

Disturbing Behavior Checklists

Technical Manual

Bob Algozzine

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Abstract

Ecological theorists have suggested that “disturbance” may result from an interaction between a child’s behavior and reactions to that behavior within ecosystems such as schools. In this context, behavior is viewed as “disturbing” rather than “disturbed” and equal emphasis is given to the child and to individuals with whom the child interacts when identifying academic and social problems. The implications for intervention from this view suggest the need for altering the child’s behavior *as well as* altering individuals’ reactions to that behavior. The *Disturbing Behavior Checklists* are rating scales for use in documenting the relative disturbingness of behaviors associated with *emotional disturbance* (ED) and *learning disabilities* (LD). The measures are comprised of items included in screening instruments used to identify students with learning and behavior problems. Factor analyses of responses from teachers and other professionals ($n = 400$) provide evidence of dimensions reflecting behaviors that are “disturbing” and bothersome when working with children. The *Disturbing Behavior Checklists* have positive psychometric qualities (i.e., reliability and validity) including evidence to support the usefulness of the construct of a disturbing child (and/or disturbing behavior) in understanding school-related problems. The checklists have been used in a variety of research studies.

©Bob Algozzine 2012

Disturbing Behavior Checklists

Technical Manual

Bob Algozzine

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Individual researchers may freely reproduce and use this document and the Disturbing Behavior Checklists included in it, using the following citation(s) to acknowledge the original source:

Algozzine, B. (2003). *Disturbing Behavior Checklists*. Retrieved (*date*), from <http://education.uncc.edu/rfalgozz>

and/or

Algozzine, B. (2003). *Disturbing Behavior Checklist I*. Charlotte, NC: University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Department of Educational Leadership: Author.

Algozzine, B. (2003). *Disturbing Behavior Checklist II*. Charlotte, NC: University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Department of Educational Leadership: Author.

Algozzine, B. (2003). *Technical Manual for the Disturbing Behavior Checklists*. Charlotte, NC: University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Department of Educational Leadership: Author.

Also available in PsycTESTS:

Algozzine, B. (2011) Disturbing Behavior Checklist I [Database record]. Retrieved from PsycTESTS. doi: 10.1037/t06569-000

Algozzine, B. (2011) Disturbing Behavior Checklist II [Database record]. Retrieved from PsycTESTS. doi: 10.1037/t06570-000

Copies of reports based on research using the *Disturbing Behavior Checklists* are appreciated.

Bob Algozzine
EDLD/Education
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
Charlotte, NC 28223
[rfalgozz@uncc.edu]

©Bob Algozzine 2003, 2011, 2012

©Bob Algozzine 2012

Disturbing Behavior Checklists

Technical Manual

Traditional assessment practices for youngsters at-risk of social and emotional problems rely heavily on checklists and rating scales of abnormal behavioral characteristics (Burke, Davis, Lee, Hagan-Burke, Kwok, & Sugai, 2012; Harrison, Vannest, Davis, & Reynolds, 2012; Lane, Little, Casey, Lambert, Wehby, Weisenbach, & Phillips, 2009; Liaupsin & Scott, 2008; Severson, Walker, Hope-Doolittle, Kratochwill, & Gresham, 2007; Walker, H. M., Severson, Stiller, Williams, Haring, Shinn, & Todis, 1988). These children and youth are often referred or identified as a result of a trained teacher or other professional completing such an instrument; it is reasoned that too much or too little of certain characteristics is suggestive of one or another condition.

Evidence exists to suggest that people are differentially reactive to stimulus qualities (i.e., characteristics and behaviors) and that the “fear and loathing” related to some differences is deep and widespread (cf. Martin, Pescosolido, & Tuch, 2000, p. 208). For example, such factors as appearance (Algozzine, 1976b; Berscheid & Walster, 1974; Ross & Salvia, 1975; Salvia, Algozzine, & Sheare, 1977; Salvia, Sheare, & Algozzine, 1975), race (Coates, 1972; Datta, Schaefer, & Davis, 1968; Rubovitz & Maehr, 1973), gender (Carter, 1952; Jackson & Lahaderne, 1967; Lippett & Gold, 1959; Meyer & Thompson, 1956; Mullen & Wood, 1986; Palardy, 1969; Schnittker, 2000), and achievement level of older siblings (Seaver, 1973) have been shown to differentially effect the attitudes and interactions of teachers and their students.

Within this context, it has been suggested that a contributing factor to “emotional disturbance” may be the reactions of others to the behavior exhibited by the child. Rhodes (1967, 1970), in his classic presentation of ecological theory, indicated that behaviors exhibited by children may be differentially bothersome to individuals working with those children. The theory suggests that “disturbance” may be “in the eye of the beholder” and may be generated within an ecosystem when an individual’s behavior is viewed as *disturbing* or bothersome by others, in the system. Deviance, then, may be as much a function of *reactions to behavior* as it is the behavior in and of itself.

To begin to ascertain the extent to which there is *construct validity* within the ecological perspective of deviance, it is necessary to have an indicator of the relative “disturbingness” of behaviors characteristic of students experiencing difficulties in school. If predictable differential reactions to those behaviors can be demonstrated, then some support for the ecological theory will have been evidenced. This manual contains two indicators of “disturbingness” of children’s behaviors (*Disturbing Behavior Checklist I* and *Disturbing Behavior Checklist II*) and provides support for their use in research investigating this conceptualization of school problems.

Disturbing Behavior Checklists

To facilitate the process of determining the relative “disturbingness” of behaviors characteristic of youngsters at-risk for school failure, it seemed appropriate to develop more than one scale. Such a procedure would enable both between and within group differences to be analyzed; that is, differences among behaviors thought to be characteristic of learning disabilities or emotional disturbance could be analyzed, as could differences between those behaviors characteristic of both groups. Two scales were developed.

Disturbing Behavior Checklist I

The *Disturbing Behavior Checklist I* (DBC I) was meant to be an indicator of the relative disturbingness of certain behaviors associated with *emotional disturbance* (ED). The first step in deriving the scale was to choose appropriate behavior items. This was done using the *Behavior Problem Checklist* (BPC), which is a scale that was often used as a screening device for emotionally disturbed children (Quay & Peterson, 1979). It contains 55 behaviors thought to be representative of children experiencing common behavior problems. In the normative study for the DBC I, the same 55 items were included, but individuals were asked to respond to the relative “disturbingness” of behaviors portrayed in those items. It was assumed that this general procedure would provide information regarding the “disturbingness” of each item as well as substantive data from which to derive dimensions of disturbingness. The DBC I used in the normative study is presented in Appendix A.

Subjects and procedure. Approximately 250 individuals were asked to complete the DBC I. The subjects included approximately 100 university students, 90 public school teachers, and 60 supervisors and

school psychologists. Each respondent was asked to indicate, on a scale from 1 to 5, “how disturbing” each item was “in working with children.” 1 = not very disturbing, 5 = very disturbing. The data obtained by this procedure were subjected to a principal components factor analysis. All factors with at least one loading of .40 or greater were rotated to a direct oblimin solution and the resulting dimensions were analyzed and interpreted.

Results. The results of the factor analytic procedure used to derive disturbingness dimensions are presented in Table 1; only loadings greater than .40 are included. Each dimension contains behaviors that are “disturbing” relative to certain constructs which are bothersome in working with children: Factor I contains *socially immature* behaviors. Factor II contains *socially defiant* behaviors, Factor III contains *physically disturbing* behaviors, and Factor IV contains *socialized delinquent* behaviors. Three of the four factors were moderately correlated with each other (I, II, IV) and one was relatively independent of the other three (III).

Means and standard deviations for the items are presented in Table 2. Factor indicators are included as well as mean “disturbingness” values for the items within each factor. An analysis of “average disturbingness” of each factor suggested that the socially defiant behaviors (Factor II) were more bothersome than those of the other factors.

Item analysis statistics are contained in Table 3. These results indicate that the scale and factorially derived subscales are relatively reliable. This condition, of course, is necessary but not sufficient for the instrument to be measuring the disturbingness of behavior.

Disturbing Behavior Checklist II

The *Disturbing Behavior Checklist II* (DBC II) was developed to be an indicator of the relative disturbingness of certain behaviors associated with *learning disabilities* (LD). The first step in deriving the scale was to choose appropriate behavioral items. Learning disabilities textbooks generally contain sections which present “characteristics” of the condition; the primary source of the 31 items in the DBC II was information from such sections in several classic texts (Bryan & Bryan, 1975; Hallahan & Cruickshank, 1973; Lerner, 1976; Wallace & McLoughlin, 1975). Forty five case studies of LD children were examined and found to include 90 percent of the items which were included in the DBC II. Three indicator variables

(general perceptual problems, unmanageable behavior, social immaturity) were included to facilitate interpretation of subsequent factors. In the normative study, individuals were asked to respond to the relative “disturbingness” of the 51 items. It was assumed that this general procedure would provide information regarding the “disturbingness” of each item as well as substantive data from which to derive dimensions of disturbing behaviors. The DBC II used in the normative study is presented in Appendix B.

Subjects and procedure. Approximately 150 advanced undergraduate students were asked to complete the DBC II. Each had taken courses in special education, none had student taught, and most were female (90%). Respondents were asked to indicate, on a scale from 1 to 5, “how disturbing” each item was “in working with children;” again, 1 = not very disturbing, 5 = very disturbing. The obtained data were analyzed and interpreted in a manner similar to those from the DBC I.

Results. The results of the factor analytic procedure used to derive disturbingness dimensions are presented in Table 4; again, only loadings greater than .40 are included. Each dimension contains behaviors that are “disturbing” relative to certain constructs which are bothersome in working with children: Factor I contains behaviors representative of general perceptual problems, Factor II contains bothersome unmanageable behaviors, and Factor III contains immature behaviors. The three factors were moderately correlated with each other.

Means and standard deviations for each item are presented in Table 5. Factor indicators are also included with the mean “disturbingness” values for each item. An analysis of the “average disturbingness” of each factor suggested that the unmanageable behaviors (Factor II) were more bothersome than those of the other factors.

Item analysis statistics are contained in Table 6. The results indicate that the scale and factorially derived subscales are relatively reliable. Again, this condition is necessary but not sufficient for the instrument to be measuring the disturbingness of the behaviors.

Evidence-Based Support

In discussing the establishment of construct validation, Cronbach (1971) suggested that three types of investigations be included within a validation study. Logical analyses are used to examine the consistency

between the construct and the measurement format; and, correlational and experimental analyses extend the explanation and understanding of the construct. Types of correlational analyses include (a) determining whether clusters of items can be identified within the totality of items representative of the construct in general (i.e., factor analyses), (b) determining whether groups of individuals likely to differ on the construct in question in fact do differ on the construct measurement instrument, and/or (c) determining whether items representative of the construct are related, yet can be seen as different aspects of the total construct.

Experimental analyses serve to identify influences to which the construct may be sensitive; that is, whether ratings representative of the construct can be changed systematically, and/or whether they are differentially influential in decision making.

In an attempt to determine the sensitivity and utility of the *Disturbing Behavior Checklists*, a series of investigations was conducted. Each was designed to address a particular question relative to various types of subjects. Selected information about each study is presented in Table 7. An analysis of the results from this research suggests that a child's behavior may indeed be an important stimulus quality in determining others' attitudes and performances. Similarly, it seems that behaviors characteristic of children with social and emotional problems and learning disabilities may generate both, within and between group differential reactions. These outcomes are predictable based upon ecological theory, and to some extent support the validity of the notion of "disturbingness" of behavior.

The disturbing child (or disturbing behavior) has received construct validation support within the framework suggested by Cronbach (1971). The measurement formats of the *Disturbing Behavior Checklists* provide a means for determining the extent to which various behaviors are rated as differentially disturbing: investigations have shown both, consistent between and within scale variability. Correlational analyses have suggested that meaningful clusters can be represented within total "disturbingness" scales and that items within the scales are related but representative of different aspects of the construct (i.e., factors within DBC I and DBC II correlated moderately). Similarly, groups likely to differ in ratings of the disturbingness of behavior (e.g., special and general teachers) have been shown to do so. Finally, experimental analyses have shown that ratings of disturbingness of behaviors may be

altered by intensive practicum experiences and that those ratings play an important part in decision making (i.e., acceptance of a child as a function of tolerance for behavior).

Implications for Improvement of Practice

Ecological theorists have suggested that “disturbance” may result from an interaction between a child’s behavior and reactions to that behavior within ecosystems such as schools (Algozzine, Serna, & Patton, 2002; Rhodes, 1967; Swap, 1974). In this context, behavior is viewed as “disturbing” rather than “disturbed” and equal emphasis is given to the child and to individuals with whom the child interacts when identifying academic and social problems. The implications for intervention from this view suggest the need for altering the child’s behavior *as well as* altering individuals’ reactions to that behavior (Algozzine, 1977; Algozzine, Serna, & Patton, 2001); and, matching of teachers and children becomes of interest (i.e., if children who exhibit certain bothersome behaviors are matched with teachers who are tolerant of those behaviors, “disturbance” in an ecological sense may be avoided).

Accepting that behaviors of children are differentially disturbing to teachers also has important assessment implications. If teachers are reactive to children as a result of their tolerance for their behaviors, a source of bias in the referral and assessments is evident. Some children may have the “assessment cards stacked against them” as a result of the effect their behavior has on important others in the ecosystem. Some evidence exists to suggest that bias may occur relative to placement of boys and girls in special classes; a common finding in prevalence studies is that boys outnumber girls in special classrooms. Schlosser and Algozzine (1979) have shown that boys’ characteristics behaviors are more disturbing than those of girls; it may be that initial referrals and subsequent placements are as much a function of this ecological difference as any other etiological factor. Students and teachers have also been found to have similar opinions about the disturbingness of behavior (cf. Mullen & Wood, 1986) and the role of disturbing behavior has recently been investigated in public attitudes toward mental illness, social tolerance, and reactions to psychological problems (cf. Martin & Pescosolido, 2000; Schnittker, 2000).

The *Disturbing Behavior Checklists* appear to have positive psychometric qualities (i.e., reliability and validity). The construct of a disturbing child (and/or disturbing behavior) has received some validation as

a result of the studies which have been conducted. The nature and direction of future research is left to the creative and energetic minds of researchers who will not accept (and find is disturbing) that children may be seen as disabled, disturbed, or otherwise different simply because others see them that way.

References

- Algozzine, B. (1976a). The disturbing child: What you see is what you get? *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 22, 330-333.
- Algozzine, B. (1976b). What teachers perceive-children receive? *Communication Quarterly*, 24, 41-47.
- Algozzine, B. (1977). The emotionally disturbed child: Disturbed or disturbing? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 5, 205-211.
- Algozzine, R. (1980). The disturbing child: A matter of opinion. *Behavioral Disorders*, 5, (2), 112-115.
- Algozzine, B., & Curran, T. J. (1979). Teachers' predictions of a child's school success as a function of their behavioral tolerances. *Journal of Educational Research*, 72, 344-347.
- Algozzine, B., Mercer, C. D., & Counterline, T. (1977). The effects of labels and behavior on teacher expectations. *Exceptional Children*, 44, 131-132.
- Algozzine, R., Serna, L., & Patton, J. R. (2001). *Childhood behavior disorders*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- Berscheid, B., & Walster, E. (1974). Physical attractiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. (Vol. 7). New York: Academic press, 1974.
- Bryan, T., & Bryan, J. (1975). *Understanding, learning disabilities*. Port Washington, N.Y.: Alfred Publishing.
- Burke, M. D., Davis, J. L., Lee, Y., Hagan-Burke, S., Kwok, O., & Sugai, G. (2012). Universal screening for behavioral risk in elementary schools using SWPBS expectations. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 20, 38-54. doi: 10.1177/1063426610377328
- Carter, R. (1952). How invalid are marks assigned by teachers? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 43, 218-228.
- Coates, B. (1972). White adult behavior toward black and white children. *Child Development*, 43, 143-154.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1971). Test validation. In R. L. Thorndike (Ed.), *Educational measurement*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

- Datta, L., Schaefer, E., & Davis, M. (1968). Sex and scholastic aptitude as variables in teachers' ratings of the adjustment and classroom behavior of Negro and other seventh-grade students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 59*, 94-101.
- Hallahan, D., & Cruickshank, W. (1973). *Psychoeducational foundations of learning disabilities*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Harrison, J. R., Vannest, K., Davis, J., & Reynolds, C. (2012). Common problem behaviors of children and adolescents in general education classrooms in the United States. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 20*, 55-64. doi: 10.1177/1063426611421157
- Herr, D., Algozzine, R., & Eaves, R. (1976). Amelioration of biases held by teacher trainees toward the disturbingness of behavior. *Journal of Educational Research, 69*, 261-264.
- Jackson, P., & Lahaderne, H. (1967). Inequalities of teacher-pupil contacts. *Psychology in the Schools, 4*, 204-211.
- Lane, K., Little, M., Casey, A., Lambert, W., Wehby, J., Weisenbach, J., & Phillips, A. (2009). A comparison of systematic screening tools for emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 17*, 93-105.
- Lerner, J. (1976). *Learning disabilities* (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Liaupsin, C. J., & Scott, T. M. (2008). Disruptive behavior disorders. In R. Morris & N. Mather (Eds.), *Evidence-based interventions for students with learning and behavioral challenges* (pp. 59-78). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lippett, R., & Gold, M. (1959). Classroom social structure as a mental health problem. *Journal of Social Issues, 15*, 40-49.
- Martin, J. K., Pescosolido, B. A., & Tuch, S. A. (2000). Of fear and loathing: The role of "disturbing behavior," labels, and causal attributions in mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 41*, 208-223.
- Meyer, V., & Thompson, G. (1956). Sex differences in the distribution of teacher approval and disapproval among sixth-grade children. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 47*, 385-396.

- Mooney, C., & Algozzine, B. (1978). A comparison of the disturbingness of LD and ED. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 6*, 401-406.
- Mullen, J. A., & Wood, F. H. (1986). Teacher and student ratings of the disturbingness of common behavior problems. *Behavioral Disorders, 11*, 168-179.
- Palardy, .T. (1969). What teachers believe - what children achieve. *Elementary School Journal, 69*, 370-374.
- Quay, H. C., & Peterson, D. R. (1979). *Manual for the Behavior Problem Checklist*. (Originally available from D. R. Peterson, 39 North Fifth Avenue, Highland Park, NJ 08904).
- Rhodes, W. (1967). The disturbing child: A problem of ecological management *Exceptional Children, 33*, 449-455.
- Rhodes, W. (1970). A community participation analysis of. emotional disturbance. *Exceptional Children, 36*, 309-314.
- Ross, M. B., & Salvia, J. (1975). Attractiveness as a biasing factor in teacher judgments. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 80*, 96-98.
- Rubovitz, P., & Maehr, M. (1973). Pygmalion black and white. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24*, 214-218.
- Salvia, J., Algozzine, B., & Sheare, J. (1977). Attractiveness and school achievement. *Journal of School Psychology, 15*, 60-67.
- Salvia, J., Sheare, J., & Algozzine, B. (1975). Facial attractiveness and personal social development. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 3*, 171-178.
- Schlosser, L., & Algozzine, B. (1979). The disturbing child: He or she? *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 25*, 30-36.
- Schnittker, J. (2000). Gender and reactions to psychological problems: An examination of social tolerance and perceived competence. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 41*, 224-240.
- Seaver, W. B. (1973). Effects of naturally induced teacher expectancies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 28*, 333-342.

Severson, H. H., Walker, H. M., Hope-Doolittle, J., Kratochwill, T. T., & Gresham, F. M. (2007).

Proactive, early screening to detect behaviorally at-risk students: Issues, approaches, emerging innovations, and professional practices. *Journal of School Psychology, 45*, 193-223.

Swap, S. (1974). Disturbing classroom behaviors: A developmental and ecological point of view.

Exceptional Children, 41, 162-171.

Wallace, G., & McLoughlin, J. (1975). *Learning disabilities*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Walker, H. M., Severson, H., Stiller, B., Williams, G., Haring, N., Shinn, M., & Todis, B. (1988).

Systematic screening of pupils in the elementary age range at risk for behavior disorders:

Development and trial testing of a multiple gating model. *Remedial and Special Education, 9*, 8-20.

Table 1
Rotated Factor Loading Pattern for Disturbing Behavior Checklist I

Item and Description	Factor			
	I	II	III	IV
Feeling of Inferiority	76*	**		
Anxiety; chronic general fearfulness	76			
Lack of self-confidence	70			
Preoccupation; "in a world of his own"	70			
Depression; chronic sadness	70			
Self-consciousness easily embarrassed	65			
Fixed expression; lack of lack of emotional reactivity	65			
Social withdrawal; performance preference for solitary activities	64			
Shyness; bashfulness	64			
Tension; inability to relax	61			
Clumsiness, awkward; poor muscular coordination	56			
Doesn't know how to have fun	55			
Easily flustered and confused	54			
Aloofness, social reserve	50			
Nervousness, jitteriness, jumpiness; easily startled	48			
Repetitive speech	47			
Often has physical complaints, e.g. , headaches, stomachaches	46			
Drowsiness	45			
Incoherent speech	44			
Passivity, suggestibility; easily led by others	43			
Sluggishness, lethargy	42			
Disobedience; difficulty in disciplinary control		71		
Impertinence; sauciness		65		
Negativism; tendency to do the opposite of what is requested		62		
Destructiveness in regard to his own and/or other's property		62		
Laziness in school & performance of other tasks		60		
Fighting		59		
Uncooperativeness in group situations		59		
Temper tantrums		58		
Irresponsibility, undependability		55		
Disruptiveness; tendency to annoy and bother others		55		
Attention seeking, "show-off"		54		
Boisterousness, rowdiness		49		
Inattentiveness to what others say		48		
Irritability, hot tempered; easily aroused to anger		44		
Distractibility		40		
Restlessness, inability to sit still			48	
Hypersensitivity; always on the go			47	
Has bad companions				55
Enuresis bed wetting				54
Masturbation				50
Profane language, swearing cursing				49
Loyal to delinquent friends				45
Truancy from school				41
Stay out late at night				41

* decimal point omitted

** only loadings of .40 or greater included

Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Indicators for Disturbing Behavior Checklist I Items

Item and Description	Mean	SD	F
Oddness, bizarre behavior	3.0	1.0	--
Restlessness, inability to sit still	2.6	1.0	III
Attention seeking, "show off"	2.8	1.1	II
Stays out late at night	1.9	1.1	IV
Doesn't know how to have fun	2.6	1.2	I
Self-consciousness; easily embarrassed	2.2	1.0	I
Fixes expression; lack of emotional reactivity	3.1	1.2	I
Disruptiveness; tendency to annoy or bother others	3.7	1.1	--
Feeling of inferiority	2.9	1.2	I
Steals in company with others	3.7	1.1	--
Boisterousness, rowdiness	3.0	1.2	II
Crying over minor annoyances and hurts	2.8	1.0	--
Preoccupation; "in a world of his own"	3.0	1.2	I
Shyness, bashfulness	2.0	1.0	I
Social withdrawal; preference for solitary activities	2.5	1.1	I
Dislike for school	2.5	1.2	--
Jealousy over attention paid to other children	2.6	0.9	--
Belongs to a gang	1.8	0.9	--
Repetitive speech	2.2	1.0	I
Short attention span	2.4	1.0	--
Lack of self confidence	2.7	1.1	I
Inattentiveness to what others say	2.9	0.9	II
Easily flustered and confused	2.5	1.0	I
Incoherent speech	2.8	1.2	I
Fighting	3.3	1.2	II
Loyal to delinquent friends	2.5	1.1	IV
Temper tantrums	3.4	1.1	II
Reticence, secretiveness	2.4	1.0	--
Truancy from school	2.9	1.3	IV
Hypersensitivity; feeling easily hurt	2.6	1.0	I
Laziness in school & in performance of other tasks	3.1	1.0	II
Anxiety chronic general fearfulness	2.9	1.1	I
Irresponsibility, undependability	3.1	1.0	II
Excessive daydreaming	2.8	1.1	--
Masturbation	2.9	1.3	IV
Has bad companions	2.6	1.0	IV
Tension; inability to relax	2.8	1.1	--
Disobedience; difficulty in disciplinary control	3.4	1.0	II
Depression, chronic sadness	3.5	1.2	I
Uncooperativeness in group situations	3.5	1.2	I
Aloofness, social reserve	2.4	1.0	I
Passivity, suggestibility, easily lead by others	2.7	1.1	I
Clumsiness, awkwardness; poor muscular coordination	2.0	1.0	I
Hypersensitivity; always on the go	2.5	1.1	III
Distractibility	2.8	0.9	II
Destructiveness in regard to his and/or other' property	3.9	0.9	II
Negativism; tendency to do the opposite of what is requested	3.6	1.0	II
Impertinence: sauciness	3.2	1.1	II
Sluggishness; lethargy	2.7	1.0	I
Drowsiness	2.6	1.1	I
Profane language, swearing, cursing	2.8	1.3	IV
Nervousness, jitteriness, jumpiness; easily startled	2.6	1.0	I
Irritability, hot tempered; easily aroused to anger	3.2	1.0	II
Enuresis, bed wetting	2.4	1.2	IV
Often has physical complaints, e.g., headaches, stomachaches	2.8	1.1	I

Table 3
Item Analyses for Disturbing Behavior Checklist I

Subscale	I	II	III	IV	Total
Number of items	22	15	2	7	55
Internal Consistency (KR20)	.93	.90	.62	.77	.93
Average item-total correlation	.64	.65	.85	.65	.52
Average inter-item correlation	.39	.38	.44	.32	.18

Table 4
Rotated Factor Loading Pattern for Disturbing Behavior Checklist II

Item and Description	Factor		
	I	II	III
being able to blend sounds	90*	**	
written reversals	85		
inappropriate recall of words and sentences	83		
difficulty remembering letter names	82		
weak auditory memory	81		
confusion of letter sounds	79		
<i>general perceptual problem***</i>	78		
weak visual memory	78		
figure-ground problems	77		
poor word attack skills	73		
letter and word reversals	69		
having difficulty copying shapes	67		
fine motor problems	65		
poor motor development	48		
disorganization of task approaches	45		
poor posture	41		
<i>unmanageable behavior</i>		68	
hyperactivity		67	
short attention span		58	
lack of motivation		57	
distractibility		53	
rudeness, tactlessness		51	
irritability		51	
an inability to follow directions		47	
carelessness		46	
impulsivity		43	
being easily frustrated		43	
insecurity			41
being shy or withdrawn			83
anxiety with regard to school			80
being unable to assume special responsibility			66
inadequate self concept			64
not participating independently			64
being insecure or craving attention			62
poor interpersonal relationships			56
poor expressive abilities			56
lack of spontaneity in communication			55
<i>social immaturity</i>			47

* decimal points omitted ** only loadings .40 or better included *** indicator variables are italicized

Table 5
Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Indicators for Disturbing Behavior Checklist II Items

Item and Description	Mean	SD	F
short attention span	2.5	1.0	II
poor discrimination skills	1.9	1.0	I
being easily frustrated	2.4	1.1	II
unmanageable behavior	3.4	1.2	II
weak visual memory	1.8	0.9	I
poor word attack skills	1.7	0.8	I
insensitivity	3.0	1.2	--
saying appropriate things	2.2	1.0	--
having difficulty copying shapes	1.5	0.8	I
figure-ground problems	1.7	0.9	I
impulsivity	2.3	1.0	II
poor motor development	1.8	1.0	I
inadequate self-concept	2.5	1.3	III
letter and word reversals	1.8	1.0	I
lack sensitivity regarding others	3.5	1.1	-
poor visual-motor integration	1.9	0.9	I
social immaturity	2.4	1.0	III
poor expressive ability	2.0	1.0	III
weak auditory memory	1.9	0.9	I
distractibility	2.7	1.0	II
poor interpersonal relationship	2.8	1.1	III
confusion of letter sounds	1.9	0.9	I
being in the state of perpetual motion	2.9	1.1	II
laziness in school	3.0	1.1	-
poor posture	1.7	0.8	I
general perceptual problems	2.0	0.9	I
carelessness	2.7	1.1	II
being unable to assume social responsibility	2.6	1.0	III
rudeness; tactlessness	3.4	1.1	II
insecurity	2.3	1.2	III
irritability	2.9	1.0	II
being shy or withdrawn	2.0	1.2	II
lack of spontaneity in communication	2.0	1.2	III
difficulty remembering letter names	2.2	1.1	III
being insecure or craving attention	1.8	0.9	I
written reversals	2.4	1.1	III
hyperactivity	1.8	0.8	I
an inability to follow directions	2.7	1.1	II
not participating independently	2.4	1.0	III
confusion with directionality	1.9	0.9	I
inappropriate recall of word and sentences	1.9	0.9	I
being unable to blend sounds	1.9	0.9	I
not differentiating left from right	1.8	0.9	I
anxiety with regard to school	2.4	1.2	III
perseveration	2.4	1.0	--
limited spontaneous verbalization	2.2	1.0	--
lack of motivation	2.9	1.2	II
fine-motor problem	1.8	0.9	I
disorganization in task approaches	2.2	0.9	I
clumsiness, awkwardness	1.8	0.9	I
gross-motor problems	2.0	1.1	I

Table 6
Item Analyses for Disturbing Behavior Checklist II

Subscale	I	II	III	Total
Number of items	22	12	11	51
Internal Consistency (KR20)	.96	.87	.91	.95
Average item-total correlation	.73	.64	.74	.59
Average inter-item correlation	.50	.36	.49	.18

Table 7
Information Regarding Selected DBC Studies

Study	Question of Interest	Subjects	Results
Herr, Algozzine, & Eaves (1976)	Extent to which ratings on DBC I vary as a function of intensive practicum experience with children with emotional disturbance	60 Undergraduate 30 Treatment 30 Control	Ratings in treatment group subjects improved after practicum; behaviors in Factor II rated as more disturbing by all subjects
Algozzine (1976a)	Extent to which ratings on DSC I vary as a function of subject type?	75 teachers and student 25 general education teachers 25 special education teachers 25 special education majors	Behavior rated more disturbing by general education class teachers; behavior in Factor II rated as more disturbing by all subjects.
Algozzine, Mercer, & Countermine (1977)	Extent to which labels and behaviors interact in generating tolerance and acceptability?	128 undergraduates 32 randomly assigned to each of four conditions	Selected behaviors of DBC I were differentially bothersome as a function of the label assigned to the child thought to exhibit them
Mooney & Algozzine (1978)	Extent to which behaviors within and between DBC I and DBC II were differently disturbing?	30 vocational education teachers	Behaviors in DBC I were generally more disturbing than those in DBC II; Factor II was more disturbing within DBC I and Factor II of DBC I was more disturbing within DBCII; Factor II of DBC I was more disturbing than Factor II of DBC II
Schlosser & Algozzine (1978)	Extent to which behaviors characteristic of boys were more disturbing than those characteristic of girls?	90 teachers 30 for each replication	Behaviors more characteristic of boys were more bothersome to teacher than those characteristic of girls.
Algozzine & Curran(1979)	Extent to which interaction potential varies as a function of teacher tolerance for exhibited behavior from	44 regular teachers 11 assigned to each of four groups	Teachers were more accepting of a case study child when the child's behavior matched their tolerance and less accepting when the behavior conflicted with their tolerance
Algozzine (1980)	Extent to which behaviors in DBC I are differentially bothersome to regular and special teachers?	38 teachers 19 general education teachers 19 special education teachers	Ratings of general education teachers were significantly higher than those of special education teachers; Factor II behaviors rated as more disturbing by all participants.

Appendix A

Disturbing Behavior Checklist (DBC) I

©Bob Algozzine 2003

Please respond to each item indicating how disturbing it would be in working with children. When completing the checklist, ask yourself, "...in working with children, how disturbing is" ...item... "to me?" and then answer the item (**NVD** means "not very disturbing" and **VD** means "very disturbing").

Item	NVD					VD				
Oddness, bizarre behavior	1	2	3	4	5					
Restlessness, inability to sit still	1	2	3	4	5					
Attention-seeking, "show-off"	1	2	3	4	5					
Staying out late at night	1	2	3	4	5					
Doesn't know how to have fun	1	2	3	4	5					
Self-consciousness; easily embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5					
Fixed expression; lack of emotional reactivity	1	2	3	4	5					
Disruptiveness; tendency to annoy and bother others	1	2	3	4	5					
Feelings of inferiority	1	2	3	4	5					
Stealing in company with others	1	2	3	4	5					
Boisterousness, rowdiness	1	2	3	4	5					
Crying over minor annoyances and hurts	1	2	3	4	5					
Preoccupation; "in a world of his own"	1	2	3	4	5					
Shyness, bashfulness	1	2	3	4	5					
Social withdrawal; preference for solitary activities	1	2	3	4	5					
Dislike for school	1	2	3	4	5					
Jealousy over attention paid other children	1	2	3	4	5					
Belonging to a gang	1	2	3	4	5					
Repetitive speech	1	2	3	4	5					
Short attention span	1	2	3	4	5					
Lack of self-confidence	1	2	3	4	5					
Inattentiveness to what others say	1	2	3	4	5					
Easily flustered and confused	1	2	3	4	5					
Incoherent speech	1	2	3	4	5					
Fighting	1	2	3	4	5					
Loyal to delinquent friends	1	2	3	4	5					
Temper tantrums	1	2	3	4	5					
Reticence, secretiveness	1	2	3	4	5					
Truancy from school	1	2	3	4	5					
Hypersensitivity; feelings easily hurt	1	2	3	4	5					
Laziness in school and in performance of other tasks	1	2	3	4	5					
Anxiety; chronic general fearfulness	1	2	3	4	5					
Irresponsibility; undependability	1	2	3	4	5					
Excessive daydreaming	1	2	3	4	5					
Masturbation	1	2	3	4	5					
Having bad companions	1	2	3	4	5					
Tension; inability to relax	1	2	3	4	5					
Disobedience; difficulty in disciplinary control	1	2	3	4	5					
Depression, chronic sadness	1	2	3	4	5					
Uncooperativeness in group situations	1	2	3	4	5					
Passivity, suggestibility; easily led by others	1	2	3	4	5					
Aloofness, social reserve	1	2	3	4	5					
Clumsiness, awkwardness; poor muscular coordination	1	2	3	4	5					
Hypersensitivity; always on the go	1	2	3	4	5					
Distractibility	1	2	3	4	5					
Destructiveness in regard to his own and/or others' property	1	2	3	4	5					
Negativism; tendency to do the opposite of what is requested	1	2	3	4	5					
Impertinence; sauciness	1	2	3	4	5					
Sluggishness, lethargy	1	2	3	4	5					
Drowsiness	1	2	3	4	5					
Profane language, swearing, cursing	1	2	3	4	5					
Nervousness, jitteriness, jumpiness; easily startled	1	2	3	4	5					
Irritability, hot tempered; easily aroused to anger	1	2	3	4	5					
Enuresis, bed-wetting	1	2	3	4	5					
Often has physical complaints, e.g., headaches, stomachaches	1	2	3	4	5					

Appendix B

Disturbing Behavior Checklist (DBC) II

©Bob Algozzine 2003

Please respond to each item indicating how disturbing it would be in working with children. When completing the checklist, ask yourself, "...in working with children, how disturbing is" ...item... "to me?" and then answer the item (**NVD** means "not very disturbing" and **VD** means "very disturbing").

Item	NVD					VD
Short attention span	1	2	3	4	5	
Poor discrimination skills	1	2	3	4	5	
Being easily frustrated	1	2	3	4	5	
Unmanageable behavior	1	2	3	4	5	
Weak visual memory	1	2	3	4	5	
Poor word attack skills	1	2	3	4	5	
Insensitivity	1	2	3	4	5	
Saying inappropriate things	1	2	3	4	5	
Having difficulty copying shapes	1	2	3	4	5	
Figure-ground problems	1	2	3	4	5	
Impulsivity	1	2	3	4	5	
Poor motor development	1	2	3	4	5	
Inadequate self-concept	1	2	3	4	5	
Letter and word reversals	1	2	3	4	5	
Lack of sensitivity regarding others	1	2	3	4	5	
Poor visual-motor integration	1	2	3	4	5	
Social "immaturity"	1	2	3	4	5	
Poor expressive abilities	1	2	3	4	5	
Weak auditory memory	1	2	3	4	5	
Distractibility	1	2	3	4	5	
Poor interpersonal relationships	1	2	3	4	5	
Confusion of letter sounds	1	2	3	4	5	
Being in a state of perpetual motion	1	2	3	4	5	
Laziness in school	1	2	3	4	5	
Poor posture	1	2	3	4	5	
General perceptual problems	1	2	3	4	5	
Carelessness	1	2	3	4	5	
Being unable to assume social responsibility	1	2	3	4	5	
Rudeness, tactlessness	1	2	3	4	5	
Insecurity	1	2	3	4	5	
Irritability	1	2	3	4	5	
Being shy or withdrawn	1	2	3	4	5	
Lack of spontaneity in communication	1	2	3	4	5	
Difficulty remembering letter names	1	2	3	4	5	
Being insecure or craving attention	1	2	3	4	5	
Written reversals	1	2	3	4	5	
Hyperactivity	1	2	3	4	5	
An inability to follow directions	1	2	3	4	5	
Not participating independently	1	2	3	4	5	
Confusion with directionality	1	2	3	4	5	
Inappropriate recall of words and sentences	1	2	3	4	5	
Being unable to blend sounds	1	2	3	4	5	
Not differentiating left from right	1	2	3	4	5	
Anxiety with regard to school	1	2	3	4	5	
Perseveration	1	2	3	4	5	
Limited spontaneous verbalization	1	2	3	4	5	
Lack of motivation	1	2	3	4	5	
Fine motor problems	1	2	3	4	5	
Disorganization in task approaches	1	2	3	4	5	
Clumsiness, awkwardness	1	2	3	4	5	
Gross motor problems	1	2	3	4	5	

Appendix C

Disturbing Behavior Checklists Related Research

Mullen, J., & Wood, F. (1986). Teacher and student ratings of the disturbingness of common problem behaviors. *Behavioral Disorders, 11*, 168-76.

Johnson, H., & Fullwood, H. (2006). Disturbing behaviors in the secondary classroom: How do general educators perceive problem behaviors? *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 33*, 20-39.

While previous research has determined the perceptions of disturbing behaviors of elementary teachers or special groups of secondary teachers, no known studies exist that examine the perceptions of disturbing behaviors of secondary certified, regular education teachers. The purpose of this study was to establish the behaviors that a sample of regular educators at the secondary level find least tolerable, using the Disturbing Behavior Checklist I. Regular secondary educators found behaviors related to social defiance most disturbing, then behaviors related to socialized delinquency. There was no difference among means using ANOVA for various teacher demographics and scores on the behavioral clusters or mean of total scores on the DBCI, but teacher subject area and highest degree earned correlated with perceptions of disturbing behaviors. (Author/Article Abstract)