

# Disability & Victimization

Dorothy L. Espelage, Ph.D.

Professor, Educational Psychology

Edward William Gutgsell & Jane Marr Gutgsell Endowed Professor

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

[espelage@illinois.edu](mailto:espelage@illinois.edu); [dlespelage@gmail.com](mailto:dlespelage@gmail.com)

[www.dorotheyspelage.com](http://www.dorotheyspelage.com)

Twitter: DrDotEspelage

Anjali Forber-Pratt, Ph.D.

Research Scientist

Beach Center on Disability at University of Kansas

[anjali@ku.edu](mailto:anjali@ku.edu)

[www.anjalifp.com](http://www.anjalifp.com)

Twitter: @anjalifp

This research was supported by Centers for Disease Control & Prevention (#1U01/CE001677) to Dorothy Espelage (PI)



# Bullying: Special Education

- Rose, Monda-Amaya, & Espelage (2008)
  - Literature review examining empirical investigations of bullying and victimization among students with disabilities
  - 32 Articles - Primary or Secondary Focus
  - 6 Conducted in U.S.
  - Determined Students with Disabilities were victimized more and exhibited higher rates of perpetration than their peers without disabilities.
  - School Factors, Disability Type and Personal Attributes, and Family Factors



# Victimization of Students with Disabilities

- School Factors (Classroom Setting)
  - Inclusive practices may serve as a protective factor when compared to self-contained settings (*see* Whitney et al., 1994; Nabuzoka & Smith, 1993; O'Moore & Hillery, 1989)
    - Acquire social skills through behavioral modeling
    - Enhance development
    - Increase acceptance
    - Reduce negative stereotypes (Martlew & Hodson, 1991)
    - Increase participation (Sabornie, 1994)



# Victimization of Students with Disabilities

- School Factors (Continued)
  - Ineffective inclusive practices may maintain or exacerbate victimization through limited integration (Martlew & Hodson, 1991)
    - Limits opportunities to learn, practice, and validate appropriate social skills (Mishna, 2003)
    - Hinder the ability to develop a protective peer base (Morrison et al., 1994; Whitney et al., 1994)



# Victimization of Students with Disabilities

- Disability Type and Personal Attributes
  - Victims characterized as having poor social skills (*see Baker & Donnelly, 2001; Doren et al., 1996*)
  - Passive and timid responses reinforce the bully
  - Misread nonverbal communication
  - Misinterpret non-threatening cues (*Sabornie, 1994*)
  - Lack appropriate socializing behaviors that help avoid victimization (*Nabuzoka, 2003*)



# Perpetration Among Students with Disabilities

- “Perpetration of bullying by students with disabilities is often a learned behavior, a reaction to prolonged victimization, or an overall lack of social skills” (Rose et al., 2008)



# Perpetration Among Students with Disabilities

- School Factors
  - Teacher Intervention
    - Underestimate the prevalence of victimization, especially for students with disabilities (See Monchy et al., 2004, Thompson et al., 1994)
    - Covert Nature (Miller et al, 1998)
    - Reluctance of Victim to Share (See Sharp & Smith 1994, Walker et al., 1995)
  - Restrictiveness of Educational Placement
    - O'Moore & Hillery (1989) determined students in segregated classroom exhibited higher perpetration rates than students in inclusive settings and students without disabilities.
    - Victims who move from inclusion to self-contained tend to exhibit higher rates of perpetration (Whitney et al., 1992).



# Perpetration Among Students with Disabilities

- Disability Type and Personal Attributes
  - May act too aggressively toward the wrong peers
  - Misinterpret social stimuli (Sabornie, 1994)
  - Misread social communication (Whitney et al., 1994)
  - Adopted as a means of protection from further victimization
  - Learned behavior from other social settings (Rose et al., 2008)
  - Students with EBD exhibit the highest rates of perpetration when compared to all other sub-groups of students (Monchy et al., 2004; Van Cleave & Davis, 2006)





# Dane County Study

## Participants (Rose et al., 2011)

- 18 Different High Schools (n = 14,315)
- 14 Different Middle Schools (n = 7331)
- 32 Total Schools
  - 72.9% White
  - 7.7% Biracial
  - 6.9% Black
  - 2% Hmong
  - 3.7% Hispanic
  - 3.2% Asian (not Hmong)
  - 3.7% Other
  - Socio-economic levels ranged from 12% to 58%



# Determining Special Education Status

- To determine special education status, students were asked whether they were involved in special education classes and were given three options:
  - No
  - Yes, Part-Time
  - Yes, Full-Time



# Study Conclusions

- American schoolchildren with disabilities have higher rates of victimization, aggression, and bullying perpetration when compared to their peers enrolled in a general education curriculum.
- More restrictive placements elicit higher rates of fighting, perpetration, and victimization
- Victimization and perpetration for older students are less than younger students over the middle school and high school years, however, students with disabilities report higher rates of bullying, fighting, and victimization throughout their educational career.



# Study Implications

- Victimization Rates are higher for students with disabilities when compared to students without disabilities.
- Victimization rates for students in more restrictive environments are higher (7th -10th grade) when compared to the other sub-groups of students.
- Implications
  - Inclusive practices could serve as a buffer
  - Students in more restrictive environments could have more severe and/or observable disabilities
  - Cognitive delays may not be evident until the latter part of the students' secondary career
  - Students in self-contained settings could be participating in a more functional curriculum that provides them with social skills training.



# Study Implications

- Students with disabilities reported higher rates of perpetration than students without disabilities
- Variability during transition for students with disabilities
  - Perpetration increases for students who receive Full-Time Special Education Services
  - Perpetration decreases for students who receive Part-Time Special Education Services
- Differential may be attributed to environmental change, routine adjustment, academic rigor, and/or social transition.



# Study Implications

- Students with disabilities reported more fighting behaviors than their peers without disabilities.
  - Younger students without disabilities reported more fighting behaviors than older students
  - Older students in inclusive settings reported more fighting behaviors than younger students.
  - Students who receive Full-Time special education services reported elevated fighting behaviors during academic transitions
- Implications
  - Transition to Relational Aggression
  - Lack of Social Skills
  - Academic, Behavioral, or Routine Change



# Predictive factors associated with bullying involvement of students with disabilities

Dorothy L. Espelage

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Chad A. Rose\*

Sam Houston State University

*Behavioral Disorders* (2012)

**This research was supported by Centers for Disease Control & Prevention (#1U01/CE001677) to Dorothy Espelage (PI) \*First author on publication.**



# Population - Students with Disabilities

- Grade (n = 163)
  - 7th Grade (n = 72)
  - 8th Grade (n = 91)
- Age
  - Range 12 - 15 (M = 13.2)
- Gender
  - Male (58.3%; n = 95)
  - Female (41.7%; n = 68)





# Population - Students with Disabilities

- Racial Distribution
  - African American (59.5%; n = 97)
  - White (27.6%; n = 45)
  - Other or Biracial (7.4%, n = 12)
  - Native American/Alaska Native (1.8%, n = 3)
  - Asian (1.8%, n = 3)
  - Hispanic (1.8%, n = 3)
- Students without Disabilities
  - 163 randomly selected from a larger population of 537 students



# Disability Descriptions

- Disability Distribution
  - 50.9% Specific Learning Disability (n = 83)
  - 15.3% Low Incidence Disability (n = 25)
    - Disabilities with relatively low frequency when compared to other subgroups of students with disabilities
    - Cognitive Disability (n = 8), Orthopedic Impairment (n = 6), Visual Impairment (n = 6), Autism (n = 2), Hearing Impairment (n = 2), Traumatic Brain Injury (n = 1)
  - 14.1% Emotional and Behavioral Disorder (n = 23)
  - 12.9% Speech or Language Impairment (n = 21)
  - 6.7% Other Health Impairment (n = 11)



# Descriptives by Scale

**TABLE 1**

**Group Means, Standard Deviations, % of Involvement of Individuals With and Without Disabilities**

<b>Group (n)</b>	<b>Bully Mean (SD, % Involved)</b>	<b>Victim Mean (SD, % Involved)</b>	<b>Fight Mean (SD, % Involved)</b>	<b>Anger Mean (SD, % Involved)</b>
Students without Disabilities (n = 163)	1.39 (.48, 13.5%)	1.64 (.80, 16.0%)	1.59 (.69, 9.2%)	1.52 (.67, 12.9%)
Dichotomized Group of Students with Disabilities (n = 163)	1.42 (.51, 13.5%)	1.58 (.75, 14.1%)	1.76 (.80, 19.0%)	1.56 (.70, 14.7%)
Low Incidence Disabilities (n = 25)	1.45 (.60, 12.0%)	1.59 (.81, 12.0%)	1.50 (.79, 12.0%)	1.54 (.69, 8.1%)
EBD (n = 23)	1.74 (.66, 30.4%)	1.91 (.75, 30.4%)	2.37 (.91, 52.2%)	1.93 (.72, 26.1%)
OHI (n = 11)	1.22 (.27, 0.0%)	1.70 (.90, 18.2%)	1.82 (1.16 18.2%)	1.49 (.58, 18.2%)
SLD (n = 83)	1.35 (.42, 10.8%)	1.48 (.69, 8.4%)	1.68 (.68, 13.3%)	1.48 (.71, 12.0%)
S/L (n = 21)	1.39 (.55, 14.3%)	1.55 (.79, 19.0%)	1.67 (.70, 14.3%)	1.51 (.61, 19.0%)

*Note.* EBD = Emotional and Behavioral Disorder, OHI = Other Health Impairment, SLD = Specific Learning Disability, S/L = Speech and Language Impairment.



**TABLE 2**  
**Summary of Multiple Regression for Bullying and Fighting**

	Bullying			$R^2 \Delta$	Fighting			$R^2 \Delta$
	<i>B (SE B)</i>	$\beta$	$R^2$		<i>B (SE B)</i>	$\beta$	$R^2$	
<i>Step 1</i>								
EBD	.37 (.11)	.25**			.72 (.17)	.31**		
	$F_{(1,358)} = 10.82^{**}$		.06	.00	$F_{(1,158)} = 16.84^{**}$		.10	.00
<i>Step 2</i>								
EBD	.11 (.08)	.07			.33 (.12)	.14**		
Victimization	.12 (.04)	.18**			-.02 (.06)	-.02		
Empathy	-.02 (.04)	-.02			-.15 (.06)	-.14*		
Anger	.31 (.05)	.42**			.67 (.08)	.58**		
Supportive Bullying Attitudes	.07 (.04)	.10			.17 (.06)	.15**		
Delinquency	.35 (.06)	.33**			.20 (.10)	.12		
	$Fchange_{(5,153)} = 46.81^{**}$		.63	.57	$Fchange_{(5,153)} = 38.57^{**}$		.60	.50
<i>Step 3</i>								
EBD	-.49 (.33)	-.33			.01 (.55)	.01		
Victimization	.16 (.04)	.25**			.02 (.07)	.02		
Empathy	-.05 (.04)	-.07			-.17 (.06)	-.16**		
Anger	.25 (.05)	.34**			.63 (.08)	.55**		
Supportive Bullying Attitudes	.07 (.04)	.09			.17 (.07)	.15*		
Delinquency	.31 (.06)	.29**			.17 (.11)	.10		
EBD × Victimization	-.21 (.10)	-.29*			-.21 (.18)	-.19		
EBD × Anger	.32 (.11)	.45**			.23 (.18)	.21		
EBD × Empathy	.15 (.12)	.27			.11 (.20)	.13		
	$Fchange_{(3,150)} = 4.62^{**}$		.66	.03	$Fchange_{(3,150)} = 1.00$		.61	.01

Note. EBD = Emotional and Behavioral Disorder. Students with EBD = 1, Students without EBD = 0.  
 \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ .



# Study Implications

- Need to consider the heterogeneity of disability and its relation to bullying and peer victimization.
- Youth who are engaging in high rates of bully perpetration report being victimized.
- Anger and empathy should be addressed in prevention programs.

