universal strategy for responding to student reports of problem behavior (Ross & Horner, 2009; 2014).

Ross and Horner (2009) examined the impact of BP-PBS on bullying with six students in three elementary schools using a multiple baseline design. Decreased incidents of bullying were observed for all six students during implementation of BP-PBS. However, a decrease in social response from victims and bystanders was also observed. The program was implemented with high fidelity and rated high on social validity. The authors discussed no functional assessment of bullying and no complete elimination of bullying as study limitations. The short intervention time frame was found to be one of the major study limitations. Ross and Horner (2014) examined the perceptions relating to bullying, harassment, and school safety using self-report surveys before and after implementation of BP-BPS in third, fourth, and fifth graders in three elementary schools. The authors found significant improvement in 12 out of 13 dependent variables measured, specifically, in assertiveness, bystander support, and the use of a “stop” signal.

The bullying prevention and intervention within SWPBS discussed above suggest that the universal, school-wide prevention of bullying may not be effective unless individual training and support are provided (Salmivalli & Peets, 2009). This implies that the context, antecedent, and maintaining consequence of bullying must be identified for individual students in the process of assessing the problems and designing interventions. The literature indicates that little is still known about the nature of the phenomenon and its roots of bullying (Reunamo, Kalliomaa, Repo, Salminen, Lee, & Wang, 2015). It is suggested that bullying can be reinforcing when seeking social status (Sijtsema, Veenstra, Lindenberg, & Salmivallli, 2009), indicating that bullying behavior may be reinforced by peer attention and serve a function for the individual like
other problem behavior (Ross & Horner, 2009). Thus, decreasing bullying may require the application of functional behavior assessment (FBA) to identifying the probable function and guiding the development of the intervention plan.

There has been an abundance of studies involving FBAs and function-based interventions for problem behavior in the school settings. However, there are some noticeable gaps in the literature; little research has examined FBA in multiple settings, FBA with peer inclusion, and FBA in bullying (Banda, Hart, & Kercood, 2012; Blair, Umbreit, Dunlap, & Jung, 2007; Gann, Ferro, Umbreit, & Liaupsin, 2014; Whitford, Liaupsin, Umbreit, & Ferro, 2013) although use of FBA is a common strategy when dealing with problem behavior in schools (Gresham, Watson, & Skinner, 2001). An FBA helps school staff collect information regarding the antecedents, behaviors, and consequences of the problem behavior in order to determine its probable function and develop an intervention that is best suited for the behavior (Banda et al., 2012; Blair et al., 2007; Gann et al., 2014; Gresham et al., 2001; Whitford et al., 2013). The FBA process can be used as a predictive model for problem behavior, which allows staff to address the behavior prior to escalation (Moreno & Bullock, 2011). FBA has been found effective for a wide variety of students ranging in severity of problem behavior, such as self-injury, aggression, disruption, off-task behavior, and stereotypy (Moreno & Bullock, 2011; Gresham et al., 2001; Scott & Kamps, 2007).

A handful of studies have looked into FBA across multiple inclusive classroom settings (Banda et al., 2012; Blair et al., 2007; Gann et al., 2014; Whitford et al., 2013). For example, Banda, Hart and Kercood (2012) aimed to decrease disruptive vocalizations in a 3rd grade boy diagnosed with high-functioning autism across three classrooms. An FBA was conducted to determine the function of the disruptive behavior and a non-contingent attention (NCA)
intervention was implemented across three academic time periods (e.g., math, social studies) for each student in an AB design. Decreased disruptive vocalizations occurred across all three environments demonstrating the effectiveness of NCA across three different academic time periods and teachers. This study was one of the first to implement a function-based intervention across multiple academic time periods in an elementary school.

Whitford et al. (2013) involved a student in high school diagnosed with a learning disability and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). The authors used an FBA to determine the function of the student’s off-task behavior across different academic periods (algebra, Spanish, and English). The researchers and teachers then created a comprehensive function-based intervention that was implemented sequentially across three classes in a multiple baseline design. Upon intervention, high, consistent levels of on-task behavior resulted in each class sequentially. The authors discussed the target problem behavior and replacement behavior that were relevant to all settings and teachers’ involvement in developing interventions, and a multi-component intervention as the reasons why the intervention might have been successful.

As discussed above, studies on FBAs in the school have mainly focused on self-injurious behavior, disruptive behavior, and off-task behavior (Gresham et al., 2001). There is currently no research involving an FBA on bullying. Many articles and presentations state the function of bullying is attention from peer victims (Good, McIntosh & Gietz, 2011; Ross, 2015; Ross & Horner, 2014). However, an FBA has not been conducted to identify the function of bullying. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to further examine the potential efficacy of BP-PBS intervention in addressing bullying in a public elementary school implementing SWPBS. The study attempted to extend the current literature on BP-PBS by (a) implementing the intervention in an urban elementary school with a large and diverse student population implementing SWPBS.
with relatively low fidelity and (b) targeting students engaging in bullying behavior maintained by peer and adult attention. Specifically, the study examined the extent to which BP-PBS could decrease the target students’ bullying behavior across settings and increase their victims’ appropriate response to bullying and the perceptions and attitudes on school safety among participating students.
Chapter 2:  

Method  

This study took place in two 4th grade and one 5th grade classrooms of an urban public elementary school located in a low socioeconomic area of a large city. The school had a population of 816 students, with 25% of them having an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). The school was a Title 1 school with 66% of students receiving free or reduced price lunch. The school demographics were as follows: Caucasian 47.58%, African American 25.67%, Hispanic 15.73%, Asian 5%, and Native American 0.27%. The most recent school year (2014-2015) was the school’s second documented year of SWPBS implementation and their fourth year of undocumented SWPBS implementation; they scored a 54% on their most recent Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ; Kincaid, Childs, & George, 2010) assessed by self-report, which is indicative of low implementation fidelity of the SWPBS program.

Participants  

Primary participants (bullies). The primary participants in this study were three children from three separate classrooms, who were reported to engage in bullying. The children were recruited through teacher nomination based on: (a) 2-5 office discipline referrals (ODRs) related to bullying (physical or verbal) or past peer (victim) reports of the student’s bullying and (b) in grades 3-5 and ages 7-11. Students were excluded from the study if they: (a) were being served full time in a self-contained special classroom; (b) engaged in severe bullying behaviors that had resulted in suspension; or (c) had chronic absence. The researcher conducted an
interview with the teachers for additional information regarding the nominated students using a brief questionnaire (Appendix A). The following information was gathered through the interview: (a) type of bullying behavior; (b) frequency; (c) severity; (d) problematic settings; (e) patterns; (f) perceived function; and (g) students involved. If the student was deemed eligible, the researcher provided a consent form for the teacher to give to the student’s parents in order to maintain confidentiality until consent was received. The children who participated in the study provided verbal assent in addition to the informed consent of their parents or legal guardians.

**Damian.** Damian was a 4th grade, male student with multiracial backgrounds. Damian had an IEP with the diagnosis of Other Health Impaired with academic goals added in May of 2015. Damian had been served in a general education classroom and was on medication for ADHD (Focalin) at the time of the study and had a history of not taking it consistently. Damian was removed from class once a day for roughly a half hour to receive additional services from a vocational education teacher. Prior to the study Damian had not received suspension or ODRs for bullying but the teacher had received several student reports. Damian’s bullying was observed to be mainly verbal (e.g., “your shoes suck”, “you’re stupid”) with one physical event with Charlie (e.g., punching him in the face), his victim. Damian engaged in bullying with between 2 and 5 students, but mostly with one particular victim, Charlie. If Charlie was not around him, he engaged in bullying toward other peers.

**Pedro.** Pedro was a 4th grade, African American male student without a disability. Pedro had not received any suspensions due to bullying, but had received one teacher managed referral and several student reports of bullying. Pedro’s bullying was observed to be mainly verbal (“your shoes suck”, “you watch Dora”, “you ugly”) with some physical (sticking a foot out to
trip a peer, pushing in line). Pedro engaged in bullying with between 3 and 8 students, but mostly with one particular victim, Maddie.

**Cassie.** Cassie was a 5th grade, African American female student without a disability. Cassie engaged in verbal and nonverbal bullying behavior (e.g., “you stupid”, making faces, eye rolls). Cassie had been referred to the office several times prior to the study due to bullying or disrespectful behavior. The teacher stated that Cassie engaged in disrespectful behavior toward peers and when in a group of girls the bullying occurred more frequently. Cassie engaged in bullying with between 2 and 5 students, particularly, with one victim, Sydney.

**Secondary participants (victims).** The secondary participants were three children from the same classroom as the bully, who reported being bullied by the primary participating children. They were selected based on the following criteria: (a) in the same classroom as the bully; (b) ages 7-11; and (c) reported being bullied by the target students at least 2 times during the current academic year. The secondary participants were excluded from the study if they were transferred to different schools or classes during the recruitment process or if they were consistently absent from school.

**Charlie.** Charlie was a 4th grade, Caucasian male student. Charlie had an IEP with the diagnosis of ADHD and had been served in the same general education classroom as Damian’s. Charlie, like Damian, was pulled once a day by a vocational education teacher to receive additional services. His teacher reported that Charlie had a give and take relationship with the bully. Charlie sometimes instigated situations with peers (e.g., he would skip his turn at a game, make faces at his peers, or make disrespectful comments); because of this, he was often on the receiving end of the bullying. Charlie often responded to Damian’s bullying by engaging in back and forth verbal behavior with his peer. For example, if Damian stated to Charlie, “your shoes
are so ugly”, Charlie would respond, “yeah well where did you even get yours, from Walmart?”),
This back and forth verbal behavior was the typical response of Charlie prior to intervention.

**Maddie.** Maddie was a 4th grade, African American female student. Maddie had an IEP with the diagnosis of Learning Disability and had been served in the same general education classroom as Pedro’s. Maddie was pulled for a Tier 2 RtI group with the special education specialist focusing on reading for 40 min every day. She had a behavior report card to address her behavioral needs (on task behavior). Maddie often responded to Pedro’s bullying by ignoring his behavior or verbally engaging with him (e.g., whining or defending herself by verbally engaging with the peer and explaining why he was wrong).

**Sydney.** Sydney was a 5th grade, Caucasian female student without a disability. Her classroom teacher reported that Sydney was bright, social, and emotional. However, Sydney tended to not express her emotions verbally and preferred to speak one on one with the teacher if a bullying situation occurred. She typically responded to Cassie’s bullying by laughing and engaging with the bully’s verbal behavior and later reporting it to the teacher. Sydney’s classroom was moved upon the training phase of this study due to a Title 9 issue, and her data in training, intervention, and follow-up phases were collected in the new classroom during reading. Although she moved to a new classroom, Sydney continued to experience bullying in that setting.

The participating students’ three classroom teachers and two other school staff (i.e., physical education coach and music teacher) also participated in the study to provide training to students and complete social validity surveys. The teachers were included in the study if they: (a) were the primary teacher for the students involved in the study; (b) nominated a potential target
student; and (c) were willing to provide training to students. The teachers were 26-42 years old and had 4-15 years of teaching experience.

Settings

Classroom. The primary target intervention setting was classroom for all participating students. All three classrooms had 16-20 students. Ms. Edward targeted writing/language arts class for intervention. Ms. Edward used a variety of instructional methods including lecture, group work, and independent work during the academic activity time. At the beginning the day Ms. Edward would have students make a morning commitment on the board, which looked like a magnet with each child’s name and a statement on the board. They would either select ‘I commit’ or ‘I do not commit’; if the child did not commit, they would have a brief conference with the teacher (e.g., ‘I commit to trying my best today.’ The student would choose yes or no). When instances of bullying occurred in the classroom, Ms. Edward typically responded by reminding students of the school wide expectations and classroom rules. Ms. Edward had also made seating adjustments to further reduce the possibility of bullying between targeted students. Damian (bully) and Charlie (victim) did not sit near each other, but were both in the front rows.

Ms. Matthew’s targeted classroom routine was morning arrival. Morning arrival consisted of students coming in, eating breakfast, putting away their items, completing possible bell-work provided by the teacher, and teacher’s morning announcements. Like Ms. Edwards, Ms. Matthew also used the morning commitment process prior to the start of class (e.g., ‘I commit to using kind words.’). Ms. Matthew also responded to instances of bullying by reminding the students of the school-wide expectations and classroom rules. Ms. Matthew had made seating adjustments to further ensure minimal contact between target students. Ms. Matthew had several students on behavior report cards including Pedro (bully). Pedro sat behind
Maddie (victim) during baseline. Prior to training on BP-PBS, Pedro’s seat was moved to the front of the class, and Maddie’s seat was also moved to behind Pedro.

Ms. Corbin targeted math activity time for intervention. Math was taught with a variety of methods including lecture, group work, and independent work. If bullying occurred in the classroom, Ms. Corbin reminded the students of the school-wide expectations and classroom rules and continued with the class lecture. She sometimes required the students to have a meeting with the guidance counselor regarding bullying behavior. Cassie (bully) and Sydney (victim) did not sit near each other. Following baseline, Sydney was moved to another class.

**Specials.** The secondary target setting was specials such as music and physical education (PE) times. Music was a problem time for all students due to the large number of students present. The target classrooms were usually in with 2-3 other classes due to schedules of the specials. The music classes tended to evoke problem behavior due to class set up and class size. The music teacher was resistant to trying new behavioral strategies. PE was also a problem time for all students due to the loose structure provided by the coach. Students often engaged in problem behaviors and the coach spent much of his time dealing with arguments among students. He often responded to the problem behavior using timeout and engaging the students in the problem solving process.

**Cafeteria.** The cafeteria was included as a generalization location, which lacked structure and adult supervision. All bullies had had student reports during lunch time in the cafeteria. At the beginning of the study Pedro and Charlie were not permitted to eat in the cafeteria due to problem behavior (later in baseline Pedro was allowed to rejoin lunch but Charlie was not). Although, Pedro’s victim was not present at any point during the generalization probe he engaged in bullying behavior with other peers.
Measures and Data Collection

Data collection sessions for each participant were conducted 2-5 days per week alternating the settings. Data were collected using direct observation procedures during the naturally occurring problematic target and generalization settings: writing (Damian and Charlie), morning arrival (Pedro and Maddie), math (Cassie and Sydney), specials (physical education and music), and cafeteria. The length of the observation was 20 min in all settings.

Bullying. The primary dependent measure was the target children’s bullying. Bullying was defined as physical or verbal aggression to a peer. Physical aggression was defined as hitting (e.g., open or closed hand making contact with another person’s body), kicking (e.g., the foot or leg making contact with another person’s body), biting (e.g., the closing of teeth on another person’s body), choking (e.g., using hands or arm to apply pressure to another individual’s throat causing impaired breathing), stealing (e.g., removal of another individual’s property without permission), throwing objects (e.g., release of an object from the individual’s hand with force), or pushing (e.g., one or both hands or body making contact with another’s body with force). Verbal aggression was defined as teasing (e.g., inappropriate comments to an individual), taunting (e.g., egging on an individual), threatening (e.g., commenting that harm would come to the individual), negative body language (e.g., making fist, acting like they would hit/punch individual), negative gestures (e.g., offensive hand gestures such as using the middle finger). The data on bullying were collected using a frequency-within-15 s interval recording procedure resulting in the number of bullying instances in the 20 min period (Appendix B).

Victim response to bullying. The secondary dependent measures were victim’s appropriate active and inappropriate responses to bullying (Ross et al., 2009). Appropriate active response was defined for Maddie and Sydney as using the stopping gesture (e.g., saying “stop”
while holding up their hand), walking away (e.g., removing themselves from the situation by walking away from the bully), and getting assistance from a teacher (e.g., approaching a teacher and asking for assistance). The definition of appropriate response for Charlie included an additional topography, ignoring the bully due to him verbally engaging with the bully during bullying situations. Ignoring the bully was defined as not commenting or responding to bullying.

Inappropriate response for Cassie and Maddie included passive responding such as whining (e.g., complaining about the situation but not asking for help), crying, complying with the bully’s request, and ignoring the bullying (e.g., not commenting or responding to bullying) and inappropriate active responding such as fighting back (e.g., verbally or physically aggressing toward the bully) and laughing (e.g., engaging in laughing and agreeing with bully to diffuse the situation). Charlie’s definition of inappropriate response was the same as others with the exception of ignoring, which was an appropriate response for him. Victim responses were recorded at the same time as the bullying using the same frequency-within-interval recording procedure resulting in the percentage of appropriate active responses or inappropriate responses. The observer recorded counts of active and passive responses, and calculated the response percentages based on the total number of opportunities for responding.

**Student perceptions and attitudes on bullying.** An adapted Student Experience Survey (Frey et al., 2004) was used to assess the participating students’ (bullies and victims) perception and attitudes towards bullying. The survey consists of 10 items (e.g., feeling safe, feeling respected, acting respectfully) and uses a 5-point rating scale (e.g., strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree or disagree, agree, strongly agree or never, 1-3 times, 4-6 times, 7-9 times, 10+ times). The classroom teachers administered the survey in baseline and immediately following the termination of intervention in order to examine whether target students’ (victims) perceptions
and attitudes on bullying changed after intervention. It took approximately 15 min for students to complete the survey each time.

**Social validity.** Teachers and staff completed the BP-PBS Acceptability Questionnaire (Ross & Horner, 2009) at the end of intervention, which was designed to assess social validity of the BP-PBS intervention. The term, school used in the original survey was changed to classroom in the current study. The questionnaire contained four items rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). It assessed whether (a) BP-PBS improved the behavior in the classroom; (b) BP-PBS was worth the time and effort of implementation; (c) the teacher would recommend the use of BP-PBS to others; and (d) BP-PBS was reasonable and easy to implement.

**Fidelity of teacher and student training.** Teacher training and student training sessions were observed by an observer to assess the fidelity of the training deliveries. The fidelity of teacher training focused on assessing the researcher’s delivery of the core training components of the BP-PBS program whereas the fidelity of student training focused on assessing the teachers’ delivery of the core program content during student training sessions. For teacher training fidelity, the Teacher Training Fidelity Checklist (Appendix C) was used, which included 9 items and listed the key content covered for the training (e.g., introduction to bullying and BP-PBS, teaching stop/walk/talk, teaching supervision). For student training fidelity, the Student Training Fidelity Checklist (Appendix D) was used, which included 7 items on the key content covered for the training (e.g., introduction to BP-PBS and Lessons 1-5). The training sessions were audio-recorded for later assessment of IOA by an independent observer.

The fidelity checks of teacher training by the researcher indicated that the researcher maintained high levels of fidelity across all components of teacher training. Fidelity of teacher
training averaged 97.9% across teachers (range, 93.8% to 100%). The one teacher training that did not reach 100% fidelity was due to the lack of time the researcher had to train the teacher, one component was skipped over (viewing fidelity sheet) and that component was addressed later via email and face to face. The teachers maintained high fidelity during student training across all lessons. The fidelity of student training by all teachers was 100%.

**Fidelity of intervention implementation.** The fidelity of BP-PBS implementation focused on measuring each teacher’s or other support staff’s adherence to the BP-PBS program components during supervising students in targeted settings. The fidelity was assessed using a checklist filled out by the researcher or a research assistant for at least 40% of the intervention sessions for each student. The checklist consisted of 6 items that assessed whether the staff: (a) checked in with target victims and used pre-correction procedures (e.g., remind how to respond to bullying) at the beginning of the target routine; (b) checked in with target perpetrators and used pre-correction procedures (e.g., review expectations and remind how to respond if another student tells them to stop or walk away) at the beginning of the target routine; (c) delivered verbal praise for students using the three step response; (d) responded to reports of bullying behavior (e.g., reinforce the student for reporting the problem behavior by saying “I am glad you told me”; ask who, what, when, and where; ensure the student safety; ensure the student told the perpetrators to stop or walk away; praise the student for using appropriate response if yes); (e) checked in with target students again, ask about how it went, and reinforce them for their efforts; and (f) modeled and had target students practice the three step, stop/walk/talk response technique if the students continued to experience bullying (Appendix E).

The results of fidelity checks throughout implementation indicated that teachers and staff members displayed low levels of adherence to the proper procedures when using pre-correction
strategies with targeted students and responding to a reported incident of bullying.

Implementation fidelity was averaged 50% (range 50% to 62.5%) for classroom teachers and 50% for specials staff. A task analysis was provided to the teachers and specials staff after the first fidelity check to help them further improve the fidelity (Appendix F). In most cases, the teachers were only rated on the pre-correction strategies during intervention because there were no occurrences of bullying and no opportunities for victims to respond to a reported instance of bullying. Teachers often missed the pre-correction strategy of reminding students to use appropriate active response strategies or how to respond when peers use Stop/Walk/Talk; however, they implemented the strategy of reminding students of their expectations prior to the targeted setting correctly 100% of the sessions.

**Interobserver agreement.** Interobserver agreement (IOA) was calculated during baseline for 25% of observations for Damian and Charlie, 25% of observations for Pedro and Maddie, and 26.3% for Cassie and Sydney. IOA for training was calculated for 30% of sessions for Damian and Charlie, 42.9% for Pedro and Maddie, and 40% for Cassie and Sydney. Implementation IOA was conducted for 50% of sessions for Damian and Charlie, 50% for Pedro and Maddie, and 75% for Cassie and Sydney. IOA was mainly conducted by two research assistants; one was a graduate student in applied behavior analysis and another an undergraduate student completing a minor in applied behavior analysis. IOA was calculated by dividing the number of intervals of agreements by the total number of intervals and multiplying by 100 for student behavior. Agreement on frequency within an interval was compared; however, there were no intervals with multiple instances of bullying behavior.

The mean IOA for Damian was 98.13% (range, 97.5 to 98.13) during baseline and 100%, during training, and implementation. The mean IOA for Pedro was 92.2% (range, 85 to 95)
during baseline and 100% during training and implementation was 100%. The mean IOA for Cassie during baseline was 97% (range, 95 to 98.75) and 100% during training and implementation. The mean IOA for Charlie was 99.4% (range, 98.8 to 100) during baseline 99.38% (range, 98.75 to 100) during training, and 100% during implementation. The mean IOA for Maddie was 100% in all phases. The mean IOA for Sydney during baseline was 100%.

IOA on training and intervention implementation fidelities were calculated for at least 30% of teacher training, student training, and intervention implementation by dividing the total number of “yes” by the total number of questions (all yes’ plus all no’s). The IOA was 100% for teacher training, 100% for student training, and 100% for intervention implementation.

**Design and Procedure**

The study used a concurrent multiple probe design across participants (Kazdin, 2011) to examine the impact of BP-PBS on bullying and victim responses to bullying in multiple settings. The design consisted of four phases: baseline, training, implementation, and follow-up. The BP-PBS intervention was implemented in two target settings for each participant. After baseline was established for each participant, the BP-PBS intervention was introduced in a staggered fashion. Generalization probes were conducted by observing the participants in the cafeteria.

**Functional behavior assessment (FBA).** FBA was conducted for each target student to identify functions of their bullying behavior. The FBA consisted of both indirect and direct methods. First, the researcher interviewed the teachers to discuss bullying patterns and possible functions and then interviewed target students (bullies). An adapted FBA Interview (Gable, Quinn, Rutherford, & Howell, 1998) and Student-Directed FBA Interview Form (Gable, Quinn, Rutherford, & Howell, 1998) were used during teacher and target student interviews to identify problematic situations as well antecedents and functions of bullying behavior. The FBA
Interview consisted of 12 items and was designed to help assist in the description of bullying behaviors, setting, time, and individuals involved and identifying the functions of bullying. The Student-Directed FBA consisted of 6 items and was designed to better understand what routines and people the student likes/dislikes and their view on bullying behavior and responses. The interview results were analyzed using a summary table that includes information on the context, antecedent, behavior, consequence, and perceived function to identify the hypothesized functions of the bullying behavior.

Following the interviews, two A-B-C observations (Bijou, Peterson, & Alut, 1968) were conducted to demonstrate correspondence with the interview results for each target student (bully) in each target setting (classroom and specials) for the duration of the activity (20 min) and generate a hypothesis. The non-targeted setting (cafeteria) was observed once for the entire 30-min duration. A structured A-B-C observation form was used to record the occurrence of bullying behavior, its antecedent, and consequence (peer or staff response to their behavior). Once A-B-C data were collected, the data were transferred to the FBA Data Tool (Wilson, 2015) to graphically analyze the antecedent and consequence variables associated with the target bullying behavior in a bar graph (frequency graph by function). Upon A-B-C data analysis, the results were compared to the interview data to confirm or disconfirm the hypothesized behavioral functions identified from the interviews.

The results gathered from the teacher and student interviews indicated that for all three students bullying behavior was maintained by positive reinforcement, peer or adult attention. However, for Damian and Pedro, escape from task demand was also found to be a potential maintaining function. The results of the A-B-C observations provided conflicting data; the antecedents pointed to a possible escape function and the consequences tended to be attention
maintained. Due to school being a high demand setting, the consequent component was focused on, which supported the hypothesis of peer or adult attention for all three students. For all students, a greater proportion of bullying behavior was followed by peer or adult attention than by escape from task demand.

According to the interviews with the teacher and Damian, Damian engaged in bullying when he participated in unstructured activities during specials or a non-preferred activity (writing) during class instructional activities, and his bullying often resulted in gaining access to peer attention or escape from the non-preferred task demand. Damian indicated that he was more likely to engage in bullying when peers began negative behaviors (e.g., name calling or teasing) or non-preferred activities (e.g., writing) were provided to get attention from peers, rather than to avoid the peer behavior or activities. During A-B-C observations, 15 instances of bullying were observed for Damian across three routines. Bullying instances following the antecedent of waiting occurred approximately 40% of the time with the second most common antecedent being other (e.g., routine tasks such as waiting or preparing materials), 33% of the time (Figure 1). The consequences for the bullying instances were peer or teacher attention 73% of the time and being ignored 20% of the time (Figure 2) indicating that when Damian was waiting for an activity to begin or end he was likely to engage in bullying behavior to access attention from peers or adults. The analysis of A-B-C data provided support for one of the hypothesized function that Damian’s bullying behavior was maintained by peer or adult attention.

For Pedro, the interviews indicated that when Pedro participated in large group activities during specials or a non-preferred demand was placed during class activity time, Pedro engaged in bullying behavior to gain peer attention or escape the demand. During A-B-C observations across three settings, Pedro engaged in 31 instances of bullying. Bullying instances
following the antecedent of teacher instruction or direction were 45% of the time with the second most common antecedents being waiting 16% and routine tasks 16% of the time (Figure 2). The consequences for the bullying instances were peer or teacher attention 58% of the time and being ignoring 16% of the time (Figure 2). The analysis of the A-B-C data provided support for one hypothesized function that Pedro’s bullying behavior was maintained by peer or adult attention.

Cassie’s teacher interview resulted in the following hypothesis: during group/social activities Cassie is more likely to engage in bullying behaviors to gain peer attention. When interviewing with Cassie, she identified the following hypothesis: if peers begin rumors or negative behavior she is more likely to engage in bullying behavior to gain peer attention. Cassie engaged in 16 instances of bullying across three routines. The antecedent of the bullying instances was teacher instruction or direction approximately 53% of the time and waiting approximately 47% of the time (Figure 3). When Cassie engaged in bullying the consequence provided was attention 89% of the time (Figure 3). The analysis of the A-B-C data provided support for one hypothesized function, that Cassie’s bullying behavior was maintained by peer or adult attention.

Baseline. During baseline, the teachers and staff continued business as usual practices, implementing school-wide Tier 1 prevention support and engaging in typical procedures regarding instances of bullying (e.g., reminding students of expectations, referring to guidance, lecturing students). Between 8 and 19 baseline data points were collected for each participant across 6 to 13 sessions until a stable pattern was established in the data for bullying and victim responses. During the first two days of baseline data collection the Student Experience Survey was administered.
**BP-PBS intervention.** Once a stable baseline was established, BP-PBS was implemented after provision of teacher and student training. BP-PBS was implemented following the guidelines provided by Ross and Horner (2009) with a few exceptions being; the curriculum was not provided school wide (i.e., all staff and students were not trained, only teachers/staff for targeted routines and targeted students), teacher/staff and student training times were shorter (i.e., teacher/staff training varied from 15-30 min and student training varied from 3-5 days), and targeted settings were more frequently monitored locations (i.e., classrooms and specials) with one less frequently monitored generalization setting (i.e., cafeteria). BP-PBS was introduced in a two-step process. First, the classroom teachers and other staff received training on the BP-PBS curriculum (Ross, Horner, & Stiller, 2008; available for download at www.pbis.org) prior to implementing the curriculum to students. Following the teacher and staff training, the curriculum implementation phase began, which also consisted of two phases: student training and implementation. Data were collected in both phases to examine changes in student behavior.

The BP-PBS curriculum consisted of six lessons. Lesson 1, which was provided on the first data of training, included the Stop/Walk/Talk Response and class-wide practice and took approximately 20-30 minutes to deliver the lesson. Lesson 2 included how to reply when someone delivers the Stop/Walk/Talk Response to them as well as some group practice. Lesson 2 was provided on the second day of training and took approximately 20 minutes (with the exception of Cassie and Sydney’s training where Lessons 1-2 were provided on the same day). Lessons 3-5 included specific examples of how to use the Stop/Walk/Talk Response appropriately when responding to gossip, inappropriate remarks, and cyber-bullying with a practice lesson for use with other problem behaviors. It took approximately 10-15 min to deliver each lesson, and these three lessons were combined into the third day of training or spread across
three separate days. Lesson 6 was the Supervision Curriculum, which provided strategies for use by staff in unstructured settings such as the cafeteria, gym, hallways, playground, and bus. It provided procedures of reviewing how to respond to reports of problem behavior, how to reinforce appropriate use of Stop/Walk/Talk, and how to check in with chronic targets and instigators.

The BP-PBS intervention focused on school-wide expectations (e.g., being respectful, being responsible, be safe) and specifically targeted unstructured settings. The specific skills taught included: (a) discriminating examples and non-examples of expected behavior; (b) saying “stop” and using the stop gesture (i.e., hand held up) as victim if someone is not being compliant with expectations; (c) saying “stop” and removing the victim from the situation as bystander if someone is being treated inappropriately; (d) walking away if the behavior that deviates from taught expectations continues after saying “stop”; (e) telling an adult if the bullying behavior continues after walking away; (f) taking a breath, stopping what you were doing, and leaving the situation if someone asks you to “stop”. Rather than bullying, student training focused on teaching school-wide expectations, removing the reinforcement of behavior that deviates from behavioral expectations (e.g., bullying), and teaching bully prevention skills.

**Teacher and staff training.** The teacher and staff training consisted of a 30-minute individual training on the BP-PBS components based on the curriculum manual and focused on how to provide the bully prevention lessons to students and how to supervise instances of bullying behavior. The training took place in each teacher’s classroom during their planning time. Training included digital handouts (e.g., BP-PBS Student Curriculum) and a PowerPoint presentation on the BP-PBS curriculum components. In addition to the 30-min training, staff (e.g., specials teachers) who were directly involved with the targeted setting and students
received a 15-20-min training on supervising behavior when outside the classroom. The additional training focused on Lesson 6 of the BP-PBS curriculum, which focused on supervising behavior during routines in target settings. The researcher reviewed with staff the implementation procedures that included in the implementation fidelity checklist and trained them to implement steps involved in implementing the intervention procedures.

Teachers and staff received the BP-PBS implementation procedures sheet (Appendix F) that could reference during student training and intervention in targeted settings. The information sheet provided the teachers and staff with the steps required to deliver the lessons and implement the intervention procedures during interactions with target students. The researcher used behavior skills training procedures during training, which included instruction, modeling, rehearsal, and minor feedback. Instruction involved training the staff on the BP-PBS curriculum and providing expectations for the training activity. Modeling occurred when discussing pre-correction procedures, 3-step response, and responding to reports of bullying. The teachers rehearsed pre-correction procedures, 3-step response, and responding to reports of bullying with the researcher, and the researcher provided positive/corrective feedback during this time.

**Student training.** Upon completion of the training, each classroom teacher provided training to the entire class including the target students within one week after the staff was trained with the exception of classroom 3. The researcher provided the training to the classroom students due to difficulties with obtaining 80% consent forms. The eight students (50%) with consent were pulled for specials and lunch to receive the training from the researcher. During training, the BP-PBS curriculum Lessons 1-5 was delivered to the students over a 3 to 5 day period. The teachers taught Lesson 1 the first day, Lessons 2 and 3 the second day, and Lessons 4 and 5 on the third day so as not to cut in to academic time during an activity period. The
researcher created a PowerPoint presentation based on the curriculum manual to provide assistance to the teachers when presenting the material. Students were taught how to use and respond to the Stop/Walk/Talk response and practiced using the response techniques in groups. During this training phase, the target students were observed in the target and generalization settings, and data on bullying and victim response to bullying were collected. Fidelity of student training was ensured by the researcher’s presence and/or audio recording during training; the researcher stepped in if needed and the sessions were audio-recorded for later scoring of the training fidelity and IOA assessment.

**Implementation.** Upon completion of all training, the full implementation phase began. Prior to engaging in the morning routine the teachers spent 5-10 min going over expectations and procedures of BP-PBS. Teachers and staff members who interacted with students in the target setting implemented Lesson 6, supervising behavior procedures listed in the implementation fidelity checklist. Staff checked in with the target students (victims and bullies) at the beginning and the end of the routines in the target settings to review expectations, remind them how to respond during bullying situations, and deliver verbal praise to students who used the response technique appropriately. Staff responded to reports of bullying behavior by reinforcing the student for reporting the bullying incident and discussing whether or not the student reporting the inappropriate behavior asked the individual to stop or walk away. Staff also modeled the behavior and encouraged its use if the student did not use the response techniques and bullying continued to occur. They also addressed the student engaging in disrespectful behavior by reviewing and rehearsing the appropriate responses (e.g., stop when asked). Data on bullying and victim response to bullying were collected until data were stable or showed a decreasing or increasing trend. At the conclusion of the intervention, teachers and staff were asked to
complete the BP-PBS Acceptability Questionnaire and the students were asked to complete the Student Experience Survey again.

**Generalization and Follow-Up**

Generalization probes were conducted in one non-target setting (cafeteria) during baseline, intervention, and follow-up phases to examine whether student use of strategies generalized to the non-target setting. To determine whether changes in target children’s behavior were maintained after termination of intervention, 1-week follow-up data were collected.
Chapter 3:

Results

Bullying

The instances of bullying for all three targeted bullies are displayed in Figure 3. All three students engaged in instances of bullying during baseline. Across all students, data indicated an immediate decrease in bullying behavior during the training phase and a further decrease or maintenance during the implementation phase across target settings. Except for one or two sessions, zero instances of bullying were observed in training and implementation sessions. Positive changes in their bullying behavior were also observed during both training and intervention implementation phases in non-trained generalization settings. In baseline, Damian’s bullying averaged 3 instances (range, 2 to 4) during 20-min classroom academic time, 4 instances (range 2 to 6) during specials, and 5 instances during generalization in the cafeteria. Damian displayed a moderately high increasing trend in bullying during this phase. Pedro engaged in an average of 7 instances of bullying (range, 2 to 14) during classroom activity sessions, an average of 11.75 instances (range, 5 to 21) during specials, and an average of 9.5 instances (range, 6 to 13) during generalization in the cafeteria. Pedro’s data were somewhat variable, but showed an increasing trend in bullying during baseline. Cassie’s bullying averaged 3.18 instances (range, 2 to 6) during structured class activities, 4.4 instances (range, 3 to 7) during specials, and 5.7 instances (range, 2 to 8) during generalization probes in the cafeteria.
Cassie had a slightly variable trend across the structured class activity and specials, but an increasing trend during generalization in the cafeteria.

A reduction in instances of bullying was seen across all three students after introducing the BP-PBS curriculum training. Damian’s bullying dramatically decreased upon participation in training, demonstrating a zero occurrence in 4 out 5 sessions during the target classroom setting and a zero occurrence in both two sessions during the second target setting, specials during this phase. His bullying averaged 0.67 instances (range, 0 to 2) in the highly structured classroom activity sessions, 0 instances in specials, and an average of 1.5 instances (range, 1 to 2) during the generalization probe in the cafeteria. It should be noted that the increase seen in session 8 and session 14 were days when Damian was not on his medication. Another potential variable that might have affected his behavior in sessions 13 and 14 would be a change in their schedule; they were testing days so Damian was observed in a setting similar to Pedro’s morning routine during which Damian would eat breakfast, unpack, do bell work, and listen to teacher announcements.

During the training phase, Pedro was also observed to have an immediate profound decrease in instances of bullying during the moderately structured morning routine and specials, but a moderate decrease during generalization probes in the cafeteria. Pedro had an average of 0.33 instances of bullying (range, 0 to 1) in the classroom sessions, an average of 2 instances (range, 1 to 3) in specials, and an average of 6 instances in the non-target cafeteria setting. Lastly, Cassie also displayed an immediate decrease in instances of bullying in the training phase with an average of 0.33 instances (range 0 to 1) during classroom activities, 1 instance of bullying in specials, and 1 instance of bullying during generalization in the cafeteria.

Further reduction in instances of bullying was observed upon full implementation of the BP-PBS curriculum across students. In the intervention implementation phase, Damian displayed
zero instances of bullying during the structured class activity except for one session, 0.33 (range, 0 to 1), instances in specials and 0.5 instances (range, 0 to 1) during generalization in the cafeteria. Pedro was observed to have near zero instances of bullying across training and implementation sessions, with an average of 0.2 instances (range, 0 to 1), in the moderately structured classroom setting, 0.33 instances in specials (range, 0 to 1), and 2 instances (range, 1 to 3) during generalization in the cafeteria. Lastly, Cassie displayed zero levels of bullying in the highly structured 20 min session, 0.33 instances (range, 0 to 1) in specials, and 0 instances during generalization in the cafeteria.

Follow up probes were conducted one week after the intervention phase ended during which the students had no access to the pre-correction and supervision provided by the BP-PBS curriculum. Across two out of the three students, the follow-up data indicated that the reduced levels of bullying remained with zero occurrences. Follow-up data were not collected for Pedro due to his absence on the two days following spring break.

**Victim Response to Bullying**

Data on appropriate active and inappropriate responses are displayed in Figures 4 and 5 for all three targeted victims, it is important to note that the sessions with no data points in the graphs denote no opportunity to respond for the victims. During baseline all three victims displayed zero instances of appropriate active responses in both target settings with an exception of one session in the second target setting (specials) for Charlie. All students displayed 100% of inappropriate responses except for one session during specials for Charlie.

Charlie appropriately responded to instances of bullying on average 5% of the time (0% in classroom, 20% in specials, and 0% in cafeteria) while inappropriate responding averaged 95% (range, 80% to 100%) across settings. Charlie had a range of 0 to 5 opportunities to respond
per session in baseline. Maddie’s appropriate response was 0% while inappropriate response was 100% across all settings during baseline. Maddie had a range of 0 to 2 opportunities to respond per session during baseline. Lastly, Sydney’s appropriately responded to instances of bullying 0% of the time while inappropriately responding 100% across all settings during baseline. Sydney had a range of 0 to 2 opportunities to respond per session.

In both the BP-PBS curriculum training and implementation phases, all three victim students did not have any opportunities to respond to bullying except for two training sessions in one target setting for Charlie and one implementation session during the non-targeted setting for Sydney due to zero instances of bullying toward them by the target bullies. During the two sessions in the training phase when Charlie had the opportunities to respond to bullying in one target setting (specials), Charlie demonstrated an average of 75% appropriate responses while demonstrating an average of 25% inappropriate responses. Charlie had a range of 0 to 2 opportunities per session to respond in the target setting; however, he had no opportunity to respond in the generalization setting. Maddie did not have any opportunities to respond to bullying in both phases across target settings, and had one opportunity to respond to bullying in the generalization setting during which she failed to appropriately respond to the bullying behavior. Lastly, Sydney had one opportunity in one session during a generalization probe to respond to bullying. She demonstrated appropriate responding during that situation.

The follow up probe for Charlie depicted zero opportunity to respond to bullying due to zero occurrences of bullying among the target bully. Maddie had zero opportunity to respond due to Pedro’s absence during follow-up. Data on Sydney was not collected due to the Title 9 class change.
Student Perceptions and Attitudes on Bullying

The students’ perceptions of their schools level of safety and respect were assessed via a pre-post intervention survey. Table 1 shows the results for each student’s pre/post survey results. In most cases the students rated the school’s positive climate as moderate prior to intervention and high post intervention. Prior to implementation of the BP-PBS curriculum, 3 or 4 out of 6 students indicated Strongly Agree or Agree to the following survey questions (4 out of 10 questions): “I feel safe”, “I treat other students respectfully”, “Adults treat me respectfully”, and “I treat adults in my school respectfully”. Only one student indicated Agree to “Other students treat me respectfully”. After BP-PBS intervention 5 out of 6 students indicated Strongly Agree or Agree to the question, “I feel safe.” 3 to 6 out of 6 students indicated Strongly Agree or Agree and all students indicated Strongly Agree or Agree to the following survey questions (3 out of 10 questions): “I treat other students respectfully”, “Adults treat me respectfully”, and “I treat adults in my school respectfully”. Only one student indicated Agree to “Other students treat me respectfully”; 3 students indicated I don’t Agree or Disagree.

On the other hand, prior to implementation of the BP-PBS curriculum, 4 out of the 6 students indicated the following survey questions: “Students have treated me disrespectfully 7-10+ times” and “I have seen someone else treated disrespectfully 7-10+ times” The following survey questions were indicated by 2 out of the 6 students: “I have asked someone else to stop 4-9 times”, “Someone else has asked me to stop 4-9 times”, and “I have helped someone else walk away from disrespectful behavior 4-9 times”. After BP-PBS intervention only 2 out of the 6 students indicated the following survey questions: “Students have treated me disrespectfully 7-10+ times” and “I have seen someone else treated disrespectfully 7-10+ times”. 4 out of 6 students indicated the following survey questions: “I have asked someone else to stop 4-9 times”.
No students indicated “Someone else has asked me to stop 4-9 times”, and two students indicated “I have helped someone else walk away from disrespectful behavior 4-9 times”.

**Social Validity**

Three teachers completed the social validity questionnaire which was scored on a six-point Likert scale, a higher score indicating higher satisfaction. All teachers indicated that they were satisfied with the intervention. The overall mean rating was 5.17 out of 6. Table 2 presents an individual breakdown for the results by each teacher and question.
Chapter 4:

Discussion

The results obtained from this study further support the use of BP-PBS to reduce bullying when used in conjunction with SWPBS. The results of the study indicate that BP-PBS was successfully implemented by school personnel in a school with low implementation fidelity of SWPBS and the supervision components of BP-PBS and was functionally related to the reduction of bullying behavior in all three targeted students and the increase in appropriate responding and decrease in inappropriate responding by all three target victims. Generalization of the intervention to non-trained settings and maintenance of the improved behavior were observed in all participants. BP-PBS was also effective in increasing some of the participating students’ perceptions and attitudes toward overall safety and respect, demonstrating high social validity by participating teachers and staff. It is important to note that the teachers stated they had also seen a positive impact of the BP-PBS curriculum on students who were not targeted for data collection. Teacher 1 and 2, had also made posters relating to Stop/Walk/Talk and had them hung in their classrooms and incorporated the program into their morning commitment routine.

It is interesting to note that the intervention was effective for bullying behavior possibly maintained by attention from peers and adults due to the intervention’s attention component. The bullies are provided attention in the form of being asked to “stop” and the teacher’s supervision process (e.g., pulling the bully aside and discussing the Stop/Walk/Talk, modeling, and role playing). The intervention could have been effective due to the type, quality, and location of the
attention provided. After baseline, the attention received by victims/peers was only the word “stop” versus engaging with the bully removing the highly reactive responses. The attention provided by teachers was no longer verbal reprimand in front of the entire classroom; instead, the teacher would discuss the student’s behavior one on one away from their peers. This could contribute to the effectiveness of the intervention for attention maintained bullying.

The results demonstrate that the BP-PBS program has vast utility for the schools. The process showed dramatic changes in bullying behavior through the use of this curriculum which addressed the limitations of standalone bullying programs that may increase incidents of bullying and that are primarily reactive and difficult to implement and sustain (Good et al., 2011). BP-PBS is a free curriculum that takes approximately a week to train students on and the changes in student behavior can maintain even after a week of no school as shown in the current study. This curriculum was found to be socially valid by the teachers, who found it easy to implement and positively affect behavior in the classroom, and recommended it for use by other teachers.

This study incorporated a FBA to determine the possible function of bullying for each individual and to examine whether BP-PBS was effective in addressing bullying maintained by the identified functions. The FBA results indicated that all three target students’ bullying behavior was maintained by peer or adult attention, and BP-PBS was effective in reducing the frequency of their bullying. Ross and Horner (2009) hypothesized that their participants’ bullying behavior was maintained by peer attention. However, the authors did not conduct a FBA to confirm their hypotheses, this study expanded on their limitation.

This study was one of the first to use BP-PBS as a Tier 2 intervention across students in three different classes at the same school, suggesting that BP-PBS could be used as a Tier 2 intervention within classrooms struggling with bullying behaviors. Ross and Horner (2009) used
BP-PBS as a Tier 2 intervention implemented with a total of 1,227 students in three schools. The teachers in this study were able to implement this program with fidelity after brief training and found it to be socially valid, BP-PBS may be easy to implement, potentially being more marketable to teachers in the future.

This study incorporated one unstructured generalization setting (cafeteria), which demonstrated decreases in bullying behavior after intervention. This study also targeted structured settings (classroom, specials) and found BP-PBS to be effective in improving student behaviors during the structured instructional time periods. This is one of the first studies to incorporate data collection across settings during BP-PBS intervention. Ross and Horner (2009) discussed a limitation of their study with regard to their data which might not have been representative of other unstructured settings in the school. This study addressed that concern.

This study incorporated one follow up data point taken one week after intervention phases for two individuals. The follow up data indicated that the changes in bullying behavior were maintained for two out of the three students. Additional research on sustainability should be conducted. The follow up data addressed another limitation of the study by Ross and Horner (2009), which was the lack of data on potential sustainability of BP-PBS.

**Future Research**

There are several areas highlighted by this study in need of future research. The sustainability of BP-PBS over an extended time period would be beneficial to target as future research, this would allow us to know if booster trainings are required to ensure lasting changes in bullying behavior. The effectiveness of BP-PBS across multiple settings should also be a focus point for future research as only one study has provided research on multiple settings. It would be interesting to determine the effectiveness of BP-PBS with students from kindergarten
to third grade and students with more severe disability (self-contained classes). Lastly, as stated in Ross and Horner (2009), a future line of research would be necessary to focus on bullying behaviors maintained by other functions (e.g., access to tangibles).

**Limitations**

This study has several potential limitations to be considered in interpreting the results. First, there were only three classrooms involved in this study. To demonstrate the generality of BP-PBS, the intervention should be replicated with additional classrooms and students. Second, potential reactivity could have played a role in the results obtained; in several situations, students were aware that they were being observed and also commented on the researcher or data collector presence. Third, the frequency of bullying behavior could have been under-recorded due to the fact that in certain situations the bully was hard to understand due to noise (cafeteria). In a few instances the researcher had to rely on the response of the victim or peers to determine if the behavior being observed was an instance of bullying. Fourth, the IOA for several students was collected by the teachers due to the need of IOA but scheduling conflicts with the research assistants. The fifth limitation occurred with the third victim, Sydney, due to a Title 9 issue she was removed from the target and generalization settings that she shared with bully 3, Cassie. Sydney was observed in a different routine with other students who engaged in bullying behaviors to determine if appropriate responding increased during training and implementation phases. Another potential limitation for this study is the lack of generalization probe data points in the second target setting (specials) and the generalization setting (cafeteria), the small number of data points during full implementation, and the lack of adequate follow-up data. The additional data points could have shown a more definitive functional relationship across settings.
Lastly, no follow-up data for Pedro is a potential limitation; however, due to his absence in the two days following spring break the opportunity to collect follow-up data was not available.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the BP-PBS curriculum demonstrated a reduction in peer or adult attention maintained bullying behavior and increase in appropriate victim responding as well as increase in overall feelings of safety and respect at the school for target students. This study addressed several future research concerns from previous studies (Ross & Horner, 2009) and has several potential limitations of its own. As found in Ross and Horner’s study and further confirmed through this research, BP-PBS can potentially become an intervention that meets several needs in one package: reduction of problem behavior, increase in appropriate behaviors, ease of implementation, and acceptability.
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Tables
Table 1.

Result of student experience survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Damian</th>
<th>Charlie</th>
<th>Pedro</th>
<th>Maddie</th>
<th>Cassie</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel safe.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other students treat me respectfully.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I treat other students respectfully.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adults treat me respectfully.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I treat adults in my school respectfully.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How many times have other students treated you disrespectfully?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How many times did you someone else treated disrespectfully?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How many times did you ask someone else to &quot;stop&quot;?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How many times did someone ask you to &quot;stop&quot;?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How many times did you help someone walk away from disrespectful behavior?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2.

Result of social validity survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>Teacher 2</th>
<th>Teacher 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. BP-PBS improved the behavior in the classroom.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. BP-PBS was worth the time and effort of implementation.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would recommend the use of BP-PBS to others.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. BP-PBS is reasonable and easy to implement.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figures
Figure 1. Bullying antecedents across bullies (FBA data).
Figure 2. Bullying consequences across bullies (FBA data).
Figure 3. Number of bullying in two target settings and one generalization setting across phases and participants (bullies).
Figure 4. Percentage of appropriate active responses in two target settings and in one generalization setting across phases and participants (victims).

Note. Sessions without data points denote zero opportunity for responding.
Figure 5. Percentage of inappropriate responses in two target settings and in one generalization setting across phases and participants (victims).

Note. Sessions without data points denote zero opportunity for responding.
Appendices
Appendix A: Teacher Interview for Student Nomination

1. What type of bullying behavior does the student engage in?

2. How often does the student engage in bullying behavior?

3. How severe is the bullying behavior?

4. In what problematic settings does the bullying occur?

5. Have you observed patterns of bullying behavior?

6. What do you think the student gets out of bullying?

7. Is there a particular student that is the victim of the bullying behavior?

8. Are there any additional comments/information you wish to provide?
Appendix B: Interval Recording Sheet

Child Name(s): ___________________ Observer: _______ Date: _______
Routine/Activity: ________________

Target Behaviors: Bullying (bully), Appropriate Response (victim), and Inappropriate Response (victim)

Type: Frequency-within-interval

Directions: 1. Whenever the time interval is signaled, record the number of occurrences of each target behavior. 2. Calculate the total number for each target behavior.

Code: + (occurrence) - (nonoccurrence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min</th>
<th>15 s</th>
<th>30 s</th>
<th>45 s</th>
<th>60 s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B1: Bullying

(+ occurrence, - non occurrence)

B2: Victim Response

(+ appropriate, - inappropriate)

Total number of Intervals: _______
Total number of bullying (B1): ______
Total number of appropriate responses (B2a): _______
Total number of inappropriate responses (B2b): _______
Percentage of appropriate responses (B2a): _____%
Percentage of inappropriate responses (B2b): _____%
Appendix C: Teacher Training Fidelity Checklist

Teacher Training Fidelity Checklist

Trainer: _______  Date: ______________  Recorder: ___________

Setting: ____________  Start Time: ____________  End Time: ____________

*Note: For quality, mark ‘N’ if any part is missing. For Items 3-6, mark ‘NA’ if no problem behavior occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Was the intervention implemented? (Adherence)</th>
<th>Was the intervention done accurately? (Quality)</th>
<th>Fidelity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Arrival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Was an agenda displayed/provided?</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Were packets/handouts ready for the teacher?</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Was the meeting started on time?</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Introduction to Bulling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Prompted the discussion of what is bullying, behaviors to increase/decrease?</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Used open ended questions</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Introduction to BP-PBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Discussed the history and basis of BP-PBS?</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Allowed the teachers to engage in discussion and ask questions about BP-PBS?</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Was the instructor knowledgeable of the BP-PBS program and seem comfortable with the topic?</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teach Social Responsibility Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Teach stop/walk/talk response</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Model stop/walk/talk response</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rehearse stop/walk/talk response</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teach Supervision Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Check-in with target victim at the beginning of the routine</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Check-in with target victim at the beginning of the routine</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Deliver reinforcement</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) Model and have target students practice the social responsibility skills if experience of bullying continues
5) Respond to reports of bullying
6) Pull student exhibiting bullying aside and thank student for stepping aside
7) Check-in with target victim at the end of the routine
8) Check-in with target perpetrators at the end of the routine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Review Implementation Procedure Worksheet and Fidelity Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Reviewed implementation procedure worksheet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Review implementation fidelity worksheet?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Role Play Bullying Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Discussed whether examples were bullying and how the teacher responded?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Did the instructor model, rehearse, and provide feedback to the teacher?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Provide Teachers with PowerPoint to Teach BP-PBS to Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Answer questions/provide coaching for teaching students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Presentation/Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Was off task discussion brought back to current topic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Did the instructor engage the teacher in frequent role play and activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Was descriptive praise provided to the teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Did the instructor answer questions/leave an appropriate amount of time for questions at the end of the session?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Scores (Total Y’s/Total Y’s + N’s in column)

Total Implementation/Fidelity Score (Total Y’s/Total Y’s + N’s across 2 domains)
Appendix D: Student Training Fidelity Checklist

Student Training Fidelity Checklist

Teacher/Staff Code: __________ Date: ______________ Recorder: __________

Setting: ______________ Start Time: __________ End Time: ______________

*Note: For quality, mark ‘N’ if any part is missing. For Items 3-6, mark ‘NA’ if no problem behavior occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Was the intervention implemented? (Adherence)</th>
<th>Was the intervention done accurately? (Quality)</th>
<th>Fidelity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/N = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA/NA = NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Introduce BP-PBS curriculum
   1) Review school-wide expectations and rules
   2) Respectful and disrespectful behavior
   Y / N / NA  Y / N / NA

2. Lesson 1
   1) Teach Stop, model, rehearse, examples
   2) Teach Walk, model, rehearse, examples
   3) Teach Talk, model, rehearse, examples
   4) Review stop, walk, talk
   Y / N / NA  Y / N / NA

3. Lesson 2
   1) Review stop, walk, talk
   2) How to respond to stop, walk, talk
   3) Group practice
   4) Review
   Y / N / NA  Y / N / NA

4. Lesson 3
   1) Example of gossip
   2) Group practice
   3) Review
   Y / N / NA  Y / N / NA

5. Lesson 4
   1) Example of inappropriate remarks
   2) Group practice
   3) Review
   Y / N / NA  Y / N / NA

6. Lesson 5
   1) Example of cyber bullying
   2) Group practice
   3) Review
   Y / N / NA  Y / N / NA

7. Questions and PowerPoint
   Y / N / NA  Y / N / NA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Did the teacher answer questions from student or ask the researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for assistance if the answer was unknown?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Did the teacher use the PowerPoint provided to them by the researcher?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Scores (Total Y’s/Total Y’s + N’s in column)**

**Total Implementation/Fidelity Score**
(Total Y’s/Total Y’s + N’s across 2 domains)
# Appendix E: Implementation Fidelity Checklist

## Implementation Fidelity Checklist

Teacher/Staff Code: _______  Date: ______________  Recorder: ______________

Setting: ____________  Start Time: ____________  End Time: ____________

*Note: For quality, mark ‘N’ if any part is missing. For Items 3-6, mark ‘NA’ if no problem behavior occurred.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Was the intervention implemented? (Adherence)</th>
<th>Was the intervention done accurately? (Quality)</th>
<th>Fidelity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Check-in with Target Victim at the Beginning of the Routine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Review school-wide expectations and rules</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Remind how to respond to bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Check-In with Target Perpetrators at the Beginning of the Routine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Review school-wide expectations and rules</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Remind how to respond if another student tells them to stop or walk away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Deliver reinforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Actively look for students engaging in the stop/walk/talk response and provide verbal praise</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td>Y / N / NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Provide verbal praise to the target perpetrator if engaging in taught response (i.e., taking a breath, stopping bullying behavior, leaving the situation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Model and Have Target Students Practice the Social Responsibility Skills if Experience of Bullying Continues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Model the 3-step response and have students practice each of stop/walk/talk response technique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Have students practice how to encourage one another when they use the appropriate response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Respond to Reports of Bullying**

1) Reinforce the student for reporting the bullying behavior (i.e., “I am glad you told me”)
2) Ask who, what, when, and where
3) Ensure the student’s safety
4) Ask the student if he or she told the perpetrator to stop or walked away from the problem behavior
5) Praise the student for using an appropriate response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y / N / NA</th>
<th>Y / N / NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. **Pull Student Exhibiting Bullying Aside and Thank Student for Stepping Aside:**

1) Ask if peer told them to stop or walked away (e.g., “Did __ tell you to stop? “Did __ walk away?”)
2) If says, yes, ask “How did you respond” and model/rehearse appropriate response if response was not appropriate
3) If says, no, have the student practice the response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y / N / NA</th>
<th>Y / N / NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. **Check-in with Target Victim at the End of the Routine**

1) Discuss how it went and reinforce their efforts

8. **Check-in with Target Perpetrators at the End of the Routine**

1) Discuss how it went and reinforce their efforts

**Implementation Scores (Total Y’s/Total Y’s + N’s in column)**

**Total Implementation/Fidelity Score (Total Y’s/Total Y’s + N’s across 2 domains)**
Appendix F: BP-PBS Implementation Checklist

**BP-PBS Implementation Checklist**

1. **Check-in with Target Victim at the Beginning of the Routine**
   3) Review school-wide expectations and rules
   4) Remind how to respond to bullying

2. **Check-In with Target Perpetrators at the Beginning of the Routine**
   5) Review school-wide expectations and rules
   6) Remind how to respond if another student tells them to stop or walk away

3. **Deliver reinforcement**
   5) Actively look for students engaging in the stop/walk/talk response and provide verbal praise
   6) Provide verbal praise to the target perpetrator if engaging in taught response (i.e., taking a breath, stopping bullying behavior, leaving the situation)

4. **Respond to Reports of Bullying**
   4) Reinforce the student for reporting the bullying behavior (i.e., “I am glad you told me”)
   5) Ask who, what, when, and where
   6) Ensure the student’s safety
   7) Ask the student if he or she told the perpetuator to stop or walked away from the problem behavior
   8) Praise the student for using an appropriate response

5. **Pull Student Exhibiting Bullying Aside and Thank Student for Stepping Aside:**
   4) Ask if peer told them to stop or walked away (e.g., “Did __ tell you to stop? “Did __ walk away?”)
   5) If says, yes, ask “How did you respond” and model/rehearse appropriate response if response was not appropriate
   6) If says, no, have the student practice the response

6. **Model and Have Target Students Practice the Social Responsibility Skills if Experience of Bullying Continues**
   1) Model the 3-step response and have students practice each of stop/walk/talk response technique
   2) Have students practice how to encourage one another when they use the appropriate response

7. **Check-in with Target Victim at the End of the Routine**
   3) Discuss how it went and reinforce their efforts

8. **Check-in with Target Perpetrators at the End of the Routine**
   2) Discuss how it went and reinforce their efforts
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