



Minnesota State University, Mankato
Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly
and Creative Works for Minnesota
State University, Mankato

All Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other
Capstone Projects

Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other
Capstone Projects

2019

Cyberbullying Prevention and Intervention: Perspectives of School Psychologists and School Counselors

Rachel E. Burlet
Minnesota State University, Mankato

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds>



Part of the [School Psychology Commons](#), and the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Burlet, R. E. (2019). Cyberbullying prevention and intervention: Perspectives of school psychologists and school counselors [Doctoral dissertation, Minnesota State University, Mankato]. Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.
<https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds/918/>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects at Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

Cyberbullying Prevention and Intervention: Perspectives of School Psychologists and
School Counselors

By

Rachel E. Burlet, M.S.

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor in Psychology
in
School Psychology

Minnesota State University, Mankato

Mankato, Minnesota

April 8, 2019

Cyberbullying Prevention and Intervention: Perspectives of School Psychologists and
School Counselors

Rachel Burlet

This Dissertation has been examined and approved by the following members of the
student's committee.

Carlos J. Panahon, Ph.D., Advisor

Kevin Filter, Ph.D., Committee Member

Daniel Houlihan, Ph.D., Committee Member

Sean Wachsmuth, Ph.D., Committee Member

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my family. Thank you for all of your support through the completion of this project and through my entire college and graduate studies career. Your love, encouragement, and belief in me has helped me to make it to where I am today. I appreciate all that you have done.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Carlos Panahon, Dr. Kevin Filter, Dr. Daniel Houlihan, and Dr. Sean Wachsmuth, for their wisdom and advice on this project. This dissertation would not have been possible without their support.

I want to extend a special thank my advisor Dr. Carlos Panahon for his commitment to supporting me not just through this project but through my entire time within the school psychology doctoral program. I am truly grateful for his guidance and for his confidence in me. It was an honor to have him as my advisor and to work with him on this project.

I also want to thank my parents and my brother for their support and for the long hours spent stuffing envelopes to send letters to participants. Their help and encouragement during this project was indispensable.

Finally, I want to thank the individuals of the School Psychology Program, the Psychology Department, and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences at Minnesota State University, Mankato. To the faculty and staff, thank you for your guidance and the learning opportunities you provided. To the students, and to my cohort in particular, thank you. It was an honor to learn and grow alongside you.

Abstract of the Dissertation

Cyberbullying Prevention and Intervention: Perspectives of School Psychologists and School Counselors

By

Rachel E. Burlet, M.S.

Recent studies have found that increasing numbers of students are experiencing cyberbullying during middle and high school. The current study examined how school psychologists and school counselors are involved in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying as well as what practices their schools are implementing to address this issue. Results found that school counselors were more involved than school psychologists with cyberbullying prevention and intervention efforts. However, 50% of school psychologists felt that their skills were being underutilized and 59% expressed a desire to be more involved in cyberbullying prevention and intervention efforts. Receiving training on cyberbullying was found to be related to increased feelings of preparedness to be involved with cyberbullying prevention and intervention. Though, in this study, only 8% of all participants felt very prepared to help select cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs. Participants rated creating a cyberbullying taskforce, positive school climate programs, peer mentors, and teaching empathy as the most effective prevention and intervention strategies. Based on these findings, schools need to provide the staff more training on the issue of cyberbullying and develop strategies to reduce school psychologists' barriers to involvement in this area. This will allow schools to develop knowledgeable teams to help address the issue of cyberbullying prevention and intervention.

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	I
Acknowledgement.....	II
Abstract of Dissertation.....	III
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
Cyberbullying as a Unique Problem.....	4
Existing Research.....	14
Current Study.....	17
Chapter 2. Methods.....	19
Participants.....	19
Measures.....	20
Procedures.....	22
Chapter 3. Results.....	24
Demographics and Training.....	24
Level of Preparedness and Concern.....	26
Utilization of Skills.....	30
Cyberbullying Programs in Schools.....	31
Chapter 4. Discussion.....	32
Conclusion and Implications.....	40
Limitations and Future Directions.....	41
References.....	43
Appendices.....	49

Chapter 1 Introduction

In today's world of increasing technology, children have more access to electronics and the internet than ever before. In addition, they are beginning to use them at a younger age each year. According to a Common sense media survey in 2011 found that 41% of children under 8 had access to smart phones in (Common Sense Media, 2013), in 2013 this had increased to 63% of children under the age of 8, and in 2017, 98% of children under 8 have access to a smart phone (Common Sense Media, 2017). These studies highlight how rapidly technology use among children expanding. With this rise in technology and internet use, a serious problem in our schools has developed, cyberbullying. Rates of students experiencing cyberbullying in schools has increased from 18% of students in 2007 to 33% of middle and high school students in 2016 (Hinduja & Patchin, 2016). As cyberbullying rates have increased, researchers have taken up the task of trying to understand the why and how of cyberbullying. So far, studies have focused on rates of cyberbullying, demographics of those who experience and commit cyberbullying, and the consequences of cyberbullying (Patchin & Hinduja, 2012). In addition, proposed prevention strategies have appeared in the literature such as: conducting a needs assessment, creating policies that address cyberbullying, creating a positive school climate, using peer mentors to teach materials, emphasizing empathy and social values online, providing information to students, teachers and parents, and finally teaching students how to effectively respond to cyberbullying. However, no articles have examined if these practices or others are actually being implemented by schools or if schools have staff who are trained and knowledgeable regarding how to intervene in

cyberbullying. Without a clear understanding of what is currently being done within schools to prevent and intervene in cyberbullying, researchers are unable to focus their research on validating the effectiveness of specific programs or identify barriers to improving staff knowledge of these issues. Therefore, this study aimed to close this gap by providing a comprehensive look into how schools are currently responding to cyberbullying, including if they have and are utilizing trained staff members.

In order to examine cyberbullying experts across professional fields have proposed various definitions. However, because this is still a relatively new topic, there does not seem to be one agreed upon definition. Some definitions of cyberbullying seem to be broad and often vague in an attempt to cover a wide range of behaviors. For example, stopcyberbullying.gov (2015) states that “cyberbullying is bullying that takes place using electronic technology.” This definition is too open-ended and does not clearly identify what is and is not cyberbullying. Other definitions attempt to list the media through which cyberbullying occurs, such as nobullying.com (2015) which defines cyberbullying as “the act of using the Internet, cell phones, video games, or other technology gadgets to send, text, or post images intended to hurt or embarrass another person.” This definition may be too restrictive by listing the types of electronics and intentions of cyberbullying. Technology and the way it is used are constantly changing. Therefore, a definition such as this one could quickly become outdated and would need to be constantly updated. One of the most common definitions cited in research is by Smith, which defines cyberbullying as “An aggressive, intentional act carried out by a group or individual, using electronic forms of contact, repeatedly and over time against a victim who cannot easily defend him or herself” (Smith et al., 2008, p.376). When compared to

the definition of traditional bullying which notes that bullying is when a student is “exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students.” characterized by “an imbalance of strength.” (Olweus, 1994, p.1173). We can see many similarities between these definitions such as a concept of repetition and a perceived power imbalance as two key components. However, the use of the term repeatedly brings about an interesting problem when referring to cyberbullying. Online, when an individual posts a hurtful lie or rumor about another, it has the potential to spread quickly to a wide number of individuals who may in turn post a mean comment or share the content with others. In this sense, the target is exposed to this victimization repeatedly though it is not necessarily by the same person (Slonje, Smith, & Frisé, 2013). Thus, one incident of cyberbullying, while not repeated by the bully, may be linked to repeated victimization. This type of repetition is an important distinction when trying to define cyberbullying.

Another unique aspect when considering the definition of cyberbullying is the concept of a perceived power differential. This concept is common in definitions of traditional bullying but is more complicated in cyberbullying where the identity of the bully may be anonymous (Slonje, Smith, & Frisé, 2013). A traditional bully’s power is often related to physical size or popularity. The power that a cyberbully wields more often stems from the individual’s internet popularity or ability to remain anonymous. When the victim is unable to determine whom the bully is, it becomes more difficult to stop the cyberbullying attacks. Additionally, when the majority of cyberbullying occurs away from school, students may feel that they do not know whom they can reach out to for help. This perceived lack of control over the situation and inability to identify the

bully could result in the power differential that is referred to in Smith's definition of bullying.

Other differences between traditional bullying and cyberbullying can be noted in the far-reaching and constant nature of cyberbullying. In traditional bullying, the extent of those who witness the attack are usually limited to the individuals within the immediate vicinity of the incident, and in some cases, news of the incident may spread throughout a school. With cyberbullying, the potential for an incident to be public and available for others to see is exponentially greater. The incident is no longer confined to a small group of witnesses, or at most a school. Instead, when a cyberbully posts a mean comment or incriminating picture on social media, anyone and everyone is able to view it. Furthermore, when something is posted online, it can be nearly impossible to completely remove it. This combination of the victimization reaching a wider audience and the difficulty to remove the post may result in victims feeling as though they cannot escape from the attack.

While no one definition of cyberbullying has yet to be universally adopted by the field, it is clear that this concept should be considered unique and distinctly different from traditional bullying. This is evident through the differences in how repetition and power are experienced as well as the constant nature of cyberbullying. Within this paper Smith's definition will be used when referring to cyberbullying.

Cyberbullying as a Unique Problem

It is not just the definitional differences which suggest that cyberbullying is unique from traditional bullying. This shift is seen in areas such as the legal system, school policies, and research recommendations.

In recent years, changes have taken place within the legal system that suggests cyberbullying is being treated as its own problem separate from traditional bullying. The 2008 Broadband Data Improvement Act put in place a requirement for schools to address the issue of cyberbullying specifically. This piece of legislation highlights that policy makers see a need to address the issue of cyberbullying separately rather than lumping it together under existing bullying legislation. Additionally, many states have started to implement legislation that is specific to cyberbullying because they discovered difficulties in trying to prove that acts of cyberbullying qualified under existing bullying legislation (Snakenborg, Van Acker, & Gable, 2011). These difficulties were mainly attributed to differences discussed earlier such as repetition, anonymity, and power of the bully. Some states, such as North Carolina and Arkansas, have enacted legislation making it a misdemeanor to engage in cyberbullying. These laws are separate from those which address traditional bullying.

In addition, differentiation is occurring between traditional bullying and cyberbullying within the school system and within recommendations for schools from the literature. Studies such as those by Cross et. al (2011), Feinberg and Robey (2009), and Hinduja and Patchin (2009) provide strategies that are specific to cyberbullying prevention and intervention. There is little evidence to suggest that traditional bullying strategies may be effective in reducing cyberbullying. As such, new programs and strategies specifically for cyberbullying are needed to address this issue.

There is also evidence to suggest that cyberbullying is generally seen and treated as a separate problem through recommendations presented on government and research supported websites. For example, stopbullying.gov provides different suggestions for

preventing cyberbullying than it does for bullying. Similarly, the Minnesota Department of Education provides different resources for cyberbullying and bullying. They provide both a resource for helping families talk to a child who is bullied (Minnesota Department of Education, 2016) as well as a separate resource for helping families prevent cyberbullying (Minnesota Department of Education, 2015).

The evidence is building to suggest that cyberbullying is a problem that is unique from traditional bullying and would suggest that the way in which we aim to prevent and intervene in cyberbullying needs to be specific to this problem. As such, this study sought to identify if schools have specific interventions aimed at cyberbullying that are separate from those used to prevent and intervene with traditional bullying. It also sought to identify if schools have staff members who have knowledge specific to responding to cyberbullying.

Techniques to prevent and intervene with cyberbullying are needed within our schools because research has shown that cyberbullying is related to a number of negative outcomes for both the bullies and the victims. Individuals who engage in cyberbullying are more likely to experience decreased school performance, engage in drug use, and take part in other maladaptive behaviors (Kowalski, Giumetti, Schroeder, & Lattanner, 2014). Individuals who are victims of cyberbullying are also at increased risk for a number of negative outcomes. For example, victims are more likely to use drugs and alcohol in the future (Stopbullying.gov, 2015). They may be unwilling to attend school or skip school for fear of encountering their bully, as well as a general fear of not knowing who at school may be the bully (Bauman, 2007). This can also lead to poor school performance. Other school problems may also occur such as skipping class, receiving increased

detentions and suspensions, and increasing the possibility that the student may bring a weapon to school (Tokunaga, 2010). Victims of cyberbullying are also more likely to have low self-esteem, suffer from depression, and attempt suicide (Cassidy, Faucher, & Jackson, 2013). These negative effects make it clear that schools need to be actively working to prevent and intervene in these incidents of cyberbullying.

To date there are only a handful of programs available to aid in the prevention of cyberbullying. Of those that do exist, there is very little research supporting their effectiveness. While many of the programs claim to be based on research of generally effective practices, most lack empirical studies that examine the effectiveness of the program's use in schools. A variety of programs exist ranging from those which only address cyberbullying to those taking a broader approach and focusing on digital citizenship. Digital citizenship teaches students how to engage in responsible and safe internet use, and is defined as "The norms of behavior with regards to technology use" (Ribble, Bailey, & Ross, 2004). These programs will often have a unit devoted to cyberbullying within the broader curriculum.

One program that is available to aid in the prevention of cyberbullying is iSafe (iSAFE Digital Learning, 2015). This digital citizenship program provides an internet safety curriculum for students in grades K-12. Within the curriculum, eight lessons are directed towards cyberbullying for students in grades K-5 and another seven lessons are available for students in grades 6-12. This program addresses what cyberbullying is, how students can recognize it, and how to respond if they or a friend experience cyberbullying. Another digital citizenship curriculum is Common Sense Education, which also addresses online safety and kind use of the internet (Common Sense

Education, 2016). Lessons on cyberbullying are available at different grade ranges including K-2, 3-5, 6-8 and 9-12. Each lesson addresses a topic of cyberbullying that is appropriate and relevant to that age group. A third digital citizenship curriculum is NetSmartz. This program offers lessons for ages 5 to adult and the cyberbullying lessons address topics such as why cyberbullying is hurtful and knowing what bystanders can do to help stop cyberbullying (NetSmartz, 2016). Another program, Cyber Bullying: A Prevention Curriculum, offers two curriculums. One curriculum is aimed at students in grades 3-5 and another aimed at students in grades 6-12. This program is designed to only address the topic of cyberbullying rather than digital citizenship. Each lesson is designed to build off of the previous one and addresses topics ranging from defining cyberbullying to examining real-life scenarios.

Research into the effectiveness of these prevention programs is limited, with many of them having little to no research support. The exception is the iSafe program. However, researchers were unable to show that using the programs resulted in changes to student behavior (Chibnall, Wallace, Leicht, & Lunghofer, 2006). Nevertheless, new research on risk factors, and prevention programs continue to be conducted each year, and a number of individual practices not tied to a specific program have been proposed for how schools can help prevent cyberbullying and mitigate its effects. While different strategies have been proposed, a few consistent recommendations were identified in the literature. These include: conducting a needs assessment, creating policies that address cyberbullying, creating a positive school climate, using peer mentors to teach materials, emphasizing social values online, providing information to students, teachers and parents, and teaching students how to effectively respond to cyberbullying.

Authors have suggested schools that formally identify the extent cyberbullying is a problem through a needs assessment may be better prepared to implement an intervention or prevention program (Feinberg & Robey, 2009; Hinduja & Patchin, 2009). School policies can aid in clarifying how teachers and administrators respond to breaches in the proper use of electronics, as well as how cyberbullying incidents will be dealt with at the school level (Brown, Jackson, & Cassidy, 2006; Diamanduros, Downs, & Jenkins, 2008; Feinberg & Robey, 2009). Positive school climate programs have shown to have a strong relationship with reductions in cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2014). Whole school approaches such as addressing school climate have also been found to be successful when addressing face-to-face bullying, and it is suspected that these policies would be similarly effective in dealing with cyberbullying (Pearce et al., 2011). Research has also suggested that the use of peer mentors may be an effective approach in the fight against cyberbullying. Peer mentoring has been found to be an effective strategy among middle school students when teaching that cyberbullying is harmful and providing ways to react to cyberbullying (Banerjee, Robinson, & Smalley, 2010). Emphasizing relationships, empathy, and social values online may also be effective in preventing and reducing cyberbullying (Bamford, 2004; Campbell, 2005; Snakenborg, Van Acker, & Gable, 2011; Walker, 2012). Finally, one of the most common recommendations for addressing cyberbullying is to teach students that when they are faced with or witness cyberbullying they should tell an adult (Diamanduros, Downs, & Jenkins, 2008; Feinberg & Robey, 2009; Snakenborg, Hinduja & Patchin, 2012; Snakenborg, Van Acker, & Gable, 2011). As we examine what schools are currently doing to prevent cyberbullying,

it will be important to look if they are implementing commercialized programs and using any of these individual practices.

Through the exploration of the current literature on cyberbullying, it became evident that information exists regarding the prevention of cyberbullying; however, there is a distinct lack of resources on interventions. Prevention programs are those that a school implements prior to the occurrence of cyberbullying to try to prevent it from occurring in the future. Intervention programs on the other hand, are those that a school can implement once cyberbullying occurs in an effort to reduce them and to provide support to the victims. The focus on the prevention of cyberbullying in the literature is understandable. Schools would prefer to be proactive and prevent all cyberbullying rather than waiting until cyberbullying is occurring to intervene. However, as discussed previously in this paper, it is known that cyberbullying is occurring in schools. While prevention programs are important and should be implemented, schools also need to have effective intervention programs in place to respond to incidents of cyberbullying.

A number of prevention programs and practices have been proposed within the research community. While research into the effectiveness of the prevention programs is still limited, more research is available regarding the individual practices that have been proposed. These practices include conducting a needs assessment, creating policies to address cyberbullying, and developing a positive school climate. In many cases, the programs that have been developed such as NetSmartz and iSafe have combined many of these individual components, which lends some credibility to their potential effectiveness. However, there is no research that examines these programs as a whole and their effectiveness in preventing cyberbullying. In addition to a lack of research into

prevention programs, there is a lack of research regarding intervention strategies and programs that may be effective in reducing current rates of cyberbullying. Schools face an uphill battle against cyberbullying without a clear understanding of effective prevention and intervention strategies and programs. To compensate for a lack of empirically supported programs, schools may turn to traditional bullying prevention and intervention strategies or may attempt to create their own programs with the hope that these will also be effective for cyberbullying. Currently, there is a lack of understanding about how schools have started to address the issue of cyberbullying among students. It is unclear if they are using the suggested strategies, have created their own programs, or are currently not addressing the issue. Without an understanding of what schools are doing to prevent and intervene in cyberbullying, researchers are unable to provide relevant recommendations for how to improve cyberbullying prevention and intervention within schools.

One resource that schools have to help examine and improve their current cyberbullying prevention and intervention efforts is to involve staff members who have training and expertise in this area. The professional roles of school psychologists and school counselors are well aligned with participating in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying. The National Association of School Psychologists supports the role of school psychologists in bullying prevention and intervention stating that they can take a leading role in developing school wide bullying prevention and intervention efforts. More specifically, they can become involved in developing prevention and intervention activities and programs (National Association of School Psychologists, 2012). With support for their role in the prevention and intervention of bullying, it is not too big of a

leap to suggest that they may be similarly well suited to engage in these efforts as they relate to cyberbullying. Diamandurous, Downs, and Jenkins (2008) also indicate that school psychologists are in the unique position of being able to serve as leaders in developing cyberbullying prevention and intervention strategies and policies within a school.

Historically school psychologists have spent a majority of their time engaging in psychoeducational evaluations (Reschly, 2000). In a 2002 study researchers found that school psychologists spent 46% of their time engaged in assessments, 16% of their time in consultation, and only 13% of their time engaging in intervention activities (Bramlett, Murphy, Johnson, Wallingsford, & Hall, 2002). However, the role of school psychologists has slowly been expanding over time and in a 2010 survey, while 47% of the average school psychologists time was still spent engaging in assessments and evaluations, it was found that up to a third of their time was spent engaging in activities to address prevention and intervention efforts at the school level (Castillo, Curtis, & Gelley, 2012). Additionally, that study found that 10% of their time was spent promoting school wide social emotional supports. As school psychologists' roles have expanded to include more school wide prevention efforts they have become well positioned within the school system to engage in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying. As such, school psychologists were chosen to participate in this study, as it is believed they have knowledge of the current strategies in place within the schools as well as knowledge regarding which strategies may be most beneficial to adopt in the future.

Similarly, the American School Counseling Association supports the role of school counselors in working with students, families, and school staff to identify and

intervene with students who engage in harmful behavior, including cyberbullying (American School Counseling Association, 2017). Their role in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying is also supported by previous studies which have noted that school counselors possess the training necessary to respond effectively to bullying, and are more confident in their ability to deal with bullying than teachers (Bauman, Rigby, & Hoppa, 2008). Additionally, school counselors were found to be more involved in selecting traditional bullying prevention and intervention programs than school psychologists (Lund, Blake, Ewing, & Banks, 2012). As such, they may also be well suited to be involved in the selection of cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs and policies.

School counselors have traditionally had widely varied roles within the school system ranging from individual counseling of students, scheduling, college prep, and crisis response (Trolley, 2011). In a study done in 2000, counselors were found to engage primarily in three areas; individual and small group counseling, classroom guidance and lessons, and consolation with community agencies (Burnham & Jackson, 2000). A more recent study in 2015 found that school counselors spent a majority of their time counseling students about academics and behaviors, and consulting with staff about student academics and behaviors (Goodman-Scott, 2015.). School counselors engage in a variety of activities and with many different individuals within a school. As such they have a broad perspective on the current climate and the needs of the school system to best support staff and students. This perspective and experience puts them in a position within the school to be able to assist with cyberbullying prevention and intervention.

While school psychologists and school counselors appear to be well positioned within the school to address cyberbullying, and their professional roles support these efforts, there is a lack of understanding on their level of preparedness and training to actually be involved with cyberbullying prevention and intervention. A previous study by Thomas, Kariuki, and Yilmaz, (2011) found that teachers were not aware of how to respond to cyberbullying among their students. However, there is not a study that addresses the level of knowledge or preparedness of school psychologists and counselors in responding to cyberbullying. Understanding school mental health workers knowledge and comfort level in dealing with cyberbullying will further the existing body of literature as well as help to focus training efforts on individuals most involved and on those areas where staff feel least prepared

Additionally, no studies to date have looked at what cyberbullying prevention and intervention strategies and programs are actually being used in schools. Academic papers have looked at what programs may be effective and provide recommendations to schools (Cross, Monks, Campbell, Spears, & Slee, 2011; Feinberg & Robey, 2009; Hinduja & Patchin, 2009). However, no comprehensive study of current cyberbullying practices is available. Additionally, there is a lack of understanding regarding how prepared school psychologists and school counselors are in regard to supporting their school in preventing and intervening with cyberbullying. The current study will fill this gap in the research by addressing current cyberbullying prevention and intervention practices in schools as well as provide insight into how school mental health provides can assist schools in advancing these practices.

Existing Research

While no comprehensive studies have taken a look at cyberbullying practices within schools, a few studies have examined what schools are doing to reduce rates of traditional bullying (Lund, Blake, Ewing, & Banks, 2012; O'Malley, 2009; Sherer & Nickerson, 2010). In their study of bullying prevention strategies used by school psychologists and school counselors, Lund, Blake, Ewing and Banks (2012) sought to understand who was involved in selecting bullying interventions for schools. In addition, the authors wanted to understand the extent that the school professionals had received training related to bullying assessment and intervention and to gain a better understanding of what bullying interventions were being implemented in schools. A total of 560 school counselors and school psychologists completed their online survey. They found that school counselors were more likely to be involved in responding to bullying incidents than school psychologists. They also found that most participants had received some form of training in bullying intervention through conferences, in-service training, or training during graduate courses. School counselors reported having received more training and feeling more competent in responding to bullying than school psychologists. They also found that the majority of programs were selected by administrators and that school psychologists rarely made these decisions. In addition to looking at traditional bullying, they briefly examined the topic of cyberbullying and noted that respondents reported using programs such as the Cyberbullying Prevention Program, Stop Bullying Now, Bully-Proofing Your School, and Common Sense Media. However, cyberbullying was not the focus of the study and it did not cover a comprehensive list of cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs or practices.

Sherer and Nickerson (2010) conducted a survey of 213 school psychologists regarding their schools' bullying prevention efforts. Participants rated the frequency of use of 43 anti-bullying strategies as well as indicating the most and least effective strategies. They found that talking with the bully and suspension/expulsion were the two most frequently used strategies. They also found that school psychologists viewed school-wide positive behavior intervention and support (SWPBIS) as the most effective. Some of the strategies examined in this study can be applied to cyberbullying, however, this was not specifically mentioned nor the focus of the study. A comparison of the use and perceived importance of strategies such as SWPBIS between bullying and cyberbullying prevention efforts may provide insight into how schools are responding to the problem of cyberbullying vs. traditional bullying.

In O'Malley's (2009) survey of 300 California school psychologists, the availability and use of interventions to address peer victimization in schools was examined. The study provided a list of 16 interventions and asked participants to indicate whether each one was available at their school and how important they felt each of the interventions was. It was found that whole-school no tolerance policies were the most available intervention and also viewed as the most important. While many of the interventions for peer victimization addressed in this study could potentially be applied to the topic of cyberbullying, it does not include programs specific to addressing this topic. This study provided insight into how schools are responding to peer victimization which is closely related to the area of cyberbullying. The current study provided a more focused examination into cyberbullying prevention and intervention efforts.

A need exists to understand what schools are currently doing to address cyberbullying as well as how prepared school psychologists and school counselors feel to support these efforts. This knowledge can be used to focus research on the efficacy of those programs, as there is currently little support for any cyberbullying efforts. Efforts should focus on programs currently in use so that research can directly inform schools if they should continue to be used or not. Understanding the level of preparedness that school psychologists and school counselors have will aid in understanding the types of roles that they play within this process. This information will shed light on who may benefit from additional training as well as who may be able to participate in supporting these efforts. These two groups of professionals were targeted for inclusion in the current study because previous research showed them to be highly involved in the prevention and intervention of traditional bullying. Therefore, it is reasonable to believe that these same individuals may be involved in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying.

Current Study

The purpose of the current study was to add to the existing body of literature on cyberbullying by providing information on what schools are currently doing to prevent and intervene with cyberbullying. It also aimed to understand the knowledge that school psychologists and school counselors have regarding cyberbullying prevention and intervention and their level of preparedness for dealing with cyberbullying. It builds upon the findings of previous studies such as by Lund, Blake, Ewing, and Banks (2012) and Sherer and Nickerson (2010) which examined the use of prevention and intervention strategies being used in schools to address traditional bullying and the involvement of school psychologists and school counselors. These previous studies primarily addressed

traditional bullying, and as such a study that addresses cyberbullying specifically, rather than merely extrapolating from traditional bullying, was needed.

This need is found through the knowledge that cyberbullying is a unique problem as seen in expanded laws, and school policies as well as the growing body of scientific literature that provides separate and unique recommendations to combat cyberbullying. The prevention and intervention strategies used to address cyberbullying may vary significantly from findings for traditional bullying. This survey of current cyberbullying practices helps understand which prevention and intervention programs are currently being used in the schools. This study also helps to highlight the roles that school psychologists and school counselors currently play within cyberbullying prevention and intervention efforts. As well as exploring the extent to which these individuals feel that they are involved in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying at a level that is commensurate with their training and their preferred level of involvement.

This study sought to answer three main research questions. First, what variables impact how prepared and involved individuals are in cyberbullying prevention and intervention efforts, as well as what variables impact to how concerned they are about cyberbullying at their school? Second, do school psychologists and school counselors feel they are involved in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying at a level that is commensurate with their skills and training, and what is their desired level of involvement? Third, which cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs are most frequently used in schools, and which are perceived to be the most and least effective?

Five hypotheses were proposed in this study. First, school psychologists and school counselors will overall feel a lack of preparedness to address cyberbullying within

the school. Second, those who had received training about cyberbullying prevention and intervention would feel the most prepared to be involved with these efforts at their schools. The third hypothesis posited that those who had received training on cyberbullying would be the most involved in prevention and intervention efforts at their schools. The fourth hypothesis posited that individuals who had recently entered their respective field would feel the most prepared and be the most involved in cyberbullying prevention and intervention efforts at their schools. Finally, it was hypothesized that prevention and intervention efforts currently being used within schools to address cyberbullying will primarily be informal methods that lack substantial support from research.

Chapter 2 Methods

Participants

A total of 212 participants accessed the survey. The sample was comprised of 122 school psychologists and 85 school counselors. The return rate for school psychologists was 12.2%. The return rate for school counselors is unknown as the total number of individuals who had access to the survey could not be counted. Five participants were removed from the sample because three indicated they worked in other fields and two did not answer the question regarding the field of employment. Of the 122 school psychologists, four participants' responses were excluded from the analysis as they completed less than 50% of the questionnaire. Of the 85 school counselors, 15 individuals' responses were removed as they completed less than 50% of the questionnaire. Therefore, a total of 188 surveys were included for analysis of which 118 were school psychologists and 70 were school counselors. Table 1 (see appendix A)

shows the demographics of the sample. Of the 188 participants, 65 had been in their field for 1 to 5 years, 36 for 6 to 10 years, 18 for 11 to 15 years, 30 for 16 to 20 years, and 39 had been in their field for 21 or more years. The total caseloads of participants varied significantly as 77 participants reported caseloads of less than 500 students, 58 had 500 to 1000 students, 25 had 1000 to 1500 students, and 28 had more than 1500 students on their caseloads. Participants were asked to indicate all school levels that they worked at, as such 101 participants indicating they worked at an elementary school, 94 at a middle school, and 110 at a high school, with 78 participants having selected two or more school levels.

Measures

An online survey was created using Qualtrics, an online survey platform that allows researchers to create sophisticated surveys that can be distributed to participants electronically and will collect and store data securely. Questions in this survey focused on three areas, demographic information and training on cyberbullying, respondents' feelings of preparedness involvement and in the area of cyberbullying, and cyberbullying prevention and intervention strategies that are currently being used in their schools. These questions were based on previous bullying surveys including those by Lund, Blake, Ewing, and Banks (2012), Sherer and Nickerson, (2010), and O'Malley (2009).

Within the area of demographics and training the following six questions were presented: what field do you work in, how long have you been working in the field, what is your student to school counselor/psychologist caseload, have you received training related to cyberbullying, where did you receive training, and what was the training about.

In the second section of the survey, six questions addressed the following topics: how prepared do you feel to support prevention and intervention efforts at your school, how prepared do you feel to directly help a student who reports that they are being cyberbullied, how have you been involved with the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying, do you feel your skills are being utilized appropriately, how much do you want to be involved with cyberbullying at your school, and how concerned are you about cyberbullying at your school.

Finally, four questions about the strategies used in the schools to prevent and intervene with cyberbullying were presented. These questions addressed the following: does your school have cyberbullying prevention programs in place, who selects these strategies, what strategies does the school currently employ, and how effective have these strategies been. For the questions regarding strategies, a list of 34 possible prevention and intervention strategies and policies were provided and participants were asked to select all programs that have been used at their school. This list was created based on a comprehensive review of the literature. Effectiveness of the interventions were scored on a five point Likert scale from 1 not effective to 5 extremely effective. For the purposes of this survey, the concepts of prevention and intervention were asked about in a single question rather than broken out as separate questions. While these concepts are certainly separate matters, as discussed previously in this paper, it was determined that because many of programs which were asked about include components of both prevention and intervention asking about them as a combined construct would aid in the ease of understanding the questions. All questions and possible responses used in the survey can be viewed in Appendix B. Questions were reviewed for clarity and participant

understanding by graduate students at Minnesota State University, Mankato prior to distributing the survey to participants.

Procedures

School psychologists were contacted through a mailing list provided by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). In order to gain access to the mailing list, a research proposal was submitted to the NASP Research Committee and approved. Then, one thousand randomly selected members were mailed an initial letter with a URL to complete the survey. The letter included an explanation of the purpose of the current study, information about the questionnaire and types of questions, as well as their rights as participants. A second letter was mailed to the 1000 members as a follow up reminder two weeks after the initial letter was sent. This follow up letter thanked those who had already participated as well as again encouraged participation from those who had not yet done so. A copy of both letters can be found in Appendix C.

School counselors were contacted in a variety of ways including posting information about the survey along with a link on the American School Counseling Association's (ASCA) research website, School Counseling Analysis Leadership Evaluation (SCALE). This information was also included in the Monthly E-news letter sent out by ASCA to all members. In addition, information and the link to the study were sent to the Minnesota School Counselors Association email list serve and to alumni of the School Counseling program at Minnesota State University, Mankato. Lastly, the researcher contacted professional acquaintances who in turn reached out to school counselors and school psychologists they knew.

The survey that participants were asked to complete was designed to include adaptive question technology. As such, the number of items presented to each participant varied depending on how they answered questions. For example, participants who responded that they had not received training related to cyberbullying were not presented with follow up questions which asked for details about the type of training received. Similarly, participants were only asked to rate the effectiveness of cyberbullying prevention programs if they had indicated that specific program was used at their school. The most questions that a participant could be asked to answer was 18, including the question if he or she would take the survey. Consent to participate in the survey was obtained by the participant selecting “Yes, I will take the survey” in the first question. If they selected “No, I do not wish to take the survey”, they were thanked for their time and the survey ended. No participants selected this option. Some of these questions included multiple sub items that participants were asked to respond to. For example, the question about which prevention and intervention efforts were currently being used at their school presented a list of 34 possible cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs and policies that participants were asked to select from.

The analyses used to answer the first two research questions consisted primarily of chi-square tests of independence. This statistical test is used to examine if a relationship exists between two categorical variables by comparing the frequency of responses observed in each category compared to what might be expected based on chance (Field, 2013). The majority of the questions presented to participants provide categorical responses. For example, the question of what field an individual worked in was answered as either school counselor or school psychologist. The first two research

questions posed by the study sought to understand if meaningful relationships existed between the categorical variables of field of work, training received, feelings of preparedness, level of involvement, level of utilization of skills, and desired level of involvement. These were all either nominal or ordinal categorical variables. As such, a chi-square test of independence was appropriate. The third research question relied on descriptive analysis. Totals for the number of individuals who reported that their school used a program were calculated. Ratings of effectiveness had been answered on a 5-point Likert scale, the scores for each program were totaled and averaged.

Chapter 3 Results

Analyses of the survey responses were conducted to examine the demographics and training of participants and to address the three main research questions. First, what variables contribute to the level of preparedness, involvement, and concern of school psychologists and school counselors in relation to cyberbullying prevention and intervention? Second, do school psychologists and school counselors feel they are being utilized to help support the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying at a level that is commensurate with their skills and training? Third, which cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs are most frequently used in schools as well as which programs are perceived to be the most and least effective?

Demographics and Training

In reviewing the demographic data reported by the respondents, school counselors were more likely to be relatively new to the field with 66% reporting being in the field for less than ten years. School psychologists on the other hand were evenly distributed

between those who had been working in the field for more (53%) or less (47%) than 10 years.

When asked if they had received any training related to cyberbullying, approximately half of both school psychologists (53%) and school counselors (49%) reported having received training through either pre-service training, in-service training, or through a conference. There was not a significant relationship between the field participants worked in and having received training or not ($\chi^2(1) = .124, p = .73$). For all participants, training related to cyberbullying prevention and intervention was most commonly received through either in-service training (N=55) or conference training (N=56). Preservice training was reported as the least common (N=22). The most common type of training received was learning about what cyberbullying is (N=95) followed by learning how to directly respond to a child who is a victim of cyberbullying (N= 69) and learning about effective prevention strategies (N=64). The least common type of training was learning about a packaged cyberbullying prevention program (N=15). A chi-square test of independence found a significant relationship between the field individuals work in and if they had received training on a packaged cyberbullying program ($\chi^2(1) = 4.27, p = .04$). That is, school counselors were more likely (25%) than school psychologists (10%) to have learned about a packaged cyberbullying program. For all other types of training, no significant relationship was found. Results are presented in Table 2 (see appendix D). For each type of training, at least 89% of participants who received them found them to be helpful with the exception of learning about a pre-packaged cyberbullying prevention program. In this case, only 65% of those who learned about a pre-packaged program found it to be helpful.

A significant relationship was found between how long individuals had been working in their field and if they had received training ($\chi^2(1) = 17.27, p < .001$). Those who had been in the field for more than 10 years were more likely to have received training (69%) compared to those who had been in the field for less than 10 years (39%).

Level of Preparedness, Involvement, and Concern

The first research question aimed to understand what variables impact participants' feelings of preparedness, involvement, and concern related to cyberbullying. Participants were asked two survey questions related to preparedness. The first asked how prepared they felt to help select cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs at their school. Overall, 8% of participants reported feeling very prepared, 65% reported feeling somewhat prepared, and 27% reported feeling not at all prepared to help select programs. The second survey question asked how prepared they felt to directly help a student who reports being cyberbullied. Twenty five percent of participants reported feeling very prepared, 65% reported feeling somewhat prepared, and 10% reported feeling not at all prepared. A chi-square test of independence was conducted to examine the relationship between the field participants work in and the level of preparedness in each of these two areas. A significant relationship was found between the field of work and preparedness to select cyberbullying programs ($\chi^2(2) = 6.37, p = .04$). Table 3 (see appendix E) shows that school counselors were more likely to feel very prepared to help select a cyberbullying prevention or intervention program at their school than school psychologists. However, a significant relationship was not found between the field

participants work in how prepared they feel to directly help a student who was being cyberbullied ($\chi^2(2) = 2.69, \rho = .26$).

The impact of having received training on cyberbullying or not on feelings of preparedness was also examined. A chi-square test of independence found a significant relationship between the level of preparedness to select an intervention or prevention program and if participants had received training or not ($\chi^2(2) = 34.65, \rho < .001$). Table 3 shows that participants who had not received training were more likely to report feeling not at all prepared to help select prevention and intervention programs compared to those who had received some form of training. A chi-square test of independence also found a significant relationship between the level of preparedness to help a student who reported being cyberbullied and having received training or not ($\chi^2(2) = 12.06, \rho = .002$). Table 2 shows that those who had received training were less likely to feel not at all prepared than those who had not received training.

The impact of length of time working in the field on feelings of preparedness was also explored. However, no significant relationship was found between the number of years an individual had been in the field and how prepared they felt to help select programs ($\chi^2(2) = 4.04, \rho = .13$) or help a student ($\chi^2(2) = .69, \rho = .71$).

In considering variables related to the participants' level of involvement, a significant relationship was found between the field an individual worked in and involvement in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying ($\chi^2(1) = 18.84, \rho < .001$). That is, school counselors were more likely to be involved with cyberbullying prevention and intervention at their school (89%) than school psychologists (59%). To investigate this more closely additional chi-square tests of independence were performed examining

the relationship between the field of work and five areas of involvement. Significant relationships were found between the field of work and involvement in; the selection of cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs ($\chi^2(1) = 13.66, p < .001$), working directly with victims and cyberbullies ($\chi^2(1) = 37.86, p < .001$), and working with the parents of students who were victims or bullies ($\chi^2(1) = 22.75, p = .001$). Table 3 (see appendix E) shows that school counselors were more likely to be involved in each of these three ways than school psychologists. There was no significant relationship between the field of work and being a part of a team that addresses the issue of cyberbullying ($\chi^2(1) = .14, p = .71$).

A chi-square test of independence did not find a significant relationship between the number of years in the field and overall involvement ($\chi^2(1) = 1.94, p = .164$). However, there was a significant relationship between the number of years in the field and involvement specifically in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying as a part of a team ($\chi^2(1) = 5.19, p = .023$). That is, individuals who had been in the field for more than 10 years were more likely to be involved with cyberbullying as part of a team (42.5%) compared to those who have been in the field for less than 10 years (27%). No significant relationships were found for other areas of involvement and the number of years in the field.

The impact of having received training on involvement was also explored. A significant relationship was found between having received training or not and involvement with cyberbullying prevention and intervention ($\chi^2(1) = 17.11, p < .001$). Those who had received training were more likely to be involved (83%) than those who had not received training (55%). Looking more closely a significant relationship was

found between receiving training in effective cyberbullying prevention strategies and involvement by participants ($\chi^2(1) = 7.74, p = .005$). Those who had received this type of training were more likely to be involved (91%) than those who had not received the training (69%). A significant relationship was not found between the other types of training and involvement.

Variables impacting how concerned respondents were about cyberbullying at their school were also assessed. Overall, 37% of respondents reported feeling very to extremely concerned, 39% moderately concerned, and 19% slightly to not at all concerned. A chi-square test of independence found a significant relationship between the field of work and level of concern about cyberbullying ($\chi^2(2) = 8.99, p = .011$). Table 5 (see appendix G) shows that school counselors were more likely to be very to extremely concerned about cyberbullying (46%) compared to school psychologists (32%), while school psychologists were more likely to report being slightly to not at all concerned (30%) compared to school counselors (12%).

A significant relationship also existed between involvement in cyberbullying prevention and intervention and level of concern ($\chi^2(2) = 12.64, p = .002$). Table 5 shows that those who were very to extremely concerned (41%) as well as those who were moderately concerned (43%) were more likely to be involved with cyberbullying prevention and intervention than those who were slightly to not at all concerned (16%). It is not possible to say which factor led to the other, whether those who were not involved were less likely to be concerned, or if those who were not concerned were less likely to be involved.

No significant relationship was found between the level of concern and number of years in the field ($\chi^2(2) = .687, \rho = .709$). There was also no significant relationship found between the level of concern and having received training on cyberbullying or not ($\chi^2(2) = 1.49, \rho = .475$).

Utilization of Skills

The study's second research question sought to understand if school psychologists and school counselors feel they are involved in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying at a level that is commensurate with their skills and training. Also, do these school professionals feel they are involved at the level that they want to be. A chi-square test of independence found a significant relationship between the field of work and feeling that current involvement was commensurate with training or not ($\chi^2(2) = 11.75, \rho = .003$). Table 6 (see appendix H) shows that school counselors were more likely to feel over utilized based on their current skill level than school psychologist. In addition, school psychologists were more likely to feel underutilized.

There was also a significant relationship between the field of work and desired level of involvement with cyberbullying prevention and intervention ($\chi^2(2) = 10.82, \rho = .004$). Table 5 shows that school psychologists were more likely to want to be more involved than they currently are than school counselors. While school counselors are more likely to want to stay at the same level of involvement compared to school psychologists.

A significant relationship was found between having received training and feeling that current utilization was commensurate with skills or not ($\chi^2(2) = 7.18, \rho = .028$).

Those who had not received training were more likely to feel that their skills were being

underutilized (51%) compared to those who had received training (33%). Additionally, those who had received training were more likely to feel that their skills were being utilized appropriately (59%) compared to those who had not received training (39%). No relationship was found between the number of years working in the field and participants perception that their skills were being utilized effectively or not ($\chi^2(2) = 2.8, p = .246$).

Cyberbullying Programs used in Schools

The final research question sought to answer which cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs are most frequently used in schools and which are perceived to be the most and least effective. Of the 188 participants 170 identified at least one prevention or intervention practice that had been implemented at their school. Administration were most frequently identified (n=96) as who made the decision in selecting which programs and policies were implemented. This was followed by school counselors (n=44), and a team of professionals (n=32). School psychologists were the least likely to select cyberbullying programs or policies (n=8).

Table 7 (see appendix I) shows the most and least frequently used strategies as well as those perceived as the most and least effective. The most frequently reported strategies included talking with the victim (n=162), talking with the cyberbully (n=138), and talking with the parents of the victim (n=134) and bully (n=131), as well as blocking websites and apps at schools (n=132). Effectiveness for each program or policy presented in the survey was scored on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 equaled not at all effective and 5 equaled extremely effective. The strategies rated as most effective on average included creating a cyberbullying taskforce ($M=3.63, SD=.74$), positive school climate programs ($M=3.55, SD=.85$), peer mentors ($M=3.54, SD=.81$), the Common

Sense Education program ($M=3.54$, $SD=.78$), and teaching empathy ($M=3.51$, $SD=.84$). Those reported to be least effective were posting rules about appropriate internet and technology use ($M=2.89$, $SD=.95$), a zero-tolerance policy ($M=2.85$, $SD=1.08$), a school policy statement on cyberbullying ($M=2.83$, $SD=.89$), Cyber Bullying: A Prevention Curriculum ($M=2.83$, $SD=.98$), and the CyberSmart program ($M=2.67$, $SD=1.53$).

School psychologists and school counselors both identified that the prevention and intervention practices that they were most involved with at their schools included talking with victims of cyberbullying ($n_{\text{psychologist}} = 34$, $n_{\text{counselor}} = 39$), talking to the cyberbully ($n_{\text{psychologist}} = 25$, $n_{\text{counselor}} = 32$), as well as providing counseling to victims ($n_{\text{psychologist}} = 32$, $n_{\text{counselor}} = 42$), and the cyberbully ($n_{\text{psychologist}} = 25$, $n_{\text{counselor}} = 40$). One area of notable difference was that school psychologists identified their third most frequent area of involvement as the implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) programs ($n=30$), while school counselors were less likely to be involved in this way ($n=13$).

Chapter 4 Discussion

Researchers and educators are learning that cyberbullying is a unique problem that differs from traditional bullying. Therefore, it is important for schools and their staff to be prepared to prevent and intervene specifically with acts of cyberbullying in addition to traditional bullying. A first step to achieving this goal is to involve school based mental health professionals such as school psychologists and school counselors who are trained and prepared to address cyberbullying at their schools.

This study's first research question sought to understand what variables contribute to how prepared and involved school psychologists and school counselors are in

cyberbullying prevention and intervention efforts. There were four hypotheses within this research question. The first hypothesis was that those who have received training about cyberbullying would feel the most prepared to be involved at their schools. This hypothesis was supported by the finding that those who had received training on cyberbullying were more likely to report feeling somewhat prepared and less likely to report feeling not at all prepared to help select cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs. Participants who had received training were also less likely to report feeling not at all prepared to help a student who was a victim of cyberbullying.

Despite findings that show that training on cyberbullying increases feelings of preparedness, only 54% of all respondents reported having received training on cyberbullying. In their study Lund, Blake, Ewing and Banks (2012) found that 87% of respondents had received training related to traditional bullying. In considering the differences between bullying and cyberbullying, it is important that school mental health professionals have training in both of these areas to be able to support their schools. The lower percentage of participants who reported having received training found in this study may be explained by the fact that cyberbullying is a relatively new area of study. As such, training related to cyberbullying prevention and intervention may be less available to school psychologists and school counselors. Schools who are committed to preventing and intervening in cyberbullying should consider ways in which their school mental health providers can receive training on cyberbullying through in-service training or attending conferences.

Another variable found to contribute to how prepared individuals felt was the field in which they worked. School psychologists and school counselors felt equally

prepared to help a student who reports being cyberbullied. However, school counselors were more likely than school psychologists to feel very prepared to help their school select cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs. This finding does not appear to be due to a difference in trainings as both school counselors (51%) and school psychologists (53%) reported similar rates of attending training. This difference in feelings of preparedness may be related to school counselors reporting they were more likely to be involved in selecting cyberbullying programs, working with victims and bullies, and working with parents. Thus, school counselors may feel more prepared to respond because they have more direct experience in this area already.

The second hypothesis posited that school psychologists and school counselors will feel a lack of preparedness to address cyberbullying within the school. This was supported by the finding that only 8% of all participants reported feeling very prepared, 65% reported feeling somewhat prepared, and 27% reported feeling not at all prepared to help select programs. Participants did report feeling more prepared to directly help students with 25% percent of participants reporting feeling very prepared, 65% reported feeling somewhat prepared, and 10% reported feeling not at all prepared. It is clear that additional opportunities for training related to selecting effective cyberbullying practices and policies may be beneficial for both school counselors and school psychologists. These additional trainings may help them feel more prepared to assist their schools with these efforts.

The third hypothesis, related to the question of variables contributing to involvement, proposed that those who had received training on cyberbullying would be more involved in prevention and intervention efforts at their schools. This hypothesis

was supported as 83% of individuals who had received training reported being involved with cyberbullying, while only 55% of those who had not received training were involved. A more in-depth exploration found that individuals who had received training specifically about effective cyberbullying prevention and interventions strategies were more likely to be involved at their schools.

Another variable that was found to be related to level of involvement with cyberbullying was the field in which an individual worked. School counselors were more likely to be involved with the selection of prevention and intervention programs, working with victims and bullies, and working with the parents. This finding is consistent with the Lund, Blake, Ewing and Banks (2012) study that reported school counselors were more involved in responding to incidents of traditional bullying. The difference in level of involvement between school counselors and school psychologists is discussed in more detail within the section pertaining to the results of the desired level of involvement between these fields.

The fourth hypothesis posited that individuals who had recently entered their respective field would feel the most prepared and be the most involved in cyberbullying prevention and intervention efforts at their schools. This hypothesis was based on the notion that individuals who had recently graduated would be the most up to date on current research and concerns. Thus, they would aim to be more involved in areas such as cyberbullying. However, this hypothesis was not supported as results found that individuals who had been in the field for more than 10 years were more likely to be involved with cyberbullying at their schools. This may be related to results that found individuals who have been in the field longer were more likely to have received training

about cyberbullying and that individuals who had received training were more likely to be involved. It was also found that conference and in-service training were the most frequently reported places to receive training about cyberbullying. It follows then that individuals who had been in the field longer would have had more opportunities to attend in-service or conference trainings. Despite differences in level of involvement and training, there was not a difference between how long an individual had been in the field and their feelings of preparedness.

Overall, factors that were found to influence how prepared and involved school psychologists and school counselors are with cyberbullying prevention and intervention included receiving training, the field they work in, and how long they have been practicing in the field. Training was found to be related to higher levels of preparedness for both selecting prevention and intervention programs as well as helping students. Training was also found to be related to greater levels of involvement. School counselors were more prepared to help select prevention and intervention programs than school psychologists and were also more likely to be involved with cyberbullying efforts. Finally, those who have been in the field longer were more likely to be involved with cyberbullying at their schools.

The second research question examined if school psychologists and school counselors feel that they are involved with the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying at a level that is commensurate with their training. It was found that 57% of school counselors feel that their skills were being utilized at a level that is consistent with their skills and training. Additionally, approximately half (54%) of school counselors reported wanting to stay at their same level of involvement with

cyberbullying. In comparison, 50% of school psychologists felt that they were being underutilized in the area of cyberbullying prevention and intervention. Additionally, 59% of school psychologists reported wanting to be more involved with the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying at their school.

There could be several factors that have contributed to school psychologists feeling they are being underutilized in this area. One such factor might be the expectations of their job as practitioners. Many school districts still have school psychologists in traditional roles where the main expectation revolves around testing and placing students in special education. While the roles of school psychologists have changed over the years, many professionals still find a large percent of their time consumed by testing students for special education (Larson, & Choi, 2010). Another factor could be a result of a lack of time given other commitments or workloads. In the 2015 member survey, NASP found that the average student to school psychologist ratio was 1,381 to 1 (Walcott & Hyson, 2018). This ratio is over the recommended maximum ratio of 1,000 to 1 and well beyond the recommendation of no more than 500 to 700 students per school psychologist when they are engaged in comprehensive and preventative supports (National Association of School Psychology, 2017). Another factor contributing to the school psychologists' lack of involvement in this area may be due to a lack of administrator support. This lack of support may not be intentional, but a lack of awareness that school psychologists have the capacity to take on these roles. Even if administrators do support school psychologists in taking on a broader role within the school, it is often with the expectation that they do so on top of their traditional role (Walcott & Hyson, 2018).

Given what is known about the negative effects of cyberbullying on students, it is important that schools utilize their resources to implement prevention and intervention programs. Currently, school counselors are the ones most involved with cyberbullying and feel that their skills are being used appropriately. While this is a step in the right direction, schools could also be utilizing the knowledge and skills of school psychologists to prevent and intervene with cyberbullying. This study found that school psychologists feel they have the skills and training to be involved in this area and that they have a desire to be more involved than they currently are. Schools should examine what barriers are preventing school psychologists from providing more support in this area.

Finally, the study's third research question sought to understand which programs and strategies were most frequently used in schools and which were perceived to be the most effective. It was hypothesized that prevention and intervention efforts currently being used within school to address cyberbullying will primarily be informal methods without substantial support from research. This hypothesis was supported as participants identified talking to the victim, bully, their parents, and blocking websites and apps at school as the most frequently used. This finding is consistent with the results from previous research on traditional bullying prevention strategies. Sherer and Nickerson (2010) also found talking to the bully following an incident was the most commonly used strategy. While these strategies were the most frequently used, none of them were identified as the most effective in reducing cyberbullying. The strategies that participants perceived as most effective included creating a cyberbullying taskforce, positive school climate programs, peer mentors, the Common Sense Education program, and teaching empathy. Many of these strategies align with suggestions that have been posed in the

existing literature such as; creating a positive school climate (Patchin & Hinduja, 2014), using peer mentors to teach materials (Banerjee, Robinson, & Smalley, 2010), and emphasizing empathy and social values online (Bamford, 2004; Campbell, 2005; Snakenborg, Van Acker, & Gable, 2011; Walker, 2012). Interestingly, creating school policies that address cyberbullying was also a common recommendation in the literature (Brown, Jackson, & Cassidy, 2006; Diamanduros, Downs, & Jenkins, 2008; Feinberg & Robey, 2009). However, this study found that a school policy on cyberbullying was perceived to be one of the least effective strategies. Further exploration into what content is included in the school policy statement, as well as its enforcement at schools, may provide more insight into why participants in this study rated it as ineffective even though it is a recommendation in the literature.

The practices that were identified by this study as the most frequently used, such as talking with the victim or cyberbully, were primarily reactive. That is, they only respond to cyberbullying after it has been reported. In comparison, those practices which were identified as the most effective, such as creating a cyberbullying taskforce and implementing a positive school climate program, are proactive and work to prevent cyberbullying from happening. Lund et al. (2012) found that ease of attainability, ease of implementation, and expense were common considerations when schools were selecting interventions for traditional bullying. These same factors may explain why schools are using less effective cyberbullying intervention strategies more frequently. The most effective strategies could be perceived to involve more time and resources to initially implement. While it may be true that these effective strategies could involve more time and preparations to put into place when first implemented, they will likely work to save

schools and staff time in the future by preventing cyberbullying incidents and the need to respond to them down the road. Another reason schools may be using less effective strategies is limited knowledge regarding what effective strategies can and should be used. This can be mitigated by providing training on effective cyberbullying prevention and intervention strategies to all staff members.

Conclusion and Implications

In conclusion, those who received training felt more prepared to select programs and support students. However, only about half of respondents have received any training. Therefore, all school mental health professional should be presented additional training opportunities that address cyberbullying. These opportunities for professional development will prepare them to address the growing concern of cyberbullying at their school. Currently, in-services and conferences were reported as where individuals are most likely to receive training. As such schools should examine the current opportunities that are presented to staff for professional development. Additionally, graduate programs should consider including training on cyberbullying as a part of their curriculum, or support their students in attending conferences on these topics.

An implication of this study is for schools to re-examine the current roles of their school psychologists. This study found that school psychologists tend to be less involved with cyberbullying prevention and intervention at schools, feel underutilized, and want to be more involved. With rising rates of cyberbullying and its numerous negative side effects, it would be beneficial for schools to fully utilize all of their available resources to address this problem. Schools should undertake efforts to identify and minimize barriers to school psychologists' involvement in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying.

This may involve redefining their expected role within the school and ensuring that they have opportunities to receive training on this topic.

Providing training and utilizing the abilities of all staff members will also aid schools in selecting and implementing effective cyberbullying prevention and intervention strategies. Schools are currently using a wide range of cyberbullying prevention strategies from zero-tolerance policies to utilizing specific programs. The programs and strategies that are currently being frequently used by schools are reactive rather than proactive and seen to be ineffective in reducing cyberbullying. The programs and policies that were found to be most effective included creating a cyberbullying taskforce, positive school climate programs, peer mentors, the Common Sense Education program, and teaching empathy. These strategies align very closely to what has been proposed within the research community. Providing training to staff and utilizing their expertise will assist schools in examining their current policies and practices to determine how they may be able to improve them to reduce rates of cyberbullying.

Limitations and Future Directions

This study had some limitations that warrant discussion and lead to suggestions for future studies. First, the relatively small sample size limits the generalization of the results as well as the analysis that could be conducted. As a result of the small sample, a number of chi-square tests of independence could not be reported as they violated the assumption of an expected frequency of less than five. Future studies should seek to gather a larger and more comprehensive sample of school counselors and school psychologists which will allow for a more detailed analysis of results.

Second, questions of which cyberbullying prevention and intervention strategies were being used solely relied on the respondents' knowledge of their schools' practices. Information from other individuals at a district, such as administrators, teachers or students, could be collected to gain additional insight into program and policy use.

Finally, because half of school psychologists reported feeling underutilized along with a desire to be more involved with cyberbullying at their school, additional research should examine what barriers are limiting school psychologists' involvement with cyberbullying prevention and intervention efforts. This future examination will help schools and administration better understand what steps they may be able to take to include school psychologists in their cyberbullying prevention and intervention efforts.

References

- American School Counseling Association (2017). ASCA position statements: The professional school counselor and the identification, prevention and intervention of behaviors that are harmful and place students at-risk. Retrieved from https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/PositionStatements/PS_AtRisk.pdf
- Bauman, S. (2007). *Cyberbullying: A virtual menace*. Paper presented at the National Coalition against Bullying National Conference. Melbourne, Australia.
- Banerjee, R., Robinson, C., & Smalley, D. (2010). Evaluation of the beatbullying peer mentoring programme: Executive Summary. University of Sussex, Brighton, England.
- Bauman, S., Rigby, K., & Hoppa, K. (2008). US teachers' and school counsellors' strategies for handling school bullying incidents. *Educational Psychology, 28*(7), 837-856.
- Bramlett, R. K., Murphy, J. J., Johnson, J., Wallingsford, L., & Hall, J. D. (2002). Contemporary practices in school psychology: A national survey of roles and referral problems. *Psychology in the Schools, 39*(3), 327-335.
- Brown, K., Jackson, M., & Cassidy, W. (2006). Cyber-Bullying: Developing policy to direct responses that are equitable and effective in addressing this special form of bullying. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 57*, 1-36.
- Burnham, J. J., & Jackson, C. M. (2000). School counselor roles: Discrepancies between actual practice and existing models. *Professional School Counseling, 4*(1), 41.
- Cassidy, W., Faucher, C., & Jackson, M. (2013). Cyberbullying among youth: A

comprehensive review of current international research and its implications and application to policy and practice. *School Psychology International*, 34(6), 575-612.

Castillo, J. M., Curtis, M. J., & Gelley, C. (2012). School Psychology 2010--Part 2: School Psychologists' Professional Practices and Implications for the Field. *Communiqué*, 40(8), 4-6.

Chibnall, S., Wallace, M., Leicht, C., & Lunghofer, L. (2006). I-Safe evaluation. Retrieved from the U.S. Department of Justice https://cdn.preterhuman.net/texts/law/national_institute_of_justice/I-Safe_evaluation.pdf

Common Sense Media (2017). Evolution of media use by kids age 8 and under. *Common Sense Media*. Retrieved from <https://www.commonsensemedia.org/zero-to-eight-census-infographic>

Common Sense Media (2013). Zero to eight: Children's media use in America 2013. *Common Sense Media*. Retrieved from <https://www.commonsensemedia.org/research/zero-to-eight-childrens-media-use-in-america-2013>

Common Sense Education (n.d.). Scope & Sequence: Common sense k-12 digital citizenship curriculum, Retrieved from <https://www.commonsensemedia.org/educators/digital-citizenship>

Couvillon, M. A., & Ilieva, V. (2011). Recommended practices: A review of schoolwide preventative programs and strategies on cyberbullying. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 55(2), 96-101.

- Cross, D., Monks, H., Campbell, M., Spears, B., & Slee, P. (2011). School-based strategies to address cyber bullying. *Center for Strategic Education, Occasional Paper 119*.
- 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*(8), 693-704.
- Feinberg, T., & Robey, N. (2009). Cyberbullying: Intervention and prevention strategies. In Canter A., Paige L.Z., & Shaw A. (Eds.) *helping Children at Home and School III*. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School psychologists.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Goodman- Scott, E. (2015). School counselors' perceptions of their academic preparedness and job activities. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 54*(1), 57-67.
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2009). Preventing cyberbullying: Top ten tips for educators. Retrieved from <http://cyberbullying.org/preventing-cyberbullying-top-ten-tips-for-educators>
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2016). Lifetime cyberbullying victimization rates. Retrieved from <http://cyberbullying.org/summary-of-our-cyberbullying-research>
- i-SAFE Digital Learning (2015). New lessons – Fall 2015-2016. Retrieved https://auth.isafe.org/docs/new_lessons.pdf

- Kowalski, R. M., Giumetti, G. W., Schroeder, A. N., & Lattanner, M. R. (2014). Bullying in the digital age: A critical review and meta-analysis of cyberbullying research among youth. *Psychological Bulletin, 140*(4), 1073.
- Larson, J. P., & Choi, H. S. (2010). The effect of university training and educational legislation on the role and function of school psychologists. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 26*(2), 97-114
- 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*(3), 246-265.
- Mason, K. L. (2008). Cyberbullying: A preliminary assessment for school personnel. *Psychology in the Schools, 45*(4), 323-348.
- Minnesota Department of Education (2016). Bullying concerns and ways to help: Steps parents and families can take to help child who is bullied. Retrieved from <https://education.mn.gov/MDE/dse/safe/bprev/059695>
- Minnesota Department of Education (2016). Bullying concerns and ways to help: Cyberbullying: Steps parents/guardians can take to prevent harm. Retrieved from <https://education.mn.gov/MDE/dse/safe/bprev/034035>
- National Association of School Psychologists (2012). Bullying prevention and intervention in schools [position statement]. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists
- National Association of School Psychologists. (2017). Shortages in school psychology: Challenges to meeting the growing needs of U.S. students and schools [Research summary]. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

- NetSmartz (2016). Teaching materials. Retrieved from <http://www.netsmartz.org/Resources>
- Nobullying.com. (2015). So, what is cyberbullying. Retrieved from <http://nobullying.com/what-is-cyberbullying/>
- O'Malley, M. D. 2009. Prevailing interventions to address peer victimization at school: A Study of California school psychologists. *The California School Psychologist*, 14, 47–51.
- Olweus, D. (1994). Bullying at school: basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 35(7), 1171-1190.
- Patchin, J. & Hinduja, S. (2012). Cyberbullying prevention and response: Expert perspectives. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pearce, N., Cross, D., Monks, H., Waters, S., & Falconer, S. (2011). Current evidence of best practice in whole-school bullying intervention and its potential to inform cyberbullying interventions. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 21(01), 1-21.
- Reschly, D. J. (2000). The present and future status of school psychology in the United States. *School Psychology Review*, 29(4), 507.
- Ribble, M. S., Bailey, G. D., & Ross, T. W. (2004). Digital citizenship: Addressing appropriate technology behavior. *Learning & Leading with Technology*, 32(1), 6.
- Sherer, Y. C., & Nickerson, A. B. (2010). Anti-bullying practices in American schools: Perspectives of school psychologists. *Psychology in the Schools*, 47(3), 217-229.
- Slonje, R., Smith, P. K., & Frisén, A. (2013). The nature of cyberbullying, and strategies

for

prevention. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(1), 26-32.

Smith, P. K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., & Tippett, N. (2008).

Cyberbullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 49(4), 376-385.

Snakenborg, J., Van Acker, R., & Gable, R. A. (2011). Cyberbullying: Prevention and intervention to protect our children and youth. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 55(2), 88-95.

Stopbullying.gov (2015). What is cyberbullying. Retrieved from www.stopbullying.gov/cyberbullying/index.html

Thomas, R. Y. A. N., Kariuki, M., & Yilmaz, H. (2011). A comparative analysis of cyberbullying perceptions of preservice educators: Canada and Turkey. *TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 10(3), 1-12.

Tokunaga, R. S. (2010). Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of research on cyberbullying victimization. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(3), 277-287.

Trolley, B. C. (2011). School counselor roles and preparation. *Michigan Journal of Counseling: Research, Theory and Practice*, 38(1), 3.

Walcott, C. M., & Hyson, D. (2018). Results from the NASP 2015 membership survey, part one: Demographics and employment conditions [Research report]. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Appendix A

Table 1
Demographics of Sample

	Total Sample	School Psychologists	School Counselors
Number of Years in the Field			
1-5	65	31	34
6-10	36	24	12
11-15	18	12	6
16-20	30	19	11
21 or more	39	32	7
Number of Students on Caseload			
Less than 500	77	20	57
500 - 1000	58	46	12
1000 - 1500	25	24	1
More than 1500	28	28	0
Level of School Participants work at			
Elementary	101	83	18
Middle School	94	60	34
High School	110	64	46

Appendix B

Survey

Cyberbullying Prevention and intervention

Start of Block: Default Question Block

Q1 Hello,

My name is Rachel Bulet I am a doctoral candidate at Minnesota State University, Mankato working to complete my dissertation. My dissertation is focused on examining the role of school psychologists and school counselors in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying. This survey is designed to gather information on how prepared individuals in each of these fields feel about handling incidences of cyberbullying, if they have experience with cyberbullying prevention and intervention efforts at their school, and what programs are being used at their school to help respond to cyberbullying.

This information can be used to identify programs that are currently being used within schools and help guide research in validating programs currently in use. It can also help to identify areas in which individuals feel they need more support and training.

- Yes I will take the survey
- No I do not wish to take the survey

Skip To: Q24 If Q1 = No I do not wish to take the survey

Q2 What field do you work in?

- School Psychology
- School Counseling
- Other

Display This Question:

If Q2 = Other

Q3 What field do you work in?

Q4 How long have you been practicing in your field?

- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- 21+ years

Q5 What level of school do you work at? select all that apply

- Elementary
- Middle School
- High School

Q6 What is your approximate student to psychologist/counselor caseload?

- less than 500
- 500 - 1000
- 1000 - 1500
- 1500 - 2000
- 2000 - 2500
- more than 2500

Q7 For the following questions please consider the question and your response only as they relate to cyberbullying not traditional bullying.

Q8 Have you received any training (pre-service, in-service, or conference) related to cyberbullying?

- Yes
- No

Skip To: Q14 If Q10 = No

Q9 What sort of training did you receive? (select all that apply)

- Pre-service
 - In-service
 - Conference
 - Other
-

Q10 If you selected other please describe the type of training you received.

Q11 Tell us more about the type of training you have received

	I have attended training in this area		Was this training helpful to you?	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Learning about a packaged cyberbullying prevention program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Learning about a digital citizenship program that includes a cyberbullying component	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Learning about effective cyberbullying prevention strategies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How to respond directly to a child who is a victim or a bully of cyberbullying	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How to develop school policies to prevent and respond to cyberbullying	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Learning what cyberbullying is and how/where it is occurring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other _____	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q12 How prepared do you feel to help support cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs at your school?

- Very prepared
 - Somewhat prepared
 - Not at all prepared
-

Q13 How prepared do you feel to directly help a student who tells you they are being cyberbullied?

- Very prepared
 - Somewhat prepared
 - Not at all prepared
-

Q14 In what ways have you been involved in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying at your school? select all that apply

- Selection of cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs
 - Directly working with victims or bullies
 - Working with parents of victims or bullies
 - Part of a team that addresses the issues of cyberbullying
 - Other
 - I am not involved in this area
-

Display This Question:

If In what ways have you been involved in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying at your s...
= 6

Q15 Because you selected other, please indicate how you have been involved in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying at your school

Display This Question:

If In what ways have you been involved in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying at your s...
= 4

Q16 What is the name of your team that addresses the issue of cyberbullying?

Q17 Do you feel that you are involved in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying at your school at a level that is commensurate with your skills and training?

- Yes, my skills are being adequately utilized in this area
- No, I am over-utilized in this area based on my current skills
- No, I am under-utilized in this area based on my current skills

Q18 Do you want to be involved with the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying at a level that is different from your current involvement?

- I want to be much more involved than I currently am
- I want to be slightly more involved than I currently am
- I am involved the amount that I want to be
- I want to be slightly less involved than I currently am
- I want to be much less involved than I currently am

Q19 How concerned are you about cyberbullying at your school?

- extremely concerned
 - very concerned
 - moderately concerned
 - slightly concerned
 - not at all concerned
-

Q20 Does your school have any prevention or intervention programs/policies in place related to cyberbullying?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know
-

Q21 Who selects these programs? (select all who apply)

- administrators
- school psychologists
- school counselors
- other
- I don't know
-

Display This Question:

If Q19 = other

Q22 Because you selected other to the question "who selects these programs?" please type in the title of the person or persons involved in this process.

Q23 For each item below please consider if you and your school use the strategy as it relates to cyberbullying. if your school uses the strategy but you are not directly involved please select "My school does this". If you are directly involved in planning, developing or implementing a strategy please select "I'm involved in this".

	My School does this	I'm involved in this	My school does not use this
Assessment of extent and nature of cyberbullying problems	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
School policy statement on cyberbullying	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Zero tolerance policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ban electronics in school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Block use of specific websites and apps at school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Post rules about appropriate internet and technology use at school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Define and enforce specific consequences for cyberbullying (suspension, detention etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Response procedure for if staff are approached by a cyberbullying target or witness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Response procedures for students to report cyberbullying	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provide faculty training on cyberbullying	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Educating parents about cyberbullying	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Involve parents in cyberbullying prevention and intervention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teach students to tell adults if they are a victim or if they see cyberbullying	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Positive school climate programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Peer mentors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teach empathy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i-SAFE program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cyber Bullying: A Prevention Curriculum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Common Sense Education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
NetSmartz	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
CyberSmart	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cyberbullying curriculum not listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PBIS	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Identification of students at risk of being victims	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Identification of students at risk for being bullies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Talk to the victim following incident	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Talk to the bully following incident	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Talk to parent of the victim	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Talk to parent of the bully	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provide counseling to the victim	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provide counseling to the bully	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mediation with victim and perpetrator	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Involve school resource officer in cyberbullying incidents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Establish a cyberbullying task force	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q24 What other prevention or intervention efforts not previously listed has your school used to address cyberbullying?

Q25 Below are the items which you indicated your school implements to combat cyberbullying. For each item below please consider how effective it has been in reducing incidences of cyberbullying at your school.

	Extremely effective	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Slightly effective	Not effective at all
Assessment of extent and nature of cyberbullying problems	<input type="radio"/>				
School policy statement on cyberbullying	<input type="radio"/>				
Zero tolerance policy	<input type="radio"/>				
Ban electronics in school	<input type="radio"/>				
Block use of specific websites and apps at school	<input type="radio"/>				
Post rules about appropriate internet and technology use at school	<input type="radio"/>				
Define and enforce specific consequences for cyberbullying (suspension, detention etc.)	<input type="radio"/>				
Response procedure for if staff are approached by a cyberbullying target or witness	<input type="radio"/>				

Response procedures for students to report cyberbullying	<input type="radio"/>				
Provide faculty training on cyberbullying	<input type="radio"/>				
Educating parents about cyberbullying	<input type="radio"/>				
Involve parents in cyberbullying prevention and intervention	<input type="radio"/>				
Teach students to tell adults if they are a victim or if they see cyberbullying	<input type="radio"/>				
Positive school climate programs	<input type="radio"/>				
Peer mentors	<input type="radio"/>				
Teach empathy	<input type="radio"/>				
i-SAFE program	<input type="radio"/>				
Cyber Bullying: A Prevention Curriculum	<input type="radio"/>				
Common Sense Education	<input type="radio"/>				
NetSmartz	<input type="radio"/>				

CyberSmart	<input type="radio"/>				
Cyberbullying curriculum not listed	<input type="radio"/>				
PBIS	<input type="radio"/>				
Identification of students at risk of being victims	<input type="radio"/>				
Identification of students at risk for being bullies	<input type="radio"/>				
Talk to the victim following incident	<input type="radio"/>				
Talk to the bully following incident	<input type="radio"/>				
Talk to parent of the victim	<input type="radio"/>				
Talk to parent of the bully	<input type="radio"/>				
Provide counseling to the victim	<input type="radio"/>				
Provide counseling to the bully	<input type="radio"/>				
Mediation with victim and perpetrator	<input type="radio"/>				

Involve school
resource
officer in
cyberbullying
incidents

Establish a
cyberbullying
task force

Page Break

Q26 Thank you for your time. If you would like to learn more about cyberbullying, and prevention and intervention programs you can visit the following websites

<https://www.stopbullying.gov/cyberbullying/what-is-it/index.html>

<https://cyberbullying.org/resources>

<http://cyberbullyhelp.com/resources/>

End of Block: Default Question Block

Appendix C

Letter to participants

Hello,

My name is Rachel Burlet and I am a doctoral candidate at Minnesota State University, Mankato. I'm conducting research as a part of my dissertation focused on examining the role of school psychologists and school counselors in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying. Below is a link to an online survey designed to gather information on how prepared individuals in each of these fields feel about handling incidents of cyberbullying, and what programs are being use at their school to help respond to cyberbullying. We anticipate that the survey should take between 5 to 10 minutes to complete.

To take the survey visit

https://mnsu.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6nEYw0OYPnX3LyB

The risks you will encounter as a participant in this research are not more than experienced in your everyday life. There are minimal risks related to privacy of information, or anonymity as we will not collect your name or any other identifiable information. All results will only be reported as a summary of all answers. No individual's answers will be reported. Additionally, the website hosting the survey, Qualtrics.com, is a secure website which offers security of collected information.

Individuals who complete the survey will be provided with a list of resources to help them learn more about cyberbullying and strategies to prevent it. The information gathered in this survey may help to advance the research and program development of cyberbullying prevention and intervention.

Your participation in this research project is voluntary, and choosing to not participate will not result in any penalty. Deciding whether or not to participate will not affect your relationship to Minnesota State University, Mankato, and refusal to participant will involve no penalty or loss of benefits. However, we would greatly appreciate your help. We will also seek your agreement to completing the survey before you answer any questions. By completing the survey, you assure that you are at least 18 years of age. You will have the opportunity to discontinue the survey, at any time before submitting your answers. To do so you may simply close the webpage.

If you have any questions about this research study or would like a copy of the consent form, contact Carlos Panahon at Carlos.panahon@mnsu.edu. You can also contact Rachel Burlet the student researcher working under Dr. Panahon at Rachel.burlet@mnsu.edu.

If you have any questions about participants' rights and for research-related injuries, please contact the Administrator of the Institutional Review Board Administrator at 507-389-1242 with any questions about research with human participants at MSU. IRBnet ID number 1309303. If you would like more information about the specific privacy and anonymity risks posed by online surveys, please contact the Minnesota State University, Mankato Information and Technology Services Help Desk 507-389-6654 and ask to speak to the Information Security Manager.

The NASP Research Committee has reviewed this study, and granted the researchers permission to recruit NASP members as research participants.

Follow up Letter

Hello,

My name is Rachel Burlet, I am a doctoral candidate at Minnesota State University, Mankato. You recently received a letter from me asking you to participate in a survey examining the role of school psychologists and school counselors in the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying.

Thank you to everyone who has participated! If you have not yet had a chance to I would invite you to take the survey at

https://mnsu.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6nEYw0OYPnX3LyB

If you have any questions about this research study, contact Carlos Panahon at Carlos.panahon@mnsu.edu. You can also contact Rachel Burlet the student researcher working under Dr. Panahon at Rachel.burlet@mnsu.edu.

If you have any questions about participants' rights and for research-related injuries, please contact the Administrator of the Institutional Review Board Administrator at 507-389-1242 with any questions about research with human participants at MSU. IRBnet ID number 1309303. If you would like more information about the specific privacy and anonymity risks posed by online surveys, please contact the Minnesota State University, Mankato Information and Technology Services Help Desk 507-389-6654 and ask to speak to the Information Security Manager.

The NASP Research Committee has reviewed this study, and granted the researchers permission to recruit NASP members as research participants.

Appendix D

Table 2
Types of Training Received

	School Psychologists	School Counselors
Learning about a packaged cyberbullying prevention program	10%	25%
Learning about a digital citizenship program that includes a cyberbullying component	24%	42%
Learning about effective cyberbullying prevention strategies	68%	58%
How to respond directly to a child who is a victim or a bully of cyberbullying	73%	64%
How to develop school policies to prevent and respond to cyberbullying	41%	33%
Learning what cyberbullying is and how/where it is occurring	95%	92%

Note. Column percentages do not equal 100% as participants were able to select multiple responses

Appendix E

Table 3
Level of Preparedness across Fields and Training

	Very Prepared	Somewhat Prepared	Not at All Prepared
Selecting Cyberbullying Programs			
School Psychologist	4%	67%	29%
School Counselor	15%	62%	23%
Received Training			
Received Training	7%	84%	9%
No Training	9%	45%	46%
Helping a Student Being Cyberbullied			
School Psychologists	21%	68%	11%
School Counselors	32%	59%	9%
Received Training			
Received Training	30%	67%	3%
No Training	20%	62%	18%

Appendix F

Table 4
Areas of Involvement for School Psychologists and School Counselors

	Selecting Prevention or Intervention Programs	Working with Victims or Bullies	Working with Parents	Part of a Team that Addresses Cyberbullying	Not Involved
School Psychologists	4%	38%	26%	33%	42%
School Counselors	21%	84%	61%	36%	9%

Note. Row totals do not equal 100% as respondents were allowed to select more than one option.

Appendix G

Table 5
Level of Concern Regarding Cyberbullying

	Very - extremely concerned	Moderately concerned	Slightly - not at all concerned
School Psychologist	32%	38%	30%
School Counselor	46%	42%	12%
Involved with cyberbullying prevention/intervention	41%	43%	16%
Not Involved	27%	33%	40%

Appendix H

Table 6
Current Utilization of Skill and Desired Involvement

	School Psychologists	School Counselors
Perceived Utilization of Skills		
Over Utilized	5%	16%
Utilized Appropriately	45%	57%
Under Utilized	50%	27%
Desired Level of Involvement		
More Involvement	59%	39%
Stay the Same	40%	54%
Less Involvement	1%	7%

Appendix I

Table 7
Frequently used Cyberbullying Prevention and Intervention Strategies and Perceived Effectiveness

	Frequency of Reported Use	Average Rating of Effectiveness
5 Most Frequently Used Strategies		
Talk to the victim following incident	162	3.44
Talk to the bully following incident	158	3.36
Talk to parent of the victim	153	3.24
Block specific websites and apps at school	151	3.21
Talk to parent of the bully	150	3.19
5 Least Frequently Used Strategies		
NetSmartz	13	3.33
Establish a cyberbullying task force	11	3.62
Cyber Bullying: A Prevention Curriculum	8	2.83
i-SAFE program	4	3.0
CyberSmart	4	2.67
5 Most Effective Strategies		
Establish a cyberbullying task force	11	3.63
Positive school climate programs	144	3.55
Peer mentors	72	3.54
Common Sense Education	17	3.54
Teach empathy	103	3.51
5 Least Effective Strategies		
Post rules about appropriate internet and technology use	123	2.89
Zero tolerance policy	97	2.85
School policy statement on cyberbullying	123	2.83
Cyber Bullying: A Prevention Curriculum	8	2.83
CyberSmart	4	2.67