

School Psychologists and School Counselors' Perspectives on Bullying

Kathy DeOrnellas and Ronald S. Palomares

INTRODUCTION

School psychologists have specialized training that combines education and psychology at the individual student level and at the systems level (Kub & Feldman, 2015). Their roles include evaluating students for academic, behavioral, and emotional concerns; consulting with parents, teachers, and other professionals regarding students' needs; and providing individual and group counseling to address these needs. The National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) also charges school psychologists with helping to create learning environments where students can feel safe and perform to the best of their abilities (2012). As noted by Sherer and Nickerson (2010), school psychologists “are in an ideal position to assume leadership roles in violence and bullying prevention and intervention” (p. 217). School psychologists have training that prepares them to assess the prevalence of bullying on campus; promote awareness among students, school personnel, and parents; lead efforts to prevent bullying; and intervene with bullies and victims as warranted (Diamanduros, Downs, & Jenkins, 2008).

K. DeOrnellas (✉) • R.S. Palomares
Texas Woman's University, Denton, TX, USA

School counselors also provide services to students, parents, school staff, and community members. They are “uniquely qualified to address all students’ academic, career, and personal/social development needs by designing, implementing, evaluating, and enhancing a comprehensive school counseling program that promotes and enhances student success” (American School Counselor Association [ASCA], *n.d.*, p. 1). As part of their duties, school counselors work to create a safe learning environment and to support the rights of all students (Sandhu, 2000). School counselors provide direct services to students, which include providing counseling core curriculum or guidance lessons that are designed to teach students “knowledge, attitudes, and skills appropriate for their developmental level” (ASCA, p. 2). Direct services also include working with individual students to plan their academic and/or post-academic careers, and services that are geared to meet students’ immediate needs, such as crisis intervention (ASCA).

Although from these descriptions it would appear that there is considerable overlap between school psychologists and school counselors, their actual roles vary significantly depending on the types of schools in which they are employed, how many schools they report to, and the types of services they provide. It is not unusual for school psychologists to cover several schools—working with preschoolers one day and high school students the next. School counselors are more likely to be based on one campus. School psychologists have traditionally spent most of their days evaluating students for academic, social, and/or behavioral problems or consulting with teachers; however, individual and group counseling is part of their repertoire. School counselors’ roles vary based on the level of their school. Those assigned to elementary schools are likely to spend more of their time giving guidance lessons to classrooms of children or providing individual and group counseling. When school counselors work with adolescents, however, they are more likely to spend their time working with academic schedules and college preparation. Despite these differences, school psychologists and school counselors are well qualified to take the lead in bullying prevention and intervention.

DEFINING BULLYING

From the perspective of school psychologists and counselors, bullying is typically defined as “pervasive or persistent hurtful acts directed at another student that have caused, or can reasonably be forecast to cause, distress

resulting in a significant interference with the ability of the student to receive an education or participate in school activities” (Willard, *n.d.*). This or similar language is found in most state statutory definitions and provides the basis upon which schools must enforce policies against bullying. Although state statutory definitions vary, “most are based on federal case law (*Tinker v. Des Moines Ind. Comm. Sch. Dist* 393 U.S. 503 [1969]; *Davis v. Monroe*, 526 U.S. 629, 633, 650 [1999]; *Saxe v. State College* 240 F.3d 200 [3d Cir. 2001])” (Willard).

This definition of bullying differs from the one used most frequently in the literature and in research studies. On *StopBullying.gov* (*n.d.*), bullying is defined as “unwanted, aggressive behavior among school aged children that involves a real or perceived power imbalance. The behavior is repeated, or has the potential to be repeated, over time.” Many research studies use surveys that ask students if they have suffered a variety of hurtful acts without providing students with a definition of bullying or clarifying that the behaviors have to have been repeated over time (see Hamburger, Basile, & Vivolo, 2011, for a review of surveys used to measure bullying). The statutory definition used by school districts is a more objective way of defining bullying, and school psychologists and counselors are encouraged to look at bullying from this perspective. By using an agreed upon definition, school staff can be more accurate when intervening in incidents of bullying, incidents can be accurately recorded to track the presence of bullying behavior on campus, and the effectiveness of bullying programs can be evaluated.

TYPICAL TRAINING RELATED TO BULLYING

A large majority of school psychologists and counselors (87%) reported having been trained in assessing and intervening in bullying when surveyed by Lund, Blake, Ewing, and Banks (2012). Less than half of those reported that their training occurred pre-service with the majority reporting that they received training through school-based in-service trainings or professional conferences. Although practitioners reported receiving training in bullying prevention and in counseling bullies and victims (Lund et al.), evidence-based interventions and empirically supported programs were seldom endorsed (Kratochwill, 2007), and practitioners tended to rely on more general interventions such as social skills training (Whitted & Dupper, 2005). When creating interventions, practitioners were more likely to use materials from staff trainings or from

books in the popular press than to rely on scholarly references (Lund et al.). Similar numbers were reported by Bauman, Rigby, and Hoppa (2008) who found that 69% of school counselors had received some type of training in bullying but only 2% had done so as part of their pre-service training. Almost half of those surveyed had received their training at professional workshops, while less than half were trained through school-based in-service trainings.

Lack of in-depth training in the aspects of bullying can lead practitioners to endorse interventions that are likely to be ineffective. Bauman et al. (2008) found that many school counselors believe it is important to work with bullies to improve their self-esteem, which is contrary to evidence that bullies tend to have average self-esteem. Mediation is also chosen as a way to intervene in bullying, but the power differential between bullies and victims can make it a poor choice (Bauman et al., 2008). In an effort to improve training for school psychologists and other school personnel, one professional organization has developed an online training program that strives to provide in-depth training on the complexities of bullying and helps practitioners to develop strategies for bullying prevention (New York Association of School Psychologists [NYASP], n.d.). The program consists of four modules with a final project; each module covers one aspect of bullying and provides three hours of continuing professional development credit (NYASP, para. 1).

IDENTIFYING BULLYING

With adequate training and experience, school psychologists and counselors should be able to identify bullying as it occurs. Their training in mental health allows them to discern those students who are in conflictual peer interactions and are thus at risk for bullying. In their survey of 560 school psychologists and counselors, Lund et al. (2012) found that the majority of school mental health practitioners believe they are aware of bullying situations within their schools. Participants reported that bullying adversely affects 10–15% of their students and they are involved in developing strategies for handling bullying situations. However, this number is lower than statistics reported by a number of studies. For example, 86.2% of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered (LGBT) students reported being bullied in a school climate survey conducted by the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (Teaching Tolerance, n.d.). In a study by the National Center for Education Statistics, 42.9% of sixth graders were

bullied in 2009 (Teaching Tolerance). These numbers make it clear that school mental health practitioners are not aware of all the students being victimized at school. This is due in part to victims that are hesitant to report bullying and to the inability of school psychologists and counselors to be present at the moment that bullying occurs.

Nevertheless, school psychologists and counselors can be instrumental in identifying students who are being victimized by bullies. Many schools rely on anonymous self-reports from victims, which can be problematic if "bullying" is not clearly defined for students. In one study, Cornell and Mehta found that only 56% of students who self-identified as victims were actually confirmed as victims by trained school counselors (2011). Baly and Cornell (2011) attribute this, in part, to some students' inability to understand the difference between bullying and ordinary conflict between peers. When students were shown an educational video that distinguished between the two, they reported significantly less victimization than a control group that did not watch the video (Baly & Cornell). It is important that students be educated regarding what constitutes bullying.

Using peer nominations was used successfully in another study. Phillips and Cornell (2012) found that school counselors, when given adequate training and experience in identifying bullying, were a valuable resource in "identifying and aiding victims of bullying" (p. 129). The middle school in this study used school-wide surveys and a peer nomination form to help identify those students who might be victims of bullying. Use of peer nominations meant that several sources of information were available and that the victim could be identified. Rather than having students identify bullies and risk the social stigma of being an informer, they were asked to identify other students who they believed to have been bullied (Phillips & Cornell).

Peer nominations of victims are not sufficient, however, since it is possible that students could be nominated as a prank by their classmates (Phillips & Cornell, 2012). With this in mind, the school counselors interviewed those students that received multiple nominations. For students with two or more nominations, 43% were confirmed as victims while 90% of students with nine or more nominations were found to be victims (Phillips & Cornell). While this process was time-consuming, the authors found peer nominations to be an effective screening tool. In addition to identifying incidents of bullying, they can be useful in helping school mental health practitioners learn about students that are experiencing conflicts with peers that could develop into bullying.

INTERVENING IN BULLYING EPISODES

School psychologists and counselors have a different set of skills that can be used when intervening with bullies and victims. There are a number of methods that have the possibility of both preventing and intervening with bullying. These include teaching students to regulate their emotions, particularly their anger; develop more tolerant attitudes toward others; build trust and develop empathy; and develop better communication and relationship skills (Modin & Ostberg, 2009). The most common approach used by school psychologists and counselors is to talk to the bully and the victim to ensure they have a clear understanding of the situation. Then, if needed, individual counseling for both parties can be introduced (Lund et al., 2012).

Intervening in bullying can take place at several levels. Having a school-wide policy against bullying has been found to make school personnel more aware of bullying as it occurs and to increase the likelihood that educators who observe the incident will get other adults (e.g., school psychologist, school counselor, administrator) involved (Bauman et al., 2008). Making changes in the school environment can also serve as bullying interventions. Kyriakides and Creemers (2012) assert that increasing adult monitoring of students during passing periods and recess can help educators to identify bullying as it occurs and to make a swifter intervention.

School psychologists and school counselors can be effective in developing positive school climates, which have been found to be a deterrent to bullying. They can work with teachers and administrators to improve learning environments and visit classrooms to develop a better understanding of the dynamics that can lead to bullying (Kyriakides & Creemers, 2012). They can also provide strategies for teachers and parents who are dealing with bullying. This can be especially helpful for new teachers who may not understand how students feel about bullying. Developing this understanding helps teachers to respond effectively (Kahn, Jones, & Wieland, 2012). School psychologists and counselors also have the expertise to provide education to school staff, students, parents, and community leaders about bullying through interactive trainings, newsletters, and other resource materials (Diamanduros et al., 2008).

When students are involved in bullying, there is often disagreement among school personnel as to what should be done. Depending on their dispositional coping styles, teachers may feel strongly that bullies should be punished, a view not so readily accepted by school psychologists and

counselors. School psychologists and counselors are less likely to feel comfortable with punishing students and are less likely to advocate for a punitive approach to bullying than teachers (Rigby & Bauman, 2010). This is likely due to their role as student advocates rather than disciplinarians. In contrast, teachers see discipline as an important part of their role in order to maintain order and manage their classrooms. When Harris and Willoughby (2003) surveyed teachers on track to become administrators, they found a preponderance of them (56%) advocated for automatically punishing bullies; however, some of the teachers acknowledged that counseling might be helpful prior to the punishment. Rigby and Bauman (2010) found that 82% of teachers were prepared to punish the bully compared with 67% of counselors. When consulting with teachers, it is important that school psychologists and school counselors be cognizant of teachers' unique perspectives on bullying and how they cope with stressors (Kahn et al., 2012).

The type of training school psychologists and school counselors receive leads them to view students and bullying in a more empathic manner and to respond to bullying in different ways. Counselors have been found to have more empathy for victims of bullying, particularly when the bullying is physical or relational, than do teachers (Jacobsen & Bauman, 2007). They take relational bullying more seriously than do teachers and are more likely to intervene in incidents of relational bullying. They are also more likely to suggest interventions for bullies in relational bullying (Jacobsen & Bauman, 2007). Bauman et al. (2008) interpret this to mean that "school counselors may be more perceptive and more sensitive to issues of bullying than teachers" (p. 838). When intervening with bullying, teachers and school counselors agreed that enlisting other adults and working with the bully were important but disagreed as to the importance of working with the victim; counselors were more likely to work with the victim (i.e., through encouraging more assertive behavior from the victim) than were teachers (Rigby & Bauman, 2010).

While school psychologists, because of the nature of their job, may not be on campus at the time an intervention is required, school counselors are often called upon to intervene. Bauman et al. (2008) attribute the differences between teacher and counselor responses to bullying to the training that counselors receive. School counselors receive extensive training in active listening skills and learn to respond to students in a supportive, nonjudgmental way. In addition to focusing on students' academic success, they work to promote students' social and emotional growth. Their

training in these areas may make it easier for them to notice the more subtle forms of bullying and make it more difficult for them to ignore bullying incidents.

PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION

Many school psychologists and school counselors are engaged in the anti-bullying prevention and intervention services found in public schools today. Due to their expert knowledge and experiences in serving the psychological needs of students, these school professionals should be the first resources the schools turn to when bullying is an issue. School psychologists and school counselors should be involved in selecting the most appropriate program for their school and/or actively engaged in the implementation of the selected program. Understanding the variety of published and researched programs, as well as the current research findings on these programs, will help provide a broader understanding of the roles school psychologists and school counselors play in the implementation of anti-bullying programs in the schools.

THREE TIERS OF SCHOOL-BASED PROGRAMS

Anti-bullying programs typically tend to focus on one of three levels within the school environment (Lund et al., 2012). The broadest types are the school-wide bullying interventions, referred to as Universal or Tier 1 level programs. These broad-based programs have the goal of creating a positive school environment through respectful behaviors and no tolerance for bullying behaviors across a system, for example, school district. Tier 2 secondary programs have interventions designed for the classroom or small group settings. The individual-focused programs, Tier 3, concentrate on individual students, with separate interventions for the victim and for the bully (Lund et al., 2012).

By far, the most commonly used approach in schools are Universal/Tier 1 programs, with research supporting their use because they are comprehensive and address multiple layers of the school system (Whitted & Dupper, 2005). By changing the environment of the school, these systemic programs are able to impact students individually and in groups. Universal/Tier 1 programs are not only applied at the school district level but can also be found implemented at the state (Pennsylvania—Schroeder et al., 2012) and national levels (Finland—Salmivalli, Karna, & Poskiparta,

2010). These types of anti-bullying programs have a focus on increasing students', teachers', and school staff's knowledge around bullying behaviors and prevention, creating a positive school environment and promoting respect for all (Cross, Pintabota, Hall, Hamilton, & Erceg, 2004). However, research has not been able to fully support the broad application of current Universal/Tier 1 programs in schools due to mixed positive results based on gender, age, race/ethnicity, and types of bullying incidents (Bowlan, 2011).

Both Secondary/Tier 2 and Individual/Tier 3 level programs predominantly have a focus on building social skills, conducting peer mentoring, or having the victim or bully engage in individual or small group counseling (Lund et al., 2012). Lund and her colleagues report that there has been little research on Secondary/Tier 2 level programs and even less on Individual/Tier 3 level programs. From the research that has occurred to date, results are also mixed as to the effectiveness of programs at these levels in changing bullying behaviors. However, several studies have reported improvement in self-efficacy and self-concept of victims of bullying after involvement in Secondary/Tier 2 programs. Lund et al. posit that the reason for the primary focus on developing and researching Universal/Tier 1 programs is due to the commonly held premise that bullying occurs as a group phenomenon, which includes the victim, the bully, bystanders, and the environmental support; thus, targeting the Universal/Tier 1 level is the more effective approach to take. Another reason for research into the effectiveness of Universal/Tier 1 programs is the level of commitment, both financial and in staff time and effort, required for the implementation of the program. Administrators want to be certain that they are getting their money's worth and school psychologists can be instrumental in determining the effectiveness of these programs given their training in program evaluation.

EVALUATING SCHOOL-BASED PROGRAMS

There has been quite extensive research conducted over the years focused on both developing and evaluating anti-bullying programs. The quantity of studies have allowed for several meta-analyses focused on the efficacy and evaluation of existing programs to help school psychologists and counselors make evidence-based decisions on the efficacy of programs to be incorporated in their schools. One recent summary from Child Trends (Lawner & Terzian, 2013) presents several generalizations that can be

made from the research on anti-bullying programs and a chart with several of the most prominent programs evaluated across various dimensions. In short, Lawner and Terzian report that programs that included parents and used a “whole-school approach” were considered to be effective. When reviewing the prominent programs, they used a three-part (Found to Work, Not Found to Work, and Mixed Findings) grading system measured across five dimensions of the program’s impact of bullying outcome. The dimensions included overall bullying, social/relational bullying, bullying victimization, being a bystander, and attitudes toward bullying. Of the nine programs evaluated, only Success in Stages (Evers, Prochaska, Van Marter, Johnson, & Prochaska, 2007), an interactive computer program designed to decrease and prevent bullying, was found to be effective on three dimensions. However, based on the specific dimensions one would want their program to target, there were several that were identified as “Found to Work” on one or two dimensions as well.

Interestingly, the program evaluation conducted by Lawner and Terzian (2013) did not include the two most commonly researched and used Universal/Tier 1 programs, both with extensive and comprehensive national and international research studies investigating them. The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP; Olweus & Limber, 2002), which uses the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (BVQ; Olweus, 2002), is noted to be the most widely used, worldwide bullying behavior self-report. Research in the United States strongly supports the use of the OBPP for anti-bullying interventions with reports of reducing school-based bullying by 30%–50%, resulting in the program gaining an endorsement by the American Academy of Pediatrics in 2009 (Schroeder et al., 2012).

In addition to the OBPP, another internationally developed and researched school-based program is the KiVa Antibullying Program (Salmivalli et al., 2010). Commissioned by the Finnish government, the KiVa program has been incorporated into the Finnish public schools’ curriculum with an emphasis on preventative student lessons and specific actions to be taken when a bullying incident takes place (Ahtola et al., 2012). The largest success noted in the current research with the KiVa is the reduction of bullying incidents and behaviors in first through sixth grades (Karna et al., 2011). Research has also noted the positive impact this program has on teachers and the school climate in general (Ahtola et al., 2012) and the higher success found when using a non-confrontational approach (Garandeau, Poskiparta & Salmivalli, 2014).

Examples of other anti-bullying programs include the School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SW-PBIS; Kennedy & Swain-Bradway, 2012) and multicomponent Rural Early Adolescent Learning Program (Project REAL; Farmer, Hall, Petrin, Hamm & Dadisman, 2010). The SW-PBIS is a Tier 1/Universal proactive organizational framework for implementing practices to support the social and academic success of all students. It has been noted to reduce the rate of problem behaviors, including bullying in elementary schools (Bradshaw, Mitchell & Leaf, 2010), but not when homegrown videos are incorporated in the presentation modules (Kennedy & Swain-Bradway). Project REAL targets middle school students and is designed to raise teachers' awareness of the peer groups with which rural school students are involved to better understand bullying behaviors as they occur (Farmer et al., 2010).

Measuring bullying behaviors and attitudes is most often conducted through a self-report form. As previously mentioned, the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (BVQ; Olweus, 2002) is viewed both nationally and internationally as one of the most commonly used measures to obtain this information. However, in a concurrent validity study, Lee and Cornell (2010) found there to be only a modest correspondence between the self-reported behaviors indicated on the BVQ when compared to peer nominations for bullying and academic grades, two additional common factors associated with bullying behaviors. This research calls into question the overreliance on self-reported behavioral data and the importance of the roles school psychologists and counselors play in supporting the identification of and interventions with bullies and their victims.

ROLE OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS AND COUNSELORS IN SCHOOL-BASED ANTI-BULLYING PROGRAMS

The governments of countries around the world (e.g., United Kingdom, Finland, Canada, France, Australia, Philippines, etc.) have begun mandating anti-bullying efforts or legislating policies related to bullying (Garandeau et al., 2014). Their primary efforts are to impact bullying at the Tier1/Universal level, which means policies are set for school systems to enact programs and actions to curtail or end bullying within their systems. Richard, Schneider, and Mallet (2011) revisited the whole-school approach to bullying prevention within the generally agreed upon understanding that bullying is systemic; therefore, interventions must be

directed at the systems. Their research in a French school system found that mutual respect among school staff members and a greater focus on the quality of teacher-student interactions were needed for more success when an anti-bullying program was put in place.

The types of interactions with school staff, especially teachers, in which school psychologists and school counselors engage may also be seen as critical roles fostering a more collegial atmosphere and improving teacher-student interactions. Trained with consultation and collaboration skills, school psychologists and school counselors are able to identify and interact, often modeling most appropriate behaviors to staff, in order to help foster the most conducive environment for reducing bullying behaviors (Dougherty, 2014). As the mental health experts with advanced training in psychological principles of behavior and observational skills, school psychologists and school counselors are critical to the identification and understanding of the covert, as well as overt, bullying behaviors occurring in schools (Barnes et al., 2012).

Although school psychologists and counselors are involved in their school's anti-bullying prevention and intervention services, few report that they are involved in activities to select programs or engaged in the implementation of the program. The primary decision makers are school administrators when it comes to anti-bullying efforts (Lund et al., 2012), with the majority of school psychologists and school counselors reporting to have only a minor role in the anti-bullying programs within their schools. School psychologists and counselors are the school-based mental health professionals in the school system, and it is imperative that school administrators recognize their expertise and experience. School psychologists and school counselors must also begin to step up and advocate to the administrators, informing them of their training and skills to help identify evidence-based anti-bullying programs, as well as the critical role they can play to support the establishment of adopted programs across the district and within their schools.

ROLE OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS AND SCHOOL COUNSELORS IN WORKING WITH BULLIES AND VICTIMS

While school psychologists have pushed to take a more active role in developing school-wide approaches to bullying, most of those who are working within schools have focused on individual approaches to

intervention, such as counseling the bully and/or the victim (Swearer, Espelage, & Napolitano, 2009). Seeking to understand the actual roles of school counselors, as well as school psychologists, in their schools as they relate to anti-bullying activities and programs, Lund et al. (2012) surveyed both school professional groups and found that they are seldom included in the selection of bullying prevention programs within their school districts or buildings. Even when their schools had anti-bullying programs in place, the majority (86%) reported their primary role was to talk with the student to learn about the situation, similar to the Sherer and Nickerson (2010) results. The next most common intervention was conducting individual therapy with the bully (47%) or the victim (58%; Lund et al., 2012).

Sherer and Nickerson (2010) sought to identify the most common anti-bullying practices school psychologists witness in their school settings. Their survey results found the most frequent strategies implemented were school staff talking with the bullies after an event, disciplinary consequences for the bully, individual counseling for the victims, and individual counseling for the bullies. Sherer and Nickerson reported that the most frequent interventions used by school psychologists include “individual interventions with bullies and victims, such as talking with them or providing counseling, avoiding contact between the bully and victim, identifying at-risk students, and disciplining students who bully others” (p. 224). In addition to these individual interventions, “95.8% of responding school psychologists indicated that increased supervision in unstructured areas was a strategy used” (Sherer & Nickerson, 2010, p. 225). Some of the least engaged in strategies included peer-led courts, anti-bullying committees, student peer counseling for victims, and student-led anti-bullying activities (Sherer & Nickerson, 2010).

Counselors have suggested a number of interventions for bullies and victims (Bauman et al., 2008). For bullies, individual meetings with the counselor and referrals to mental health professionals have been suggested; for victims, extra attention, support groups, and training to develop assertiveness and self-esteem are warranted. Counselor-led mediation has also been suggested although it may be of limited effectiveness due to the power differential between bullies and victims (Bauman et al., 2008). Broader interventions such as targeted classroom guidance lessons, school-wide education programs to build character, and panel discussions have also been suggested (Bauman et al., 2008). When counseling is con-

sidered, school counselors were more likely to use group rather than individual sessions for treating bullies (Jacobsen & Bauman, 2007). Support groups can also be a protective factor for victims. Goodenow, Szalacha, and Westheimer (2006) found that LGBT students were less likely to be threatened by peers when their school had a support group for them. They were also less likely to make multiple suicide attempts.

In addition to individual interventions, school psychologists and school counselors may elect to assist in training students to participate in peer support programs. These programs help students to become more assertive, develop resilience, make good decisions, solve problems, and become leaders (Peer Support Australia, n.d.). Peer support systems have been found to be effective in challenging bullying in schools and creating a caring environment in UK schools (Naylor & Cowie, 1999) but were not found to be engaged in frequently by Sherer and Nickerson. This is likely due to the additional adult support required for peer support programs (Naylor & Cowie). Although school psychologists and school counselors have the expertise to play important roles in school-wide anti-bullying programs, research indicates they are seldom consulted when Universal/Tier 1 programs are selected. As a result, it appears their primary role is to provide individual and group interventions for bullies and victims. While they are trained to provide these services, it is likely they are being underutilized by school districts.

CONCLUSION

As previously noted, school psychologists and school counselors vary in their job roles, the number of schools they serve, and their ability to intervene in bullying as it happens; nevertheless, they serve as the mental health professionals for most school campuses and are arguably the best trained to manage bullying within the school. School counselors are likely to have received training related to bullying and to perceive themselves as being competent to counsel bullies and victims (Lund et al., 2012). Historically, school psychologists spent much of their time on campus assessing students and were more often viewed as assessment personnel than mental health practitioners. As the role of school psychologists broadens, it is likely they will spend more time intervening in bullying and helping schools to develop intervention programs. Their expertise in program evaluation should make them leaders at the campus or district level in developing and evaluating anti-bullying programs (Swearer, Espelage, &

Hymel, 2009). School psychologists and school counselors can also be instrumental in educating and training staff (Sherer & Nickerson, 2010) and in improving school climate (Espelage, Polanin, & Low, 2014).

REFERENCES

- Ahtola, A., Haataja, A., Karna, A., & Salmivalli, C. (2012). For children only? Effects of the KiVa antibullying program on teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*, 851–859.
- American School Counselor Association. (n.d.). *The role of the professional school counselor*. Retrieved from <http://schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/home/RoleStatement.pdf>
- Baly, M., & Cornell, D. (2011). Effects of an educational video on the measurement of bullying by self-report. *Journal of School Violence, 10*, 221–238. doi:10.1080/15388220.2011.578275.
- Barnes, A., Cross, D., Lester, L., Hearn, L., Epstein, M., & Monks, H. (2012). The invisibility of covert bullying among students: Challenges for school interventions. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 22*, 206–226. doi:10.1017/jgc.2012.27.
- Bauman, S., Rigby, K., & Hoppa, K. (2008). US teachers' and school counselors' strategies for handling school bullying incidents. *Educational Psychology, 28*, 837–856. doi:10.1080/0144340802379085.
- Bowllan, N. M. (2011). Implementation and evaluation of a comprehensive, school-wide bullying prevention program in an urban/suburban middle school. *Journal of School Health, 81*, 167–173. doi:10.1111/j.1746-1561.2010.00576.x.
- Bradshaw, C., Mitchell, M., & Leaf, P. (2010). Examining the effects of a school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports on student outcomes: Results from a randomized controlled effectiveness trial in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 12*, 131–132. doi:10.1177/1098300709334798.
- Cornell, D. G., & Mehta, S. (2011). Counselor confirmation of middle school student self-reports of bullying victimization. *Professional School Counseling, 14*, 261–270. doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2011-14.261.
- Cross, D., Pintabota, Y., Hall, M., Hamilton, G., & Erceg, E. (2004). Validated guidelines for school-based bullying prevention and management. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion, 6*(3), 34–42. doi:10.1080/14623730.2004.9721937.
- Diamanduros, T., Downs, E., & Jenkins, S. J. (2008). The role of school psychologists in the assessment, prevention, and intervention of cyberbullying. *Psychology in the Schools, 45*, 693–704. doi:10.1002/pits.20335.
- Dougherty, A. M. (2014). *Psychological consultation and collaboration in school and community settings* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Cengage.

- Espelage, D. L., Polanin, J. R., & Low, S. K. (2014). Teacher and staff perceptions of school environment as predictors of student aggression, victimization, and willingness to intervene in bullying situations. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *29*, 287–305. doi:[10.1037/spq0000072](https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000072).
- Evers, K. E., Prochaska, J. O., Van Marter, D. F., Johnson, J. L., & Prochaska, J. M. (2007). Transtheoretical-based bullying prevention effectiveness trials in middle schools and high schools. *Educational Research*, *49*, 397–414. doi:[10.1080/00131880701717271](https://doi.org/10.1080/00131880701717271).
- Farmer, T. W., Hall, C. M., Petrin, R., Hamm, J. V., & Dadisman, K. (2010). Evaluating the impact of a multicomponent intervention model on teachers' awareness of social networks at the beginning of middle school in rural communities. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *23*, 94–106. doi:[10.1037/a0020147](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020147).
- Garandau, C. F., Poskiparta, E., & Salmivalli, C. (2014). Tackling acute cases of school bullying in the KiVa Anti-Bullying Program: A comparison of two approaches. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *42*, 981–991. doi:[10.1007/s10802-014-9861-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-014-9861-1).
- Goodenow, C., Szalacha, L., & Westheimer, K. (2006). School support groups, other school factors, and the safety of sexual minority adolescents. *Psychology in the Schools*, *43*, 573–589. doi:[10.1002/pits.20173](https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20173).
- Hamburger, M. E., Basile, K. C., & Vivolo, A. M. (2011). *Measuring bullying victimization, perpetration, and bystander experiences: A compendium of assessment tools*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.
- Harris, S., & Willoughby, W. (2003). Teacher perceptions of student bullying behaviors. *ERS Spectrum*, *21*(3), 11–18.
- Jacobsen, K., & Bauman, S. (2007). School counsellor's responses to school bullying scenarios. *Professional School Counseling*, *11*, 1–9. doi:[10.5330/PSC.n.2010-11.1](https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2010-11.1).
- Kahn, J. H., Jones, J. L., & Wieland, A. L. (2012). Preservice teachers' coping styles and their responses to bullying. *Psychology in the Schools*, *49*, 784–793. doi:[10.1002/pts.21632](https://doi.org/10.1002/pts.21632).
- Karna, A., Voeten, M., Little, T. D., Poskiparta, E., Alanen, E., & Salmivalli, C. (2011). Going to scale: A nonrandomized nationwide trial of the KiVa antibullying programs for grades 1–9. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *79*, 796–805. doi:[10.1037/a0025740](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025740).
- Kennedy, M. J., & Swain-Bradway, J. (2012). *Rationale and recommended practices for using homegrown video to support school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports* (pp. 20–28). Winter: *Beyond Behavior*.
- Kratochwill, T. R. (2007). Preparing psychologists for evidence-based practice: Lessons learned and challenges ahead. *American Psychologist*, *62*, 826–843. doi:[10.1037/0003-066X.62.8.829](https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.8.829).

- Kub, J., & Feldman, M. A. (2015). Bullying prevention: A call for collaborative efforts between school nurses and school psychologists. *Psychology in the Schools*, 52, 658–671. doi:10.1002/pits.21853.
- Kyriakides, L., & Creemers, B. P. M. (2012). Characteristics of effective schools in facing and reducing bullying. *School Psychology International*, 34, 348–368. doi:10.1177/0143034312467127.
- Lawner, E. K., & Terzian, M. A. (2013). What works for bullying programs: Lessons from experimental evaluations of programs and interventions. Child Trends Research Brief. Publication #2013–39. Bethesda, MD: Child Trends.
- Lee, T., & Cornell, D. (2010). Concurrent validity of the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. *Journal of School Violence*, 9, 56–73. doi:10.1080/15388220903185613.
- Lund, E. M., Blake, J. J., Ewing, H. K., & Banks, C. S. (2012). School counselors' and school psychologists' bullying prevention and intervention strategies: A look into real-world practices. *Journal of School Violence*, 11, 246–265. doi:10.1080/15388220.2012.682005.
- Modin, B., & Ostberg, V. (2009). School climate and psychosomatic health: A multilevel analysis. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 20, 433–455. doi:10.10880/09243450903251507.
- National Association of School Psychologists. (2012). *Bullying prevention and intervention in schools [Position statement]*. Retrieved from http://nasponline.org/about_positionpapers/BullyingPrevention.pdf
- Naylor, P., & Cowie, H. (1999). The effectiveness of peer support systems in challenging school bullying: The perspectives and experiences of teachers and pupils. *Journal of Adolescence*, 22, 467–479. doi:10.1006/jado.1999.0241.
- New York Association of School Psychologists. (n.d.). *NYASP bullying prevention specialist program*. Retrieved from nyasp.wildapricot.org/bullying
- Olweus, D. (2002). A profile of bullying at school. *Educational Leadership*, 60, 12–17.
- Olweus, D., & Limber, S. P. (2002). *Bullying prevention program (Blueprints for violence prevention)*. Washington, DC: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence.
- Peer Support Australia. (n.d.). *Program overview*. Retrieved from <http://peersupport.edu.au/the-program/overview/>
- Phillips, V. I., & Cornell, D. G. (2012). Identifying victims of bullying: Use of counselor interviews to confirm peer nominations. *Professional School Counseling*, 15, 123–131. doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2012-15.123.
- Richard, J. F., Schneider, B. H., & Mallet, P. (2011). Revisiting the whole-school approach to bullying: Really looking at the whole school. *School Psychology International*, 33, 263–284. doi:10.1177/0143034311415906.
- Rigby, K., & Bauman, S. (2010). How school personnel tackle cases of bullying. A critical examination. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage

- (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 455–467). New York: Routledge.
- Sandhu, D. S. (2000). Alienated students: Counseling strategies to curb school violence. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 81–85.
- Salmivalli, C., Karna, A., & Poskiparta, E. (2010). Development, evaluation, and diffusion of a national anti-bullying program, KiVa. In B. Doll, W. Pfohl, & J. Yoon (Eds.), *Handbook of youth prevention science* (pp. 238–252). New York: Routledge.
- Sherer, Y. C., & Nickerson, A. B. (2010). Anti-bullying practices in American schools: Perspectives of school psychologists. *Psychology in the Schools, 47*, 217–229. doi:10.1002/pits.20466.
- Schroeder, B. A., Messina, A., Schroeder, D., Good, K., Barto, S., Saylor, J., & Masiello, M. (2012). The implementation of a statewide bullying prevention program: Preliminary finding from the field and the importance of coalitions. *Health Promotion Practice, 13*, 489–495. doi:10.1177/1524839910386887.
- StopBullying.gov. (n.d.). *What is bullying?* Retrieved from <http://www.stopbullying.gov/what-is-bullying/definition/index.html>
- Swearer, D. L., Espelage, T. V., & Hymel, S. (2009). What can be done about school bullying? Linking research to educational practice. *Educational Researcher, 39*(1), 38–47. doi:10.3102/0013189X09357622.
- Swearer, S. M., Espelage, D. L., & Napolitano, S. A. (2009). *Bullying prevention and intervention: Realistic strategies for schools*. New York, NY: Guilford Press. doi:PSIN-2009-01976-000; 2009-01976-000.
- Teaching Tolerance. (n.d.). *Bullying by the numbers*. Retrieved from http://www.tolerance.org/sites/default/files/kits/tt_BULLIED_Statistics.pdf
- Whitted, K., & Dupper, D. (2005). Best practices for preventing or reducing bullying in schools. *Children & Schools, 27*, 167–175. doi:10.1093/cs/27.3.167.
- Willard, N. (n.d.). *Professional practice: Addressing critical issues in bullying*. Retrieved from <http://www.nasponline.org/publications/periodicals/communicue/issues/volume-43-issue-2/addressing-critical-issues-in-bullying>