# Bullying in schools

Bullying in Schools: School Counselors' Responses to Three Types of Bullying Incidents School counselors responded to an Internet survey containing vignettes describing physical, verbal, and relational bullying. Respondents rated relational bullying the least serious of the three types, they had the least empathy for victims of relational bullying, and they were least likely to intervene in relational bullying incidents. Counselors with anti-bullying training rated relational bullying as more serious and were more likely to intervene in relational bullying incidents than were those without training. Implications for counselor education are discussed. School bullying was once considered a childhood ritual or a normal part of development and was therefore often overlooked or ignored by school personnel. However, research has found that bullying is not a harmless phenomenon; rather, it is a widespread and serious problem that must be addressed (Espelage & Swearer, 2003; Hoover & Oliver, 1996; Nansel et al., 2001; Olweus, 1993). Bullying has negative consequences for victims, for bullies, and for school climate (Berthold & Hoover, 2000; Olweus; Payne & Gottfredson, 2004). A large body of research on bullying exists in Australia, Canada, Europe, and Japan, and recognition of the magnitude and effects of bullying is growing in the United States, as researchers, educators, and lawmakers address this problem with concern. There is a general agreement that for a behavior to be considered bullying, it must have three elements: It must be intended to harm, it must be repetitive, and a difference of power--physical, social, or other--must exist between the bully and the victim (Olweus, 1993). Bullying is a subset of aggression that is typically categorized as physical, verbal, or relational (Shore, 2005). Physical bullying tends to receive more attention

from school personnel, and this includes behaviors such as hitting, kicking, or any form of overt violence toward another student. Many schools have developed zero tolerance policies for violent behavior, prioritizing physical bullying over other forms of bullying (Limber & Small, 2003). Verbal bullying refers to name calling, teasing, and verbal threats. Relational bullying is a form of social isolation that includes behaviors such as gossiping, intentionally leaving students out of activities, spreading rumors, and other measures that seek to change peer groups (Olweus, 1993). BjÃ¶rkqvist, Lagerspetz, and Kaukiainen (1992) described relational bullying as an " attempt to inflict pain in such a manner that he or she makes it seem as though there has been no intention to hurt at all" (p. 118). Data on bullying prevalence rates vary and are usually limited to a single school or district. However, Nansel et al. (2001) conducted a national survey of students in public and private schools in grades 6 through 10 (N = 15, 686), using the World Health Organization's Health Behavior in School-Aged Children survey. These researchers reported that 29. 9% of students reported moderate or frequent involvement in bullying--13% as bullies, 10. 6% as victims, and 6. 3% as both bullies and victims. Victims of bullying can suffer from various health problems including diminished levels of psychological well-being, poor social adjustment, psychological distress, and physical symptoms (Rigby, 1996, 2003). Victims exhibit a range of problems from social isolation and truancy to suicidal feelings and depression. While these symptoms vary in severity, it is reasonable to infer that even moderate feelings of unhappiness may affect a student's ability to learn and be successful at school. Experiencing peer harassment has been linked to depression, loneliness, and

social isolation (Juvonen & Nishina, 2000). Victims of bullying may suffer from low self-esteem, fewer friendships, school absences, and even suicide (Meraviglia, Becker, Rosenbluth, Sanchez, & Robertson, 2003). Crick and Grotpeter (1995) concluded that relational bullying is related to peer rejection, loneliness, isolation, and depression. Depression, loneliness, and social anxiety were uniquely predicted by being victimized by relational bullying (Crick & Bigbee, 1998) and also predict future social and psychological difficulties (Crick, Casas, & Ku, 1999). The lack of effective adult responses to school bullying has been discussed in the literature. Several studies have examined teacher responses to school bullying. Garbarino and deLara (2003) suggested that in some instances, adults may not witness or observe bullying behavior. Rigby (1996) noted that teachers simply may not know what to do to resolve a bullying incident. These speculations suggest that school personnel could benefit from training, so they clearly know how to identify and respond to bullying. Craig, Henderson, and Murphy (2000) studied prospective teachers' attitudes toward bullying and found that prospective teachers viewed physical bullying to be more serious than other types of bullying. Pre-service teachers were more likely to intervene in physical bullying than in other types of bullying incidents, and they had difficulty identifying relational bullying. Yoon and Kerber (2003) also investigated teachers' attitudes toward bullying and found that teachers viewed relational bullying to be less serious than physical or verbal bullying and were less likely to intervene in relational bullying incidents. Although researchers have begun to study the role of teachers and administrators in bullying interventions, school counselors are virtually absent from the

literature. The role of school counselors is to contribute to the academic success of all students in their academic, career, and social development (American School Counselor Association, 2005). School counselors work with the entire school population and may be more aware of underlying school climate concerns like bullying due to their unique role. In addition, school counselors are trained to address social concerns, to design, implement, and evaluate programs, and to be experts in interpersonal communication skills. They have both a preventative and a responsive role in schools. Given this skill set, it is important to determine whether school counselors are prepared to respond to bullying in schools and whether they possess knowledge and skills to implement effective programs and interventions. It is with these concerns in mind that the current study was implemented. DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY The current study contributes to the literature by focusing on the school counseling profession and its role in reducing bullying within the school environment. No studies were found in the existing literature that investigated school counselors and bullying. The study described herein examined how a sample of school counselors in Arizona responded to physical, relational, and verbal bullying scenarios and how they believe they would intervene in bullying situations, using methodology developed by Yoon and Kerber (2003) in a study with a sample of teachers. This study addressed several research questions. First, how do school counselors respond to bullying scenarios? Do they respond differently to portrayals of physical, verbal, and relational bullying? It was hypothesized that counselors do respond differently to the three types of bullying. Second, do school counselors who receive anti-bullying training respond differently than those

who report no training? It was hypothesized that school counselors with training respond differently than those without such training. Third, do school counselors whose schools have implemented an anti-bullying program respond differently than counselors who report no anti-bullying program in their schools? The hypothesis was that counselors in schools with anti-bullying programs are more likely to intervene in all types of bullying. Finally, are the differences in perceived severity, empathy for students, response to bullying, and need for intervention by bullying type as perceived by school counselors similar to those found with teachers? It was hypothesized that counselors have more empathy for all victims of bullying and that they propose stronger interventions for bullies across all types of bullying.

METHOD The method for conducting this survey was chosen because of the benefits of Internet surveys over traditional survey methods. Although Internet surveys may have lower response rates compared to traditional mail surveys, they require minimal (if any) expense, have less time commitment, simplify data entry, and are relatively easy to execute (Dillman, 2000; Granello & Wheaton, 2004; Schonlan, Fricker, & Elliot, 2001). A participant disclaimer was used to gain informed consent and to explain participants' confidentiality. Procedure Participants were invited to participate in the survey with a personalized e-mail invitation. One week after their initial invitation, participants were sent a reminder e-mail to complete the survey. Only Arizona school counselors who had an e-mail address listed in the Arizona Department of Education guidance directory were included. After those listings without e-mail addresses or with incorrect e-mail addresses were removed, the total possible sample size was 974. The final response

rate was 183 participants, or 18. 8%. Therefore, this was not a representative or random sample of counselors, and it excluded counselors who did not have access to computers or did not have a current correct e-mail address in the directory. Participants Of the 183 participants, 26. 4% (n = 48) were male and 73. 6% (n = 134) were female; one participant did not report gender. The ages of participants varied; 4. 9% (n = 9) were 21 to 30, 20. 2% (n = 37) were 31 to 40, 31. 1% (n = 57) were 41 to 50, 39. 3% (n = 72) were 51 to 60, and 4. 4% (n = 8) of the participants reported being 61 or older. Most reported 6 to 10 years of experience as a school counselor (31. 9%, n = 58); school counselors with 0 to 5 years experience made up 29. 1% (n = 53) of the sample. The remaining school counselors reported 11 to 15 years of experience (15. 9%, n = 29), 16 to 20 years of experience (13. 7%, n = 25), 21 to 25 years of experience (6%, n = 11), or more than 26 years of experience as a school counselor (3. 3%, n = 6). One respondent did not report years of experience. Participants represented counselors across all levels of K- 12 schools. Most counselors reported working at the high school level (48. 6%, n = 89), followed by 21. 9% (n = 40) at the middle school/junior high level, 18. 6% (n = 34) at the elementary level, and 10. 9% (n = 20) at K8 schools. The majority of the sample worked in a public school setting (97. 8%, n = 179), compared to 0. 5% (n = 1) in private schools and 1. 6% (n = 3) at charter schools. Hispanics represented 15. 1% (n = 27) of the sample, Caucasians 77. 7% (n = 139), African Americans 1. 1% (n = 2), Asian/Pacific Islanders 1. 1% (n = 2), Native Americans 3. 9% (n = 7), and 1. 1% (n = 2) other. Data on this variable were missing for four respondents. Of the participants, 42. 5% (n = 76) reported that their school had an anti-

bullying program and 57. 5% (n = 103) reported no anti-bullying program. Four respondents did not complete this item. The majority of counselors indicated that they had received prior bullying training (74. 3%, n = 136), while 25. 7% (n = 47) reported no training. Of those who had prior training, 65% (n = 89) indicated that the training occurred at a workshop or conference, or in-service (23%, n = 32), with 7. 3% (n = 10) selecting other. Only 4% (n = 6) of those who had bullying training received this training as part of their graduate school experience. Measure The questionnaire used in this study consisted of six school bullying vignettes used by Yoon and Kerber (2003), modified slightly to be used with school counselors (see Appendix A). Two vignettes portrayed physical bullying scenarios, two illustrated relational bullying, and two described verbal bullying incidents. The children were neutral with respect to gender and race/ethnicity. Each vignette was followed by three Likert-scale items on a 5-point scale that asked respondents to rate the severity of the incident (1 = not at all serious to 5 = very serious), the degree of empathy they had for the victim (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree), and their likelihood to intervene in the situation (1 = not at all likely to 5 = very likely). The final two items were open-ended and asked how the respondent would respond to the victim and to the perpetrator. The scores of the items for each bullying type were summed, to create a physical bullying, verbal bullying, and relational bullying score for severity, empathy, and likelihood of intervention. The open-ended responses for the six vignettes were coded independently by two coders. Each response to the bully was coded according to the categories used by Yoon and Kerber (2003), arranged by level of

involvement of personnel (e. g. teacher, administrator, parent) in dealing with the incident, using a scale of 0 to 6, with higher levels reflecting stronger interventions. Yoon and Kerber did not code the open-ended responses to the victim, but Bauman and Del Rio (2006) developed coding categories for victim responses that were used in the current study. When a response included several interventions, the highest-numbered response (strongest intervention) was coded. Similarly, when an immediate response and future consequence (" the next time this happens...") were suggested, only the immediate response was coded. The researchers independently coded the responses, discussed any disagreements, and then created a consensus score for use in subsequent analyses. RESULTS Reliability Measures Because each item of the survey measures a different construct (perceived seriousness of the incident, empathy for the victim, likelihood to intervene, etc.), a measure of internal consistency of the entire survey is not appropriate. A coefficient alpha was calculated for the three Likert-scale items for each bullying type. For physical bullying, Î± = . 76 (note that due to a malfunction in the database, no data were available for the likelihood to intervene item for one of the two physical bullying items). For relational bullying, Î± = . 73; and for verbal bullying, Î± = . 65. In addition, reliability was calculated for the coding of the open-ended questions (responding to bullies and victims in each vignette). These reliability estimates were lower; Î± = . 44 for bully items (n = 6) and Î± = . 51 for victim items (n = 6). Reliability also was conducted using coefficient alpha for seriousness items (n = 6), Î± = . 68; empathy items (n = 6), Î± = . 88; and likelihood to intervene items (n = 5), Î± = . 67. No data were obtained regarding

temporal stability of the measure. Two items requested open-ended responses to prompts for each of the six vignettes. These items asked, " If you would respond to this situation, what would you do with the perpetrator?" and " What would you do with the victim?" The inter-rater agreement (r) for the two trained raters ranged from . 78 to . 99 for bullies/perpetrators and from . 49 to . 88 for victims. School Counselors" Responses to Physical, Verbal, and Relational Bullying To determine if school counselors responded differently to physical, verbal, and relational bullying scenarios, repeated-measures ANOVAs were conducted on the seriousness and empathy scores for the three bullying types (physical, verbal, relational). Means and standard deviations are provided in Table 1. The differences in seriousness among the three bullying types were statistically significant (Wilks' lambda = . 480, F[ 2, 165] = 89. 364, p < . 0001, η·p2 = . 520). In this case, the value of partial eta-squared (. 520) is considered a large effect (Stevens, 1996), which means that approximately 52% of the variance in perceived seriousness of a bullying incident was associated with the type of bullying. The difference in empathy toward the victim by bullying type also was significant (Wilks' lambda = . 626, F [ 2, 165] = 49. 308, p < . 0001, η·p2 = . 374, a large effect). Approximately 37% of the variance in empathy toward the victim was associated with bullying type. For the perceived need for intervention, a paired t test was used to compare likelihood to intervene in relational and verbal bullying. The difference in this pair was significant (t = -2. 468, df = 174, p < . 0001). To examine how school counselors might intervene with bullies and victims for each type of bullying, a repeated-measures ANOVA was conducted on the recommended action toward the

perpetrator and action toward the victim items. The differences were significant across the three bullying types (Wilks' lambda = . 841, F [ 2, 135] = 12. 730, p < . 0001, Î·p2= . 159, a large effect). This means that approximately 16% of the variance in action toward the bully was associated with the bullying type. The difference in action toward the victim was significant across the three bullying types (Wilks' lambda = . 953, F [ 2, 129] = 3. 201, p < . 044, Î·p2 = . 047, a small effect). To summarize, differences between the bullying types of most pairs were significant (Î± < . 05). Participants as a group rated physical and verbal bullying as more serious than relational bullying, and they had more empathy for victims of physical and verbal bullying than for victims of relational bullying. They also were more likely to intervene in verbal bullying than in relational bullying and suggested stronger interventions for verbal bullying incidents than for physical and relational bullying. Comparing School Counselors by Level of Training To determine if school counselors who had received anti-bullying training responded differently than those without training, independent t tests were conducted for all items. The difference in perceived seriousness of relational bullying was significant (t = 2. 34, df = 172, p < . 02). School counselors with training (M = 4. 00, SD = . 56) rated relational bullying as more serious than did those without training (M = 3. 77, SD = . 48). No other significant differences were found. Comparing School Counselors and Presence/ Absence of School Anti-Bullying Programs To determine if school counselors in schools with anti-bullying programs responded differently than those in schools without anti-bullying programs, independent t tests were conducted for all items. The difference between participants who worked in

schools with a specific anti-bullying program in place and those without such a program on strength of action toward bully was significant for physical bullying (t = 2. 19, df = 145, p < . 03). The difference in tile likelihood of intervening between school counselors who work in schools with a program in place and those whose schools do not have a program was significant for both verbal bullying (t = 3. 63, df = 166. 926, p < . 0005) and relational bullying (t = 2. 319, df = 170, p < . 02). School counselors in schools with an anti-bullying program were more likely to intervene in all types of bullying than were those in schools without a program. Refer to Table 2 for means and standard deviations. Comparing Counselors and Gender To determine if counselors responded differently based on gender, independent t tests were conducted on all items. Females in the sample perceived relational bullying to be more serious than did males (t = -2. 833, = 81. 201, p < . 006). No other significant differences were found. DISCUSSION While school counselors in this study rated all three types of bullying as being at least moderately serious, there were significant differences in the way they perceived the three types. They rated physical and verbal bullying as more serious than relational bullying, had more empathy for victims of physical and verbal bullying than for victims of relational bullying, and were more likely to intervene in verbal bullying than in relational bullying. They suggested stronger interventions with bullies when bullying was verbal compared to physical and relational, and they described a stronger intervention with victims of physical bullying than relational bullying. The findings are similar to Yoon and Kerber's (2003) results with teachers regarding the relative ratings of the three types of bullying. However, school

counselors' lower ratings for relational bullying are particularly disturbing, because evidence suggests that relational bullying is quite damaging. Because school counselors are trained to be aware of emotional and psychological aspects of student functioning, one would expect them to be aware of these harmful outcomes. One possible explanation of this finding is that relational bullying is difficult to observe and perhaps even more challenging to detect in victims. Victims of physical bullying are likely to have bruises or cuts, yet victims of relational bullying often have no obvious evidence that they are ridiculed or excluded on a regular basis. Because school counselors often do not see the same students each day, a pattern of relational bullying and its consequences could be very difficult to detect. It is also possible that counselors mistakenly interpret that a student has difficulty with friendships because of low self-esteem or shyness when in fact the student is a victim of relational bullying. Additionally, school counselors, like teachers, may minimize relational bullying and assume that teasing and excluding are part of normal childhood development, or as Garbarino and deLara (2003) suggested, school counselors may not believe that a bullying incident was problematic. School counselors with bullying training perceived relational bullying to be more serious than did school counselors without bullying training and were more likely to intervene in relational bullying than counselors without training. These findings were the only significant differences between school counselors with and without bullying training. However, it is encouraging to note that having training was associated with increased sensitivity to relational bullying in this sample of school counselors. It is also notable that female school counselors perceived

relational bullying to be more serious than did male school counselors. Given that relational bullying may be more common in girls, and is more distressing to girls, it is not surprising that adult females perceive relational bullying to be more serious than males (Björkqvist et al., 1992; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995). School counselors who worked in schools with anti-bullying programs in place proposed stronger interventions for bullies in physical bullying scenarios and were more likely to intervene in relational and verbal bullying than counselors in schools without an explicit program. It may be that program guidelines specify sanctions for bullying behaviors that school counselors then are committed to implement. Limitations Several limitations are associated with this study: Only a small percentage of school counselors in the sampling frame agreed to participate, and no analyses are available on participants who chose not to participate. The statistical treatment may be limited due to missing data for the category of likelihood of intervention for physical bullying (scenario 4, question 3). For the open-ended responses, only the strongest response was coded, so other responses were not included in data analyses. Sampling limitations include participants skipping items and an inability for some respondents to access the survey online. Participants are from only one state, so it may be difficult to generalize findings to the entire population of school counselors. Finally, the survey asked participants to respond to hypothetical situations. It is unknown if participants responded the way that they would respond in real-life bullying situations. In addition, the finding that almost three quarters of participants had had prior anti-bullying training suggests two possibilities: One, the public and professional concern for bullying in recent years has resulted in more

widespread training for educators, including school counselors. The other possibility is that those school counselors who had such training were more interested in the topic and more likely to complete the questionnaire, resulting in a biased sample. Implications and Recommendations Several studies have suggested that students are often reluctant to seek help with bullying (Rigby & Bagshaw, 2003; Unnever & Cornell, 2004). Students may feel ashamed or embarrassed to report bullying, or they may wonder whether telling an adult will solve a bullying problem or exacerbate it. If students fall to ask for help in the case of relational bullying, it may be very difficult for school counselors or teachers to know that a student is having problems because of the covert nature of relational bullying. However, school counselors could address this problem by teaching guidance lessons about relational bullying and how to ask adults for help when being bullied. This conveys the message to students that school counselors are knowledgeable about bullying and willing to help students who are involved in bullying. School violence has become a serious problem and schools are pressured to maintain a violence-free environment. Schools may prioritize physical and verbal bullying in order to maintain a safe school environment; relational bullying may be overlooked. Physical and verbal bullying can easily be understood as violent acts toward another student, but perhaps school counselors and other school personnel do not perceive relational bullying as a form of violence. In this study, school counselors who work in schools with specific anti-bullying programs more often proposed the strongest interventions for bullies in physical bullying scenarios, which suggests that anti-bullying programs may focus on more overt types of bullying. Woods

and Wolke (2003) found that in schools with more comprehensive anti-bullying policies, the prevalence of relational bullying was higher than in schools with less clear policies. It is important for schools to examine their school safety policies and reconsider what constitutes violence. Schools must recognize the damaging effects of all types of bullying and include all types of bullying in their anti-violence policies. School counselors must be leaders in raising awareness of all members of the school community. Rigby and Barnes (2002) suggested that if victims feel that there are no consequences for bullies, it is pointless for them to report bullying to an adult. In schools that do not consistently sanction bullies or that ignore bullying behaviors, students are unlikely to ask for help. Students may equate a school climate that ignores bullying to a school climate that accepts bullying. The results of this study suggest that school counselors do sanction bullies, but they use stronger interventions for verbal bullying than for other types of bullying. This finding is a concern because school counselors' interventions should take into account the seriousness of relational bullying. For interventions with bullies, the strongest intervention for all three types of bullying was to contact parents or report to a higher authority, such as the school principal. Respondents indicated they would more readily contact parents and report to authority for bullies than for victims. It is a concern that victim interventions are less extensive than bully interventions. Parents should be informed when a child is a victim of any type of bullying. Alerting parents of the victim that bullying has occurred enlists parents' cooperation and assistance in working with these problems. School counselors did quite frequently recommend positive interventions for victims, such as comforting

and encouraging the victim. This is reassuring and highlights counselors' training in crisis intervention and counseling. Nevertheless, counselors were more reluctant to inform parents or report to a higher authority when working with victims of bullying. While some of the school counselors' recommended interventions for bullies and victims were insightful, others reflected inadequate knowledge of effective interventions for bullying. Some respondents recommended interventions that are considered by experts to be ineffective, such as peer mediation, ignoring bullying behavior, and putting bullies into " bully groups." (For recommendations of effective interventions, see the following: Fried & Fried, 1996; Hoover & Oliver, 1996; Limber & Small, 2003; Rigby, 2001; Shore, 2005; Sommers-Flanagan & Sommers-Flanagan, 2004; Young, 2002.) School counselors are trying to work with bullies and victims, but many appear to need more information about what types of interventions are appropriate and effective for reducing the incidence of bullying. These examples are evidence of the need for more extensive and more effective training on bullying prevention and intervention in school counselor training programs. School counselors need knowledge, awareness, and skills to address this widespread behavior. They need to know about the prevalence and consequences of all types of bullying, and they need to be aware of signs of bullying involvement in children. They also need skills in intervening when bullying incidents do occur. School counselors also must incorporate a collaborative approach, so that teachers, parents, and administrators are all informed and engaged in addressing the problem. The consulting role of school counselors makes them the ideal person to coordinate the efforts of various stakeholders.

School counselors who had received bullying training did perceive relational bullying to more serious than those who had not, and they were more likely to intervene in relational bullying than those without bullying training. This finding suggests that training programs may increase awareness of relational bullying and its serious consequences. However, it appears that training opportunities may not provide appropriate intervention techniques and skills, based on the types of interventions that counselors suggested. In some cases counselors' responses suggested that any response is better than none or even that ignoring bullying situations is acceptable. Clearly, bullying training programs need to include effective intervention strategies so that counselors can learn how to appropriately intervene. Counselor education programs must include bullying prevention and intervention curricula for school counselors. Unless programs include such training in required coursework, school counselors may not be sufficiently prepared to address bullying in their schools. In addition to learning about the significance of bullying, counselors must learn about their role in bullying reduction during their pre-service education, so when they enter the profession they will have needed skills. School counselors can assist with training other school personnel and help implement bullying prevention programs (Casey-Cannon, Hayward, & Gowen, 2001; Clarke & Kiselica, 1997; Fried & Fried, 2003). School counselors must have a proactive role with students, through teaching guidance curricula on how students can make their school bully-free (Clarke & Kiselica; Colvin, 2004; MacNeil & Newell, 2004; Roberts & Coursol, 1996). They also have a responsive role through working with students in groups (Hoover & Hazier, 1991; Roberts & Coursol) and

individually (Clarke & Kiselica; Fried & Fried; Hoover & Hazier; Roberts & Coursol). More effective training programs need to be developed. Based on the results of this study, the training that counselors are currently receiving is not having the optimal effects. Training programs should be rigorously evaluated on a regular basis to make sure that content is current and that participants learn from the training. These training programs need to be incorporated into school counselors' pre-service education, as well as part of ongoing professional development opportunities (in-services, conferences). Clearly, a deeper understanding of relational bullying must be included. An important focus of training should be teaching school counselors and other school personnel how to effectively intervene with bullies and victims, because results suggest that school counselors may use ineffective or inappropriate interventions. Bullying remains a serious issue in American schools and school counselors are ideally suited, both by training and job description, to make a significant contribution to reducing school bullying.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations of Vignette Ratings by Participants, by Bullying Type Legend for Chart: A - Item B - Physical C - Bullying Type Verbal D - Relational A B C D Seriousness 4. 45 (0. 52)[1] 4. 42 (0. 46)[1] 3. 96 (0. 55)[1] Empathy for victim 4. 44 (0. 66)[1] 4. 42 (0. 67)[1] 4. 10 (0. 64)[1] Need for intervention --(a) 4. 75 (0. 39)[1] 4. 27 (0. 58)[2] Action -- perpetrator 4. 67 (0. 78)[1] 5. 01 (0. 62)[2] 4. 62 (0. 88)[1] Action -- victim 4. 81 (0. 78)[1] 4. 73 (. 81)[1, 2] 4. 56 (1. 07)[2] Note. Values with identical superscripts were not significantly different. (a) Missing data here -- unable to calculate for partial data set.

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations of Vignette Ratings for School Counselors by Presence/Absence of Anti-Bullying Program Legend for Chart:

A - Item B - Bullying Type Physical Have program C - Bullying Type Physical No program D - Bullying Type Verbal Have program E - Bullying Type Verbal No program F - Bullying Type Relational Have program G - Bullying Type Relational No program A B C D E F G Seriousness 4. 47 4. 41 4. 47 (. 50) (. 53) (. 47) 4. 37 4. 03 3. 87 (. 45) (. 55) (. 55) Empathy for victim 4. 51 4. 39 4. 50 (. 66) (. 66) (. 64) 4. 38 4. 18 4. 03 (. 68) (. 64) (. 63) Need for intervention (a) (a) 4. 86(c) (. 28) 4. 65(c) 4. 37(b) 4. 18(b) (. 45) (. 49) (. 63) Action -- perpetrator 4. 80(b) 4. 49(b) 5. 01 (. 79) (. 91) (. 62) 5. 02 4. 76 4. 51 (. 60) (. 75) (. 99) Action -- victim 4. 82 4. 78 4. 6 (. 81) (. 77) (. 92) 4. 82 4. 54 4. 66 (. 70) (1. 11) (. 99) (a) Data are missing for this item. (b) Means are significantly different at p < . 03. (c) Means are significantly different at p < . 0005. References American School Counselor Association. (2005). The ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author. Bauman, S., & Del Rio, A. (2006). Pre-service teachers' response to bullying scenarios: Comparing physical, verbal, and relational bullying. Journal of Educational Psychology, 98, 219-231. Berthold, K., & Hoover, J. (2000). Correlates of bullying and victimization among intermediate students in the Midwestern USA. School Psychology International, 2, 65-78. Björkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Aggressive Behavior, 18, 117-127. Casey-Cannon, S., Hayward, C., & Gowen, K. (2001). Middle-school girls' reports of peer victimization: Concerns, consequences, and implication. Professional School Counseling, 5, 138-147. Clarke, E., & Kiselica, M. (1997). A systematic counseling approach to the problem of bullying. Elementary School Counseling and Guidance, 31, 310-325. Colvin, G. (2004). Classroom

counseling in secondary schools: An old idea that's new again. American Secondary Education, 33(1), 43-48. Craig, W., Henderson, K., & Murphy, J. (2000). Prospective teachers' attitudes toward bullying and victimization. School Psychology International, 21, 5-21. Crick, N., & Bigbee, M. (1998). Relational and overt forms of peer victimization: A multi-informant approach. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66, 337-347. Crick, N., Casas, J., & Ku, H. (1999). Relational and physical forms of peer victimization in preschool. Developmental Psychology, 35, 376-385. Crick, N., & Grotpeter, J. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. Child Development, 66, 710-722. Dillman, D. (2000). Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method. New York: John Wiley & Sons. Espelage, D., & Swearer, S. M. (2003). Research on school bullying and victimization: What have we learned and where do we go from here? School Psychology Review, 32, 365-383. Fried, S., & Fried, P. (1996). Bullies and victims: Helping your child through the schoolyard battle. New York: M. Evans and Company. Fried, S., & Fried, P. (2003). Bullies, targets, & witnesses: Helping children break the pain chain. New York: M. Evans and Company. Garbarino, J., & deLara, E. (2003). Words can hurt forever. Educational Leadership, 60, 18-21. Granello, D., & Wheaton, J. (2004). Online data collection: Strategies for research. Journal of Counseling and Development, 82, 387-393. Hoover, J., & Hazier, R. (1991). Bullies and victims. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 25, 212-219. Hoover, J. H., & Oliver, R. (1996). The bullying prevention handbook: A guide for principals, teachers, and counselors. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service. Juvonen, J., & Nishina, A. (2000). Peer harassment, psychological adjustment, and school functionality

in early adolescence. Journal of Educational Psychology, 92, 349-359. Limber, S., & Small, M. (2003). State law and policies to address bullying in schools. School Psychology Review, 32, 445-455. MacNeil, G., & Newell, J. (2004). School bullying: Who, why, and what to do. The Prevention Researcher, 11(3), 15-17. Meraviglia, M., Becker, H., Rosenbluth, B., Sanchez, E., & Robertson, T. (2003). The Expect Respect project. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18, 1347-1360. Nansel, T., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R., Ruan, W., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among U. S. youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. Journal of the American Medical Association, 285, 2094-2100. Olweus, D. (1993). Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell. Payne, A. A., & Gottfredson, D. C. (2004). Schools and bullying: School factors related to bullying and school-based bullying interventions. In C. E. Sanders & G. D. Phye (Eds.), Bullying: Implications for the classroom (pp. 159-176). London: Elsevier. Rigby, K. (1996). Preventing peer victimization in schools. In C. Sumner, M. Israel, M. O'Connell, & R. Sarre (Eds.), International victimology: Selected papers from the 8th international symposium: Proceedings of a symposium held 21-26 August 1994 (pp. 303-309). Retrieved January 30, 2005, from http://www. aic. gov. au/publications/ proceedings/27/rigby. pdf Rigby, K. (2001). Stop the bullying: A handbook for teachers. Markham, Ontario, Canada: Pembroke Publishers. Rigby, K. (2003). Consequences of bullying in schools. Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 48, 583-590. Rigby, K., & Bagshaw, D. (2003). Prospects of adolescent studies collaborating with teachers in addressing issues of bullying and conflict in schools. Educational Psychology, 23, 535-

546. Rigby, K., & Barnes, A. (2002. The victimized student's dilemma to tell or not to tell. Youth Studies Australia, 21(3), 33-36. Roberts, W. B., Jr., & Coursol, D. H. (1996). Strategies for intervention with childhood and adolescent victims of bullying, teasing, and intimidation in school settings. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 30, 204-212. Schonlan, M., Fricker, R., Jr., & Elliot, M. (2001). Conducting research surveys via e-mail and the Web (Electronic version]. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. Retrieved January 30, 2005, from http://www. rand. org/ publications/MR/MR1480 Shore, K. (2005). The ABC's of bullying prevention: A comprehensive schoolwide approach. Port Chester, NY: Dude Publishing. Sommers-Flanagan, J., & Sommers-Flanagan, R. (2004). The buzz on bullying. ASCA School Counselor, 42(2), 40. Stevens, J. O. (1996). Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. Unnever, J., & Cornell, D. (2004). Middle school victims of bullying: Who reports being bullied? Aggressive Behavior, 30, 373-388. Woods, S., & Wolke, D. (2003). Does the content of anti-bullying policies inform us about the prevalence of direct and relational bullying behaviour in primary schools? Educational Psychology, 23, 381-401. Yoon, J., & Kerber, K. (2003). Bullying: Elementary teachers' attitudes and intervention strategies. Research in Education, 69, 27-34. Young, S. (2002). Solutions to bullying. Tamworth, Staffs, United Kingdom: NASEN House.
APPENDIX A Bullying Vignettes with Bullying Type Labeled 1. At the writing center you hear a student chant to another child, " Teacher's pet, brown-nose, suck-up, kiss-ass." The child tries to ignore the remarks but sulks at his desk. You saw this same thing happen the other day. [Verbal bullying] 2. During a guidance lesson you overhear a

child say to another student, " If you don't let me have the purple marker, I won't invite you to my birthday party." This is not the first time you have heard this child say this type of thing. [Relational bullying] 3. Students are in line for lunch in the cafeteria. You hear a kid say to another child, " Hey, give me your lunch money or I'll give you a fat lip." The child complies at once. This is not the first time this has happened. [Verbal bullying] 4. A student brought a dinosaur-shaped eraser to school. He boasts that it was a prize from a game arcade. Another child goes over and smacks his head, demanding the eraser. The child refuses at first, but eventually gives in. [Physical bullying] 5. You are watching kids play at recess. You witness a kid say to another student, " No, absolutely not. I already told you that you can't play with us." The student is isolated and plays alone for the remaining time with tears in her eyes. This is not the first time this child has isolated someone from playing. [Relational bullying] 6. You have assigned the kids in your class to work in groups of four to do projects. While the kids arc getting in their groups you see a student push another child with enough force that he falls to the floor. The push was clearly intentional and was not provoked. The child who fell yells, " Stop pushing me around! You always do this, just go away." [Physical bullying] Note. Vignettes used with permission. ~~~~~~~~ By Kristen E. Jacobsen and Sheri Bauman Kristen E. Jacobsen is a professional school counselor at Roadrunner Elementary School, Marana, AZ. Sheri Bauman, Ph. D., is an associate professor at the University of Arizona, Tucson. Copyright of Professional School Counseling is the property of American School Counselor Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright

https://assignbuster.com/bullying-in-schools-2/