

Evaluation of Implementing Dignity for All in 2019 Academic Year

Prepared by

Elaine M. Walker, PhD

Sametric Research

August 2019

Elainewalker@sametric.com

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

Findings from the first year of implementing Dignity for All (DFA) indicated that on average, DFA provided an effective approach for addressing the ongoing dilemma of anti-social behaviors. Conducted in Brooklyn, New York, the evaluation study revealed that students benefitted from their participation in the program-developing skills to address anti-bullying efforts. However, a major shortcoming of that study was the absence of a control group against whose performance the effects of DFA could be reliably measured. To correct for this, during year 2 of implementation, a comparison school, located in the same neighborhood as the implementing site was selected. This evaluation delineates the study effects of implementation during year 2 based on the comparison school. In addition, the report contains feedback received from teachers who were responsible for delivering the curriculum throughout the academic year. As previously noted in our first evaluation report, the DFA curriculum is premised on a trauma-informed understanding of the etiology of bullying, drawing upon multiple theoretical frameworks embedded in fields as diverse as neuroscience and the social sciences.

EVALUATION SITES

The present evaluation drew upon data collected from two middle schools. The implementing site, MS354, was located in Brooklyn, NY and had a student population that was: 78 percent African-Americans, 30 percent special need and nine percent English Language Learners. Students in the comparison school, were from - The Ronald Edmonds Learning Center II- had approximately 159 grades 6 through 8 students enrolled in 2018. The percentage of students in the middle school were 75 percent African-Americans, 22 percent Hispanics and three percent other.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The evaluation was informed by one overarching purpose, which was to examine the effects of DFA on increasing students' understanding of bullying and other social emotional issues. In doing this, the evaluators sought to gain some understanding into how implementation progressed over the course of the academic year. The evaluation relied on a design in which students in MS 375 were compared to students in the control school. In conducting these analyses controls were entered for other covariates - such as percent Hispanics, grade, age and gender.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Our findings indicate that DFA students outperform control group students in their understanding of the ameliorative consequences of bullying and the key steps to employ when this occurs. We found that DFA students were significantly more inclined to identify key steps that can be utilized to help students and their bullies out of problematic situations. This did not mean that students in the control school were not aware of what some of these consequences could be. However, unlike the DFA students, control students did not have the necessary skills and competencies for assisting students.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, DFA was a preventative strategy that worked.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	ii
Introduction	1
Background	1
Dignity for All: Overview	1
Evaluation Methodology.....	2
Evaluation Approach.....	2
Evaluation Tools and Data Analysis	3
Study Findings	3
Baseline Equivalence Between MS354 and Comparison Schools.....	3
Primary Outcomes: Changes in Participants’ Knowledge, Attitudes toward Bullying and Behavior	3
Changes in Knowledge and Attitudes About Bullying.....	3
Changes in Bullying Behavior Indicators	7
Cyberbullying	8
Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations	9
References	10
Appendix A - Instruments	11
Table A.1- Copy of Questionnaire	11
Appendix B – Baseline Equivalency Studies.....	19
Table B.1 – Baseline Equivalency Tables.....	19

INTRODUCTION

Background

As intimated in the first evaluation report of implementing DFA at MS 354, an increasing number of students, approximately 20%, report being bullied at some point between 2015 and 2016. The likelihood for victimization was more likely to occur in the middle grades (grade 6 – 31 percent; grade 7 -25 percent and grade 8- 22 percent) than in high schools where the rates ranged from 15 percent to 21 percent. The ethnic background of those bullied indicates that about 24.7% were African-Americans, and 21.6% were whites. These students were more likely to have been bullied than Asian (15.6 percent) and Hispanic students (17.2 percent). Furthermore, the incidences of bullying were likely to be more prevalent in urban (21 percent) and suburban school systems (21 percent) than in rural settings (15 percent). The deleterious effects of bullying have been well demonstrated in the literature. For example, bullying has been shown to have adverse consequences for the victim, those who witness an incidence, the perpetrator, schools and classrooms both in the short and long run. Victims, for example, are more likely to suffer from psychosocial maladjustment, low self-esteem, feelings of loneliness, school avoidance, poor academic achievement and health. On the other hand, bullies are prone to exhibit other harmful behaviors such as elevated levels of substance abuse, impulsivity and delinquency, and like victims' experience- feelings of suicidal ideation (Swearer et al., 2009). The deleterious effects associated with bullying also are evident in the psychosocial health of witnesses. Students who witness bullying have been found to suffer from feelings of anxiety, as well as what some authors describes as interpersonal sensitivity ; and schools in which bullying is pervasive tend to have a negative school climate. (Should we cite reference here)

Common to most understanding of bullying is the notion that it taps into an element of aggressive behavior that includes an imbalance of power- which distinguishes it from other forms of aggression. According to Hymel and Swearer (2015), bullying behavior can either be observable or non-observable and could take the form of relational and social aggression, as well as physical aggression. Because of its complexity, numerous theories have been used to explain the motivation behind bullying behavior and its effects. They include social cognitive theories, as well as theories that focus on social capital, dominance, restorative justice and social skills to name a few. School- based prevention programs have focused on curriculum adoptions, whole school policies, developing empathy, parental involvement, emotional regulation, teacher training and restorative approaches. Not-with-standing, the progress that has been made in the last forty years, bullying remains a significant phenomenon in schools in both the US and abroad. As noted previously, the prevalence rate in the US is still moderately high with 1 in every 5 students reporting being victimized in schools.

Dignity for All: Overview

In our first-year report, we provided an overview of DFA. To encapsulate, DFA is a comprehensive standards-based whole school bullying prevention program. Premised on evidence from bullying research and findings in neuroscience, as well as constructs related to attachment and ecological systems theories, and mentalization-based therapy, DFA seeks to help students develop social and emotional skills. It accomplishes this by focusing on a number of critical elements that include working collaboratively with administrators, teachers, school staff, parents and students. For example, it fosters an understanding of the interpersonal dynamics of bullying, builds caring communities that encourage critical reflection, empathy and compassion; provide teachers with support and skills and create schools in which principles of restorative justice prevail.

Developed by the National Urban Technology Center, DFA is grounded in a trauma-informed approach to understanding and ameliorating bullying. The DFA curriculum embodies six principles frequently associated with trauma-informed care. These are: emotional and physical safety, trustworthiness and transparency, empowerment, peer support, collaboration, and cultural, historical and gender issues (SAMSHA, 2014). The curriculum spirals over three levels or quests where students are introduced to more complex attitudinal and behavioral strategies and information, as they move through the levels. In Quest 1, the focus is on building knowledge and awareness, Quest 2 seeks to impact attitudes and Quest 3, behavior. There are six core components to DFA: Professional Development, Classroom Support, Youth Leadership Academy (YLA) digital platform, parental/family engagement and Youth or Individual Level support. Ultimately, DFA seeks to create safe and supportive climates in which students will excel academically. In the short and medium terms, there are a number of expected outcomes for schools, classrooms, students, teachers and parents. These outcomes help to benchmark progress towards meeting the long-term goals of the program.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Evaluation Approach

The focus of the present evaluation was primarily to understand how DFA might have contributed to changes in students' understanding, knowledge and behavior. A secondary outcome was to determine from the teachers' perspective, how implementation unfolded during the secondary year. Two schools were recruited for the study. MS354 - The School of Integrated Learning- is a grade 6 through 8 middle school located in Brooklyn, New York. There are approximately 221 enrolled students-although the numbers this year is higher; 77% of whom are Black, 14% Hispanic and 9% other. Almost a third (30%) of students are identified as having special needs and 9% of the school population are English Language Learners. Among the teaching staff, approximately 88% have three or more years of experience. The school offers a wealth of extra and co-curricular activities and has established partnerships with a number of organizations. During the 2018-2019 academic year (the year for which the most current information is available) student attendance rate was 89% below the city's 94% rate; and about 34% of students were chronically absent in comparison to 19% citywide. Data on the economically disadvantaged status of the student body indicate for the 2019 academic year 90% were from disadvantaged backgrounds.

The second comparison school (MS113) - The Ronald Edmonds Learning Center II- had approximately 159 grades 6 through 8 students enrolled in 2018. Seventy-five percent of students were African Americans; 22% Hispanic and three percentage points other. Twenty-eight percent of students had a special needs and five percent spoke a language other than English. Approximately, 85% of teachers were assigned to the district for more than three years, and 97% attended school for more than one year. With regards to student attendance, 91% attended for the mandatory number of days (compared to 94% citywide) and 37% were chronically absent compared to 20% citywide. The school participates in a number of extra-curricular activities to include partnerships with the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, trips to Broadway shows among others. For the comparison school, no DFA activity was implemented.

Evaluation Tools and Data Analysis

Two data collection instruments were developed for this evaluation (See Appendix A). The primary instrument- Dignity for All Student Questionnaire - was administered in a pre/post format. There were a group of seventh and eighth graders who participated during the first year and for whom we have the first- year data. The instrument has five sections: (i) basic demographics; (ii) measurements of students' knowledge and attitudes toward bullying; (iii) students direct experience of bullying either as a victim or perpetrator; (iv) experience as a bystander and beliefs about the role of a bystander and (v) being a victim of cyberbullying and attitudes toward cyberbullying.

Before establishing the equivalence of the implementing and comparison groups, a series of baseline equivalence testing was done on the key demographic variables of gender, age, grade level, ethnicity and race. For all the baseline tests, with the exception of grade level testing, which relied on an independent t-test, a chi square analysis was conducted. For the outcomes related variables, a series of regression, correlation and basic demographic testing were used. Significance levels were based on a significance value of .05. In all the regression models, the covariates were used as control variables in the analyses. Interview data gathered from the focus group relied primarily on basic descriptive analysis. The presentation of the findings begins first with a brief description of the baseline equivalent testing. This is followed by a discussion of the implementation study. The primary variables of interest are the outcomes related ones. Discussion of these findings are included with an emphasis on how reliable they are for understanding DFA effects.

STUDY FINDINGS

Baseline Equivalence between MS354 and Comparison Schools

A series of analyses was conducted to establish the degree to which the implementing DFA school was comparable to the control school. The findings indicate that the schools were similar for gender but not for grade level, ethnicity and race. With regards to grade level, proportionately more students in the control school were older (12.60) compared to students in MS354 (11.66). Similarly, with regards to Hispanic origins, students in the control school were significantly higher (32.8%) than students in MS354 (21.1%); but were less diverse in their racial makeup (Refer to Appendix B for the table on equivalence testing). Given these results, these variables were used in our regression analyses of program effects.

Primary Outcomes: Changes in Participants' Knowledge, Attitudes toward Bullying and Behavior

The evaluation allowed us to test whether the hypothesized relationships in the logic model were met. In testing these hypotheses, we collected, as stated previously, data on 325 students who were in the implementing site and 151 in the control. For some of the outcomes variables there were missing values. These were excluded from the analyses.

Changes in Knowledge and Attitudes About Bullying

The DFA logic model hypothesizes that one is likely to see an improvement in student knowledge as a function of being exposed to the curriculum. In the study, students' knowledge about bullying was assessed at baseline (start of the 2018-2019 academic year) and again upon the immediate completion of the project (June 2019). Students were asked to define their understanding of what bullying

represented, if they had experienced being bullied (both in-person and online), and if they had helped someone who was being bullied. Findings from both the DFA school and the control school indicate that there were no differences between the two groups of students. At both the start of the academic year and at the conclusion both groups of students felt similarly. Specifically, students felt that while they understood what bullying meant, neither group had directly been involved, and both, about two thirds of all students, had helped someone who was being bullied.

Table 1

Predictors of Students' Understanding of Cyberbullying

Understanding Cyber Bullying	
<u>Variable</u>	<u>Model</u>
Constant	1.007
Age	-.023
Grade level	-.109
Gender	-.063
Hispanic	.065
Treatment (DFA versus Control)	.142*
<i>R Square</i>	.026
<i>F</i>	1.573

Note. $N=301$.

* $p < .041$.

With respect to how students felt about specific acts of bullying, one saw significant differences at the end of the academic year on the effects of cyberbullying. There were 11 items that measured students' understandings of how bullying and anti-social behaviors get manifested. On ten out of these items there were no significant differences- with the exception of cyberbullying. As can be seen from Table 1, students exposed to DFA, were more likely to conclude that the effects of cyberbullying are far more expansive than in a school setting. DFA students were more apt to indicate that cyberbullying is more inclined to occur in other environments (.142) than merely in a school. For all the other remaining items, students in both the DFA and non-DFA schools did not differ substantially in their perspectives. For example, we found minimal disagreement between the groups of students on items such as 'when we feel threatened, our brains cannot think critically'. Approximately, 61 percentage points for DFA students agreed to this question at the end of the academic year as well as 56% of students in the control. Although we had slightly more DFA students agreeing, the difference between the two groups was not significant.

Table 2

Percentage of Students' Beliefs about Bullying Upon Completion of Year 2

	<u>DFA Students</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Disbelief that it is OK to push someone if they get in your way.	90.0	93.3	-3.3
Disbelief that making fun of other students is just part of school.	83.4	90.0	-7.0*
It bothers me when I see someone get picked on.	86.7	68.0	18.7*
Disbelief that it can be fun to watch other kids get teased.	89.2	91.8	2.6
Disbelief that It is OK to keep other kids from joining a group.	80.9	84.1	-3.2
Disbelief that it is OK to tease kids who are not your friends.	95.5	94.9	.6
Disbelief that it is important to be part of a group even if it means you have to be mean to some kids.	92.1	87.7	4.4
Disbelief that it's OK to call someone names of you do not like the person.	90.3	87.6	2.7
Disbelief that it's not a big deal to make fun of someone.	89.8	87.4	2.4
Disbelief that some kids deserve to be pushed around.	82.9	87.8	-4.9 *
Disbelief that it is OK to tease other kids about the way they talk or look.	94.7	94.9	-.2
It is wrong to start a fight with someone.	56.4	59.2	-2.8
Disbelief that some kids deserve to be picked on.	85.9	86.5	-.6
It bothers me if other kids get beat up.	70.3	65.9	4.4
Disbelief that it is OK to tease someone if other kids are also doing it.	90.8	90.0	.8
It bothers me when other kids are teased.	67.5	60.5	7.0
Disbelief that spreading rumors about someone is a good way to get back at someone.	81.1	82.9	-1.8
It is wrong to hit other kids.	60.6	55.6	5.0 *
Disbelief that pushing someone around is a way to get respect from others.	91.8	94.1	2.3

Note. N=370, DFA & N=125, Control School

**P<. 05*

In Table 2, is reported for the 19 statements, the percent of students who were correct in their responses. These items sought to measure if students had accurate knowledge about bullying, its causes and how it is manifested. Students were asked to identify for each statement whether it was true, false or if they were unsure. An item analysis allowed us to pinpoint those specific misperceptions about bullying that students held, as well as those perspectives that were in fact accurate. The comparison allows us to determine how DFA students fared in response to students in the control school. Generally, there were not many significant differences between both groups of students. Students in the DFA site and those who were assigned to the comparison school felt similarly on most topics with the exception

of four: disbeliefs about making fun of other students, bothers a student when someone gets picked on, disbeliefs that some kids should get pushed around and it is wrong to hit other kids. DFA students were significantly more likely to believe that it is wrong to pick on someone (18.7) and it is wrong to hit other kids (5.0). On the other hand, students in the control site were more inclined to disbelief that making fun of others is part of school (-7.0) and that pushing other kids around was ok (- 4.9).

Table 3

Predictors of Students' Attitudes/Knowledge Towards Bullying

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Model</u>
Constant	-3.430**
Age	.255**
Grade level	.026
Gender	.049
Hispanic	.040
Treatment (DFA versus Control)	.165*
<i>R Square</i>	.049
<i>F</i>	2.507*

Note. N=247

** $p < .004$; * $p < .030$

Although the preliminary analysis above allowed us to determine the extent to which there were differences between the two groups of students, it did not allow us to test whether those difference persisted across conditions. The research on attitudes and their relationships to behaviors suggests that they are often considered antecedents to behaviors and are defined as either positive or negative evaluations of a given behavior. Within the field of bullying research, there are numerous studies that examine how favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward bullying are as they relate to bullying behavior. Thus, in this second stage, we examined whether the differences persisted when we controlled for other variables (condition (treatment versus control), gender, Hispanic status, age and grade level). Analyses of the psychometric two factor structure was reproduced in the present study. The first factor loaded 15 items (See Table 2). There were four items, which loaded differently than what Craven found. In the analyses we constructed two scales. For the first scale, we had a factor loading of .80; and for the second, .73. The second scale consisted of items such as: *It is wrong to hit other kids; It bothers me when other kids are teased; It bothers me if other kids get beat up and It is wrong to start a fight with someone*. The first scale had the remaining items.

Of the two scales, only the first was found to have a statistically significant effect on attitudes/knowledge. Specifically, once we controlled for the other variables, condition or whether the students had been exposed to a DFA curriculum, this explained their knowledge about bullying (See Table 3).

Students who were part of DFA (model regression equals .165), were more inclined to believe that picking on students and getting physical / social with them was incorrect.

Changes in Bullying Behavior Indicators

Our next questions of interest focused on the extent to which one was likely to see a reduction in bullying incidences as a function of implementing DFA. There were two sets of questions on this topic: first, the extent to which DFA participants engaged in bullying incidences with their fellow classmates; and second, what options, if any, they pursued with either someone they saw bullying, or they bullied themselves. With regards to the first question, we found no significant differences between students enrolled in a DFA school and those in the control. On every item listed, students' expression was similar- which was they engaged in fewer incidences of bullying over the course of the school year. However, when we examined how students responded to incidences of bullying, we saw significant differences between the DFA students and those in the control school. Evident in Table 4, are the ways in which students in the DFA site responded to bullying. Whether, the student was bullied, the victim of a bullying act, was the recipient of a bullying threat or simply a subject of an event, students in DFA site were significantly more likely to engage in a proactive response than a student in the control school. The average response for DFA students was about -.21, after controlling for age, grade level, gender and Hispanic origins (See Table 4).

Table 4

Predictors of Students' Reporting of their Responses to Bullying

Variable	Tried to Become Friends	Encourage Someone to tell an Adult	Defended the person who was being bullied	Tried to include that person with me and my friend
Constant	-381.49	-406.14***	-413.64*	-406.27*
Age	.217**	.225**	.228**	.226**
Grade level	-.045	-.043	-.041	.041
Gender	.056	.055	-.059	.059
Hispanic	-.011	-.009	-.007	-.007
Treatment (DFA versus Control)	-.212**	-.208**	-.214**	-.215**
<i>R Square</i>	.168	.170	.173	.173
<i>F</i>	11.448***	11.520***	11.823***	11.778***

Note. N=288

*** $p < .000$; ** $p < .005$, * $p < .05$

The extent to which DFA students felt that they have the internal requisite skills to prevent or stymie bullying can be seen from Table 5. On all seven items, DFA students were significantly more likely to believe that they possess the skills to deal with a bullying incident than students not exposed to DFA. For example, DFA students felt they have the skills to say something to bullies than students in a control

school. In fact when we look at the rating for DFA students, we see that their sense of competency in dealing with a difficult situation is around -.210. Similarly, when we examine DFA students' responses to helping someone out of a bullying situation the value was -.216. Students in a DFA school were significantly more likely to note that they can help a student who is being bullied.

Table 5

Predictors of DFA Students' Self-Inclined Responses to Incidences of Bullying

Variable	It's up to me to stop bullying	I have the skills to help a student who is being bullied	I know what to say to someone who is bullying someone else	I can say something to a kid who is being mean to another kid	I can help someone out of a situation when they are being bullied	Even if I don't bully others, it is still up to me to try and stop it	I would tell my friends to stop doing or saying mean things I see or hear them
Constant	-400.79*	-.448.66*	-.485.08*	-395.02*	-404.28*	-399.97*	-410.36*
Age	.225**	.243**	.243**	.223**	.226**	.224**	.227**
Grade level	-.045	-.020	-.033	-.040	-.040	-.038	-.348
Gender	.056	.053	.093	.057	.058	.056	.056
Hispanic	-.009	-.009	-.003	-.009	-.011	-.011	-.008
Treatment (DFA versus Control)	-.210**	-.216**	-.212**	-.213**	-.211**	-.213**	-.211**
<i>R Square</i>	.171	.174	.180	.170	.170	.170	.170
<i>F</i>	11.687***	11.893***	12.385***	11.573***	11.553***	11.520***	11.570***

Note. $N=288$

*** $p<.000$; ** $p<.005$, * $p<.05$

Cyberbullying

Our final analysis was on cyberbullying. Cyberbullying, which occurs with a digital device, has increasingly become a critical issue among the school-aged population. In this study, we looked at the extent to which students who had been exposed to DFA first had a position on cyberbullying that differed from their control students; and second, whether they or their friends had experienced themselves cyberbullying acts. With regards to the first question, we found no difference between the DFA students and their control students. Both groups of students felt that cyberbullying was prevalent, sending pictures/text messages over the internet occurred, and sending other students' names online got them in trouble. With regards to the second question, we found there was only one area with differences. Specifically, we found that students in the DFA school were more apt to identify that friends

of theirs have been cyberbullied. In comparison to 76% of students in the control school who did not select any of their friends being cyberbullied, in the DFA school, only 50% of students identified that choice.

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The evidence from the present study yields positive results for DFA. Indeed, the findings suggests that on average, DFA was an effective preventative strategy when compared with the control school. Students in the DFA program were definitely more apt to have a battery of tools and communication strategies that were used with students in their schools. Although there were no differences on some indicators between the DFA and control sites, on all the other key indicators these distinctions were important. We did not find these differences to be important as they spoke to the general importance of bullying in all schools. However, what we found to be important, were the significant differences between the DFA site and the control school. In the DFA site, most of the significant critical distinctions addressed the importance of actors engaging in activities that would prevent the furtherance of anti-social behavior. Bullying has a number of adverse consequences. Some have argued that it can result in a number of co-occurring negative outcomes affecting students' emotional, academic and behavioral functioning. Consequently, the impetus to find effective approaches to redress this problem, particularly in school settings remains an imperative. This evaluation suggests, as intimated previously, that based on the evidence, the Dignity For All curriculum may be one such promising approach.

References

- Ayers, S. L., et al., (2012). Examining School-Based Bullying Interventions Using Multilevel Discrete Time Hazard Modeling. *Prevention Science, 13*, 5: 539-550. .
- Dunn C., Deroo, L., & Rivara, F. (2002). The use of brief interventions adapted from motivational interviewing across behavioral domains: a systematic review. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1360-0443.2001.961217253.x>
- Hymel, S., & Swearer, S. M. (2015). Four Decades of Research on School Bullying. *American Psychologist 70*, 4, 293-299.
- Smith, P. (2016). Bullying: Definition, Types, Causes, Consequences and Interventions. *Social and Personality and Psychology Compass, 10*, 519-532.
- Swearer, S.M., Espelage, D. L., & Napolitano, S. A . (2009). *Bullying Prevention and Intervention: Realistic Strategies for Schools*. New York: Guilford Press.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2017). *School violence and bullying: Global status report*. Paris, France.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2017* (NCES 2018-036), Indicator 11.

Appendix A

Instruments

Table A.1

Copy of Questionnaire

Dear Student,

Please take a few moments to answer this questionnaire about bullying. There are no right or wrong answers. We want to understand what you know and think about bullying. The survey will ask you what you know about bullying, if you have ever been bullied and how you feel about bullying. The questions are not only about bullying in your school but also your experiences on the way to and from school. Your answers are important to us. So please answer truthfully. There are five parts to the survey and it should take you no more than 10 minutes to complete.

Thank you

ABOUT YOU

YOUR NAME _____

1) What is your student ID number? _____

2) How old are you? _____

3) What grade are you in? _____

4) What is your gender? Male Female Transgender Bisexual
Neither male nor female Other

5) Are you Hispanic?

Yes No

6) What is your race/ethnicity? Choose only one from the list below by placing a checkmark (✓).

American Indian

African-American

White

Mixed

Other

Part A: What you know and feel about bullying

A1. Do you know what bullying is?

Yes []

No []

Not Sure []

A2. Have you ever felt bullied in the past three months by another student either in school or on your way to or from school or in your neighborhood?

Yes []

No []

Not sure []

A3. Have you ever been cyberbullied?

Yes []

No []

Not sure []

A4. Have you ever helped someone being bullied?

Yes []

No []

Not sure []

For each of the statement below, tell us if it is true, false or you are not sure by putting a checkmark (√).	True	False	Not Sure
1. Social bullying is leaving someone out every time you play basketball.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. According to the government, bullying is aggressive behavior that involves hurting other people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Bystanders continue the cycle of bullying by intervening.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. A new problem created by cyberbullying is that it occurs at school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. When we feel threatened, our brains cannot think critically.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. When we have a safe and supportive environment, only some people feel that they belong.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. When you practice mindfulness, you think about all the work you have to do.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Restorative justice is using punishment to correct a behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. In a safe and supportive environment student, feel free.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. An unmet need is not feeling safe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. The reflective brain is that section of the brain that allows us to meditate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>The sentences below described how students in school feel about themselves and other students. Please mark your agreement with each sentence. Answer how you actually feel, not how people believe you should feel. Choose only one answer by putting a checkmark (✓)</p>	<p>Disagree a lot</p>	<p>Disagree a little</p>	<p>Agree a little</p>	<p>Agree a lot</p>
<p>1. It is OK to push someone if they get in your way.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>2. Making fun of other students is just part of school.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3. It bothers me when I see someone get picked on.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4. It can be fun to watch other kids get teased.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>5. It is OK to keep other kids from joining a group.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6. It's OK to tease kids who are not your friends</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>7. It is important to be part of a group even if it means you have to be mean to some kids.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>8. It's OK to call someone names if you do not like the person.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9. It's not a big deal to make fun of someone.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>10. Some kids deserve to be pushed around.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>11. It is OK to tease other kids about the way they talk or look.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>The sentences below described how students in school feel about themselves and other students. Please mark your agreement with each sentence. Answer how you actually feel, not how people believe you should feel. Choose only one answer by putting a checkmark (✓)</p>	<p>Disagree a lot</p>	<p>Disagree a little</p>	<p>Agree a little</p>	<p>Agree a lot</p>
<p>12. It is wrong to start a fight with someone.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>13. Some kids deserve to be picked on.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>14. It bothers me if other kids get beat up.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>15. It is OK to tease someone if other kids are also doing it.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>16. It bothers me when other kids are teased.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17. Spreading rumours about someone is a good way to get back at someone.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>18. It is wrong to hit other kids.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>19. Pushing someone around is a way to get respect from others.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PART B: Your Experience with Being Bullied or Bullying Someone

B1. Place a check mark in the space, which indicates if another student teased you or bullied you during the past 3 months.

Statement	Never	Once or twice per week	Sometimes	Once a week	Few Times per week
1. A student teased me in a very bad way.					
2. A student intimidated me by saying that they would hit me					
3. A student ignored me on purpose to hurt my feelings.					
4. A student lied about me in order for the other students not to like me.					
5. A student hit me, kicked me pushed me in a bad way.					
6. Some students didn't hang around with me out of hate.					
7. A student chased me like he or she wanted to hurt me.					
8. Some students gathered and moved against me and treated me badly.					

B3. Circle the number that indicates how often YOU bully or YOU moved against another student at school. Mention the events that happened during the past 3 months.

Statement	Never	Once or twice per week	Sometimes	Once a week	Few Times per week
1. I teased or made fool out of a classmate in a bad way.					
2. I intimidated a classmate saying that I would them.					
3. I ignored a classmate wanting to hurt their feelings.					
4. I lied about a classmate in order for the other students not to like them.					
5. I hit, kicked or pushed another classmate in a bad way.					
6. I grabbed, held or touched another classmate in a bad way.					
7. I was telling my classmates not to hang around another classmate out of hate.					
8. I chased a classmate trying to hurt them.					
9. I and some of my classmates moved against another classmate and treated them badly.					

PART C: What do you do when someone is being bullied

What I did When Someone was being bullied		Yes	No
1. I tried to become friends with the person who was being picked on.			
2. I encouraged someone to tell a teacher or another adult.			
3. I defended the person who was being bullied.			
4. I tried to include that person with me and my friends.			

C3. Tell us how much you agree with each of the following statement

Statement	Really Agree	Agree	Disagree	Really Disagree
1. I think it is up to me to stop bullying.				
2. I have the skills to help a student who is being bullied.				
3. I know what to say to get someone to stop bullying someone else.				
4. I would say something to a kid who is being mean to another kid.				
5. I can help someone out of a situation when they are being bullied.				
6. Even if I don't bully others, it is still up to me to try and stop it.				
7. I would tell my friends to stop doing or saying mean things if I see or hear them.				

PART D: What do you know about cyberbullying

D1. Cyberbullying is: (Select all that apply)

- a) When some student bullies another student on the Internet. []
- b) When you send mean text messages or pics to another student. []
- c) When you call another student names online. []
- d) When you use a student's cell phone to get them into trouble. []
- e) When you pretend to be another student online. []

D2. Please select all of the answers that apply to you.

- a) Cyberbullying is no big deal. []
- b) Friends of mine have been cyberbullied. []
- c) We've had cyberbullying incidents in my school. []
- d) I have cyberbullied others. []
- e) I have said nasty things to others online, but don't consider it cyberbullying. []
- f) I've cyberbullied someone with my friends just for fun. []

Appendix B**Baseline Equivalency Studies**

Table B.1

Baseline Equivalency Tables

Variable	DFA	Control
Age	11.66	12.60
Gender (Females)	56.2%	53.4%
Hispanic	21.1%	32.8%
Race (Africa-American)	54.4%	62.2%