

## TEACHER-DIRECTED VIOLENCE – A LITERATURE REVIEW

**Jennifer Leanne Hancock Montgomery**  
**University of Toronto, Canada**  
**jennifermontgomery@outlook.com**

**Abstract:** *Despite recognition that teacher-directed violence is a common phenomenon that is considered a “salient and concerning” (Wilson et al., 2011, p. 2354); it remains widely overlooked and understudied. Teacher-directed violence garners very limited attention internationally (Galand, Lecocq, & Philippot, 2007; Dzuka & Dalbert, 2007; Chen & Astor, 2008; Wilson, et al., 2011; Ozkilic & Kartal, 2012; Kauppi & Pörhölä, 2012) despite its broad impacts like those on stakeholder well-being, schools and school climate, teacher recruitment/retentions, and student academic and behavioural outcomes (Espelage, et al. 2013). This article reviews literature concerned with teacher-directed violence from 1983 through 2019. The literature derives publications from international contexts (North America, Europe, the Middle East, and Asia) exploring and comparing experiences of teacher-directed violence. The analysis of the studies examines teacher-directed violence from a socio-ecological model developed by McMahon et al. (2017), and results explore the implications of teacher-directed violence, perspectives on why teacher-directed violence occurs, preventative measures, as well as the identification of common types of violence teachers experience: (1) verbal behaviour, (2) non-verbal behaviours, (3) physical behaviour, (4) damage to personal property, and (5) technology related behaviours. This research has implications for researchers, teacher pre-service, professional development training, school administrators, community leaders, and policymakers.*

**Keywords:** *teacher-directed violence; bullying; school climate; school violence;*

### 1. Methods

The following electronic databases were searched: Google Scholar, Proquest, Education Resources Information Center, JSTOR, and Scopus. The search was limited to articles with abstracts in English published in the last 40 years (from 1980 to April 2019). In addition to the search, the references in the articles were screened for missed research articles, and an initial total of 616 articles, reports, dissertations, and papers was identified. Publications were first analyzed for content according to the research questions. These were then coded by citation analysis, and 273 documents were identified as highly cited or having one or more authors commonly cited when examining teacher-directed violence. The following publications were excluded: (1) publications reporting on research in the field of workplace hazards and occupational health and safety (e.g., focus on many workplaces not specifically education); (2) publications in which results were not clearly linked to a formal educational setting (e.g., homeschooling) (3) publications in which the research results did not specifically address violence directed at educational staff (e.g., school-climate, school-violence) (4) publications in which the research results were redundant (e.g., the same author publishing for different journals, or updating work). Following the application of the exclusion criteria, 51 publications remained. These were then critically appraised on their research quality using criteria recommended by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Results relating to teacher-directed violence were categorically explored: a) methodology and study designs; b) the description of violent behaviour(s); c) the incidence and forms of teacher-directed violence; d) implications of violence at the individual level; e) implications of violence at the interpersonal level; f) implications of violence at the organizational level and g) violence prevention/training.

## 2. Results

### 2.1 Description of Violent Behaviour

Of the fifty-one publications included, a variety of terms were used to describe teacher-directed violence; however, all incidences could be classified and broadly defined as “actual, attempted, or threatened harm to a person or persons against grade school teachers and the self-reported consequences of this violence.” (Wilson et al., 2011, p. 2354). These behaviours, whether verbal, emotional or mixed forms of bullying (Ozkilic & Kartal, 2012) were intended to harm the teacher and are perpetrated repeatedly and intentionally over a certain amount of time (Dzuka & Dalbert, 2007). Teacher-directed violence may include physical and psychological harm (Harber, 2002); as well as verbal, emotional, or mixed forms of bullying (Ozkilic & Kartal, 2012). However, it only pertains to forms of actual harm and does not include, nor to be confused with Bourdieu’s concept of “symbolic violence” which attributes schools imposing dominant knowledge; a form of violence by omission, (e.g., ignoring injustices like racism or bullying) (Harber, 2002). Seven publications identified specific examples of behaviours experienced by teachers that could be identified as teacher-directed violence. Though not exhaustive (e.g., hair pulling, grabbing, choking, scratching is not explicitly mentioned in the literature), the examples in table 1 identified the types of the harmful behaviours included thus far in literature when considering teacher-directed violence. These behaviours were examined and categorized into five areas: (1) *verbal behaviour*, (2) *non-verbal behaviours*, (3) *physical behaviour*, (4) *damage to personal property*, and (5) *technology related behaviours*.

Table 1: Teacher-Directed Violence - Descriptions of Behaviours Identified

| Behaviour Category   | Examples of Behaviour  |
|----------------------|--|
| Verbal behaviour     | Opposition, deliberate insolence, or refusal to cooperate<br>Obscene, offensive remarks, or cursing.<br>Insulting, belittling, devaluation, teasing, or mocking<br>Playing harmful tricks<br>Humiliating<br>Slandering, gossiping, spreading rumours, or backbiting<br>Intimidation or social coercion<br>Name calling<br>Shouting<br>Threatening or blackmailing<br>Lying |
| Non-verbal behaviour | Ignoring teachers<br>Insulting gestures<br>Laughing at teachers<br>Mimicking characteristic/features<br>Hiding from the teacher<br>Repeatedly coming late to class<br>Withholding information<br>Physical or socially isolating teachers<br>Sabotaging/preventing work   |

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Physical behaviour            | Beating or punching<br>Kicking,<br>Using Instruments or weapons cause injury or bodily harm<br>Pushing or shoving<br>Biting<br>Cutting<br>Attempt/touch in a sexual manner or sexual harassment<br>Non-defined physical attacks |
| Damage to personal property   | Destruction or damage of belongings or property<br>Theft<br>Vandalism   |
| Technology related behaviours | Internet victimization or other inappropriate usages of technologically mediated communication (e.g., email, telephone calls, text messages, and cyberbullying via texts or images)   |

Table 1: Teacher-Directed Violence - Descriptions of Behaviours Identified in Current Literature compiled from Bounds & Jenkins, 2018; Chen & Astor, 2009; Dzuka & Dalbert, 2007; Kauppi & Pörhölä, 2012; Kõiv, 2015; Ozkilic & Kartal, 2012; Zeira et al., 2004.

## ***2.2 Incidence and Forms of Teacher-Directed Violence***

Throughout the investigated period 1983-2019, there have been sporadic studies of teacher-directed violence; however, it can be observed that since 2007, there has been a notable increase from less than one study per year 1983-2006 to three or more studies per year from 2007 onward. This increase is indicative of growing concern and interest in the subject over the past few decades. Furthermore, incidences of teacher-directed violence seem to be increasing in reporting frequency, particularly in the Canadian context. For instance, most notably, current reviews of existing publications, media reports, and survey findings from five Canadian Teachers Federation member organizations which included over 40,000 teacher respondents and identified that “more than 70% of teachers across Canada are seeing an increase in both the rate and severity of violence in schools”. Results suggested that “between 41% and 90% of teachers (depending on their province) report having experienced violence at some point in their careers” (People for Education, 2018, p. 1), and it has been similar for nearly a decade. For instance, in related research from 2011 exploring the Canadian teacher landscape, 80% of the 585 out of 731 respondents had experienced violence and over a quarter of them (27.6%), physical violence. Teachers continue to face frequent and severe violence in the workforce, like “verbal aggression, property damage, threats, and physical assault. Non-physical (verbal/emotional) violence is most commonly experienced by educators, followed by physical violence” (People for Education, 2018, p. 1). Though the specific rates of violence and types of violence vary from setting to setting; violence occurs at high proportions internationally (typically 50% of teachers or more report violence). Furthermore, the influences of age, gender, school type on teacher-directed violence tends to be similar across cultures (Chen & Astor, 2009).

## ***2.3 Implications of Violence at the Individual Level***

Studies conducted have demonstrated that violence against teachers may have effects on the personal lives of teachers, the learning-teaching process in the classroom and the relations of teachers with other individuals in society (Ozkilic & Kartal, 2012). Teacher victimization is likely to impact a teacher’s feelings of safety negatively, their ability to fulfill

their role (Wilson et al., 2011; Zeira, Astor, & Benbenishty, 2004) and may contribute to job dissatisfaction (Galand et al., 2007). Furthermore, events of victimization are salient and concerning since they are likely to contribute to overall lower levels of life-satisfaction (Dzuka & Dalbert, 2007) and have also been documented to have physiological implications. For instance, bullied teachers may experience impaired health and well-being (Kauppi & Pörhölä, 2012; Galand et al., 2007). They may experience emotional exhaustion or post-traumatic stress disorder (Wilson et al., 2011; Galand et al., 2007). These emotional experiences can be examined as part of the “individual level” of the socio-ecological theory, which focuses on how victimization makes teachers feel (McMahon et al., 2017).

#### ***2.4 Implications of Violence at the Interpersonal Level***

The teaching and school milieu are markedly different from any other working environment because while there are multiple individuals (e.g., adults) who contribute to victimization and bullying against teachers, victimization comes most prevalently from the students (Kõiv, 2015). This embedded relational aspect of teacher victimization is at the heart of the second level of the socio-ecological model, the interpersonal level, which is characterized by relationships between teachers and others (McMahon et al., 2017). For example, there is an interesting power dynamic to examine between teacher and students. From the teacher perspective, “teachers represented institutional authority in the school; due to their position, they had to guide, instruct, and reprimand students, and they were bullied, they thought, because of these characteristics of their working duties...some of them presumed that they were bullied because of the special characteristics of their professional duties, such as working with students who needed special attention, or because they were not yet familiar with the student they worked with” (Kauppi & Pörhölä, 2012, p. 1065). Students share that perpetration of violence occurs due to perceived imbalances of power and powerlessness. For instance, to students, violence is justified on the basis of a teacher’s unreasonable requirements, teacher’s unfair treatment, and disagreements with the teacher, being punished by a teacher, being provoked by teachers, fighting for friends, being upset or merely because the teacher was an easy target (Chen & Astor, 2009). While the precise power dynamic is unclear (e.g., job position, role, student-teacher relationships, or power struggles), a closer examination of the teacher-student relationship when considering teacher-directed violence may be necessary.

Also, teacher-directed violence in the school context can be conceptualized as a relational dynamic between teachers and students; whereby identity plays a central role when considering victimization and the perpetration of victimization. For instance, Bounds and Jenkins (2018), found that teachers who are white, female, homosexual, religious or older tended to be more victimized than those of other demographics; furthermore, they noticed that teachers were more likely victimized in urban schools, rural school and then suburban schools. Likewise, teachers were more likely victimized by male students between the ages of 5-15 (Chen & Astor, 2009). High school teachers were more often victimized than grade school colleagues (Bounds & Jenkins, 2018; Zeira et al., 2004). Though, elementary teachers were more likely to be physically attacked; whereas, high school teachers were more likely to receive threats (Chen & Astor, 2009). While the results of these studies are not generalizable, though they arguably demonstrate trends, they may demonstrate the importance of exploring areas of identity and intersectionality is as one lens to consider when exploring victimization of teachers and the perpetuation of victimization.

Also, in the teaching profession, gender is currently unequally distributed, and women are predominant. The Canadian Teacher’s Federation identified that in 2008, 72.6% of teachers across Canada were women. Further studies suggest that the number of women teachers is steadily increasing (e.g., 59 percent women in 1989, to 65 percent in 1999 and 69

percent in 2005) (Canadian Teachers' Federation, 2019). Thus, when considering violence against teachers, gender identity may be another lens to consider. This anecdote highlights a consideration: as women primarily make up the teaching workforce, it is women who are victimized; violence against teachers is also, in some ways, violence against women. Moreover, though controversial, Wilson (2011), highlights research that suggests that there are gender differences in response to trauma. As such, it may be essential to consider aspects of identity intersectionality, like the role of gender, in the experience of violence against teachers.

## **2.5 Implications of Violence at the Organizational Level**

Also, not only does teacher-directed violence impact the teacher as an individual and interpersonal relationships, but it may also contribute to organizational and system challenges. For instance, events of teacher bullying, violence, and fear of victimization are documented to increase teacher attrition (Wilson et al., 2011; Chen, & Astor, 2008; Zeira et al., 2004) and the likelihood of turnover (Galand et al., 2007). Likewise, it negatively impacts the quality of teacher work performance, motivation, and commitment to the job (Wilson et al., 2011; Ozkiloglu & Kartal, 2012; Zeira et al., 2004; Kauppi & Pörhölä, 2012); as well, it has been attributed to an increase in teacher absenteeism (Dzuka & Dalbert, 2007). Also, these factors "could result in classroom instability, a lack of community for the students, and have severe negative consequences for the quality of education" (Wilson et al., 2011, p. 2366) while also impacting "teachers and their ability to appropriately educate students in their classroom" (Bounds & Jenkins, 2018, p. 4).

Victimization can be inversely related to the organization, structure, and system that it is embedded within. A school's location, for example, is identified as a contributing factor to the prevalence of teacher victimization (e.g. country or urbanization) (Dzuka & Dalbert, 2007; Chen & Astor, 2009). Congruently, there is evidence that suggests that different school types and school structures influence the prevalence of student violence against teachers (Chen & Astor, 2009) and that the organizational structure and system of education causes students to experience frustration to a level where they externalize it; student frustration may be expressed as violence towards inanimate objects or towards teachers (Harber, 2002). Expressions of violence may be in part due to the impersonal nature of large-sized schools or schools with large numbers of students, which contributes to a break-down in interpersonal relations and the feelings of self-esteem of the students; or what Fullan and Steigelbauer (1991) identify as 'the alienation theme.' Here, students demonstrate little sense of identity or belonging; as well as, scarcity in communication, dialogue, participation and engagement in the learning. Organizational challenges like lacking access to supports and services or larger class sizes are attributed to exacerbating the potential for violence (Ore et al., 2019).

## **2.6 Violence Prevention and Training**

Furthermore, teachers across the country tend not to report the victimization and cite numerous reasons for underreporting the violence they experience at work (e.g., apathy, embarrassment, fear, or concern) (Ore et al., 2019; Ramsankar et al., 2018; Smol, 2017; McMahon et al., 2017). In Ontario, for example, over one-fifth of Elementary Teacher's Federation members surveyed expressed that they would report classroom violence and less than a quarter felt that reports did not garner preventative actions like increased supports or services do decrease victimization (Ore et al., 2019). Teachers from the British Columbia Teachers Federation expressed that "those who teach violent young students are embarrassed to admit that five and six-year-olds have hurt them" (Smol, 2017). Teachers have also expressed that they "underreport violent incidents out of concern for their students and also

because they fear it may reflect poorly on their worth as an educator” (Ramsankar et al., 2018). They demonstrate their reluctance for "fear of repercussions," (Ore et al., 2019), or do “not ask for help because they feel their administrators expect teachers to solve these problems on their own” (McMahon et al., 2017 p. 503). However, whatever the mitigating circumstances may be or what the justification is for underreporting, the organizational structure of the school and supports available to teachers is indicative of the prevention of violence. For instance, “school settings in which teachers report high levels of mutual support among colleagues, collaborative students, and strong leadership were also more effective in preventing violence through the implementation of a psychosocial intervention. School environments in which teachers report feeling supported are associated with greater well-being, less professional disengagement, and less exposure to school violence. Without additional support, many teachers too often find themselves too busy to cope with increasing demands (Round, Subban, & Sharma, 2016). Nevertheless, there is profound importance in sharing and reporting victimization because “social support has a central role in an individual’s coping processes” (Kauppi & Pörhölä, 2012, p. 1060). In a recent article, Kauppi and Pörhölä cited Einarsen (2000), established that teachers are presumed to feel less vulnerable when experiencing workplace bullying if they had higher social support and that support minimizes the negative impact of victimization (2012).

In tandem with a limited supports or resources, lack of training (for teachers and other school personnel) and the need for the development of anti-bullying prevention programs surrounding teacher-directed violence are other salient organizational or systemic challenges that require further exploration (Zeira et al., 2004; Chen & Astor, 2009; Ozkilic & Kartal, 2012; Kõiv, 2015). Teachers report a lack of understanding and training in dealing with violence (Zeira et al., 2004) and school personnel, similarly, need to learn more about anti-bullying measures (particularly addressing violence directed towards teachers) through programs like in-service training sessions to inform teachers and develop intervention skills which may reduce victimization (Ozkilic & Kartal, 2012). Furthermore, there are only few violence intervention programs “designed to educate or protect teachers from violence” (Chen & Astor, 2009, p. 4); as such, prevention through training ought to be an area for further research and consideration.

When considering violence against teachers, Kõiv (2015) emphasized that victimization “seems to be universally prevalent and also increasing social phenomenon in schools; thus, strategies to address and prevent victimization of teachers should be included as a critical element of comprehensive multi-component bullying prevention programs in schools (p. 132). In 2018, Bounds and Jenkins made a case necessitating teacher protection for the sustenance of a functional education system; meanwhile echoing that, “more research should be done to fully understand how to impact teachers positively through programs and trainings for those in the school setting” (p. 8).

## ***2.7 Methodology and Study Designs***

Like many educational issues, there are many stakeholders and perspectives to consider. For instance, school staff are highly involved as “victims and observers – in various facets of school violence” (Zeira et al., 2004, p.150); however, methodologically, studies on issues of teacher-directed violence have primarily explored this perspective, and only a few have examined possible perpetrators or students’ perspectives (Chen & Astor, 2009). Many of the studies applied a survey or questionnaire with Likert scale or closed-ended questions (some did include limited open-ended questions for verification purposes); and typically, studies limited utilization of other qualitative methods (e.g., ethnographies or observational data) (Chen & Astor, 2009; Zeira et al., 2004; Dzuka & Dalbert, 2007). Most of the research employed and focused on perceptual data and self-reporting (Dzuka & Dalbert, 2007; Zeira et

al. 2004). Self-report surveys seemed to facilitate teacher response rate and participation, and allowed researchers better access (e.g., the principal distributes or provides a survey, or conducts a survey at in-service). Some surveys were mass-distributed without discrimination of teacher role or knowing how many surveys were distributed in total, but primarily looked to gather a more comprehensive sample size (Kauppi & Pörhölä, 2012). Many did not have a timeframe/timeline for accepting responses (no deadline) to support participation (Bounds & Jenkins, 2018).

Because of the sensitive nature of this subject (e.g., job implications, personal emotional feelings, working with children, and privacy), and to help support participants expressing experiences freely, many studies maintained anonymity for participants (Zeira et al., 2004, p. 153), or opted to provide some form of reduced disclosure/redaction of specific data to ensure privacy (e.g. no collection of age or sex, providing a sealed envelope, and having an impartial person to distribute the survey like a psychologist) (Dzuka & Dalbert, 2007, p. 254). Participants sometimes had a secret identity or pseudonyms, and demographic data were not collected (Ozkilic & Kartal, 2012, p. 3436).

There have been successful studies exploring teacher-directed violence that have utilized both random (Dzuka & Dalbert, 2007) or convenience sampling (Zeira et al., 2004); the sample size varies from small groups of educators (Bounds & Jenkins, 2018) to extensive wide-scale studies (Wilson et al., 2011). Likewise, many researchers measured response and return rate (Dzuka & Dalbert, 2007; Chen & Astor, 2009; Zeira et al., 2004; Wilson et al., 2011; and Galand et al., 2007) which might be beneficial for extrapolating further understanding about under-reporting, generalizability, and validity towards wider populations. On the same vein, many studies have explored a cross-sectional rather than longitudinal approach (Köiv, 2015). It must be recognized, however, that as such, convenience from the collection of cross-sectional data only compromises generalizability of studies and that no causal conclusions can be drawn. Longitudinal data is further required for more precise information about the assumed causal direction of any associations which may be observed (Dzuka & Dalbert, 2007). Existing measures, like the Teachers Reaction to Violence Scale (Wilson et al., 2011, p. 2355), were implemented. Likewise, ad hoc constructed self-report measures in tandem with statistical analysis (e.g., correlational data, regression analysis using Chronbach 1952 and X2 statistics) were employed to identify trends (Dzuka & Dalbert, 2007, p. 258).

In some studies, researchers utilized digital tools to facilitate their work. For instance, qualitative work was sometimes analyzed using programs like SPSS and MPlus for confirmatory factor analysis (Wilson et al., 2011, p. 2359). Similarly, the use of internet surveys was engaged in supporting participant access and limited the requirement of the number of distributors or the workload of distribution (Kauppi & Pörhölä, 2012). In some cases, data was collected through professional programs like Qualtrics, a web-based survey program (Qualtrics, Provo, UT) and emailed through a listserv, which limited the accuracy of the overall response rate (Bounds & Jenkins, 2018, p. 4). These methods of distribution, while increasing convenience and limiting workload; also diminished the possibility for observational data and potentially distanced the researcher from the subjects.

### **3. Limitations of the Study**

This literature review investigating teacher-directed violence in 51 publications has several limitations. First, many studies demonstrated methodological heterogeneity; for instance, studies employed similar approaches (e.g., teacher recollection and self-report), perspectives (e.g., examining teachers as the research population), and methods or tools of research (e.g., surveys or questionnaires). Next, researchers often emphasized the limitations of generalizability due to contexts (e.g., cultural contexts) (Bounds & Jenkins, 2018);

moreover, each study also revealed only a narrow perspective of a broader and interconnected complex phenomenon. Similarly, the studies investigated employed different terminology, including definitions of teacher-directed violence and what constituted violent acts.

Another aspect of educational research is that it is very challenging to control variables (e.g., neuroticism, unpredictability or oversensitivity) particularly in self-reports (Dzuka & Dalbert, 2007). Likewise, the validity of study results is impinging on increased triangulation or additional research (e.g., observational data in addition to statistical data) (Dzuka & Dalbert, 2007). Along the same line, recall bias and participant selective memory must be considered since research results often acquired through self-reporting questionnaires or surveys that invited teachers to reminisce and explain past experiences. Additionally, there was inconsistent use of the research variables of victimization, bullying and violence. The term violence was used loosely to describe a range of behaviours. Descriptions were categorized as either psychological or physical violence; however, the level of violence was not always precise (e.g., assertiveness, aggression, or actual harm).

#### **4. Discussion and Conclusions**

Teacher-directed violence continues to be an understudied phenomenon, where members of the research community continue to pioneer studies to develop understanding and encourage dialogue. As such, there is limited consistency in the methodology and validation of tools for comparison in different contexts. However, current research has identified that teacher-directed violence occurs broadly in many cultural contexts internationally and has identified that many contributing social-ecological factors which must be considered in tandem. Victimization and the perpetration of victimization demonstrate trends which suggest identity as an impacting factor (e.g., gender, culture, race, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, age) as well as positionality (e.g., region, geography, grade).

As well, while teacher-directed violence is a prominent professional risk for educators internationally, the type of violence may vary (e.g., grade school and high school). Furthermore, studies most often discriminate between psychological and physical violence. Similarly, teacher-directed violence often manifests predominately in the form of psychological violence (e.g., verbal, non-verbal, technological harm); physical violence (e.g., physical harm, injury or destruction of property) is also experienced widely by teachers. Most recently, in Canadian contexts, teachers have noticed an increase in the rate and severity of violence in schools which may be interconnected with or impacted by individual, interpersonal or relational and organizational challenges.

Furthermore, teacher-directed violence can negatively impact the personal lives of teachers, and it impacts the learning-teaching process in the classroom and the relations of teachers with other individuals in society. Negative impacts can also be examined within the interpersonal relational dynamic between teachers and students as well as contributing to organizational and system challenges. The results of this review demonstrate the complex interplay between the various factors that contribute to teacher-directed violence. Thus, teacher-directed violence and its prevalence can be considered one aspect of many challenges into the broader school-climate. Thus, it is essential to consider all aspects of the social ecology of a school and other contextual factors (e.g., teacher, organizational and workplace characteristics as well as student-teacher interactions) that can impact the incidence of teacher-directed violence.

Finally, Teacher-directed violence may be better conceptualized as a symptom of wider challenges within the interconnected complexities of school climate (e.g., student-teacher relationships or organizational deficits that impact the capacity of educators or resources impacting learners). For instance, some organizational procedures, such as a teacher's represented institutional authority, students requiring special attention, or power



unbalances between student-teacher relationships have been attributed to increasing the likelihood of teacher-directed violence. Adequate management strategies and capacity building are required to remedy this situation.

## 5. Future Research

Since teacher-directed violence is still widely understudied, ongoing research and broader studies of investigating this complex process in schools are necessary. Future research should be aimed at developing a complex model that encompasses a wide range of socio-ecological factors. Additionally, to better comprehend and ultimately prevent teacher-directed violence, future research should aim to explore the systemic challenges of underreporting. Equally, it is prudent to consider multiple perspectives when examining teacher-directed violence.

Further studies should also aim for collaboration within the research community to support clarity, consistency and comprehensiveness of the definition of violence and the development of an explicit model or framework for examining teacher-directed violence. Given the wide range of methodology and instruments used to investigate teacher-directed violence, it is further recommended that researchers validate instruments and approaches so that comparisons can be expertly made. Also, since there is limited professional learning, training, programs and interventions to support teachers in developing peaceful schools and classroom climates; it is necessary to further examine school community prevention processes (e.g. restorative practices and peacebuilding). Comparative research that considers other wide-spread school disciplinary policies, procedures, and programs (e.g., Crisis Prevention Institute training) ought to also be researched further.

## References

- Bounds, C., & Jenkins, L. (2018). Teacher-directed violence and stress: the role of school setting. *Contemporary School Psychology, 22*(4), 435-442. doi:10.1007/s40688-018-0180-3
- Chen, J., & Astor, R. A. (2008). Students' reports of violence against teachers in taiwanese schools. *Journal of School Violence, 8*(1), 2-17. doi:10.1080/15388220802067680
- Dzuka, J., & Dalbert, C. (2007). Student violence against teachers teachers' well-being and the belief in a just world; *European Psychologist, 12*(4), 253-260. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/614476632>
- Espelage, D., Anderman, E. M., Brown, V. E., Jones, A., Lane, K. L., McMahon, S. D., . . . Reynolds, C. R. (2013). Understanding and preventing violence directed against teachers: Recommendations for a national research, practice, and policy agenda. *The American Psychologist, 68*(2), 75-87. doi:10.1037/a0031307
- Fullan, M., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Galand, B., Lecocq, C., & Philippot, P. (2007). School violence and teacher professional disengagement. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology, 77*(Pt 2), 465-477. doi:10.1348/000709906X114571
- Harber, C. (2002). Schooling as violence: An exploratory overview. *Educational Review, 54*(1), 7-16. doi:10.1080/00131910120110839
- Kauppi, T., & Pörhölä, M. (2012). School teachers bullied by their students: Teachers' attributions and how they share their experiences. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*(7), 1059-1068. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2012.05.009
- Kõiv, K. (2015). Changes over a ten-year interval in the prevalence of teacher targeted bullying. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 171*, 126-133. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.098

- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- McMahon, S. D., Reaves, S., McConnell, E. A., Peist, E., Ruiz, L., Espelage, D., . . . Brown, V. (2017). The ecology of teachers' experiences with violence and lack of administrative support. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 60*(3-4), 502-515. doi:10.1002/ajcp.12202
- Ozkilic, R., & Kartal, H. (2012). Teachers bullied by their students: How their classes influenced after being bullied? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46*, 3435-3439. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.080
- People for Education. (2018). National report finds teachers increasingly experience violence in schools. Toronto: People for Education.
- Ramsankar, H. M., Brown, S., & Fillion, F. (2018, July 08,). Lack of resources and supports for students among key factors behind increased rates of violence towards teachers. Retrieved from <https://www.ctf-fce.ca/en/news/Pages/default.aspx?newsid=1983998942&year=2018>
- Round, P. N., Subban, P. K., & Sharma, U. (2016). 'I don't have time to be this busy.' exploring the concerns of secondary school teachers towards inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 20*(2), 185-198. doi:10.1080/13603116.2015.1079271
- Smol, R. (2017, Mar 28,). Violence against teachers by students is turning into a bona fide workplace hazard. Retrieved from <https://www.cbc.ca/news/opinion/violence-against-teachers-1.4468577>
- Wilson, C. M., Douglas, K. S., & Lyon, D. R. (2011). Violence against teachers: Prevalence and consequences. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(12), 2353-2371. doi:10.1177/0886260510383027
- Zeira, A., Astor, R. A., & Benbenishty, R. (2004). School violence in israel. *School Psychology International, 25*(2), 149-166. doi:10.1177/0143034304043679