Problem Solving Application on Guidance and Counseling Teachers for Bullying Victim Students

[1]Faizah Binti Awad and [2]Ismail Suardi Wekke
[1]Institut Agama Islam Negeri Kendari, Southeast Sulawesi, Indonesia
[2]Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri (STAIN) Sorong, West Papua, Indonesia

Abstract: Bullying phenomenon has been a part of school life. There are various reasons caused students being bullying victim. Lack of teacher's/guardian's control at recess time having no care about bullying behavior and inconsistency of the application anti-bullying rules are the conditions that create bullying in educational institution. The research aimed at knowing the handling model of guidance and counseling teacher to the bullying victim at Junior High School 17 of Kendari. It was descriptive analytic research used observation, interview and documentation to collect the data and to describe facts accurately and systematically. The data were analyzed by data reduction, display, verification and finishing with data and sources triangulation. The results showed that the effective procedure of handling model was confronter model. This model is in form of agreement letter, invitation of parents/guardians and home visitation. This model made the victims felt accomplished as well as comfort from offender's threat due to the agreement with guidance and counseling teacher. So, every consequent will makes the offender be cured.

Key words: Problem solving of bullying, bullying victim, confronter model, offender, threat

INTRODUCTION

The incident of school bullying might differ ranging from light to heavy one. It also differs from the impact upon bullying victims and surrounding people. The >16% of students in age 9-11 had been reported as bullying victims and 5.5% of active school students also experienced it (Fekkes *et al.*, 2005). Ideally, school should be a proper educational environment with high care, cooperation, affection and humanity (Gourneau, 2012; Kousholt and Fisker, 2015; Rigby, 2014). However, school also often offers harmful behaviors, including bullying (Side and Johnson, 2014; Yerger and Gehret, 2011). In Indonesia, school bullying has been considered as main issue in school problems, since 2005 in form of aggression.

This school bullying has become part of school life. The background causing students as bullying victims varies (Jacobsen and Bauman, 2007; Strohmeier and Noam, 2012). The issue of school bullying has mainly considered due to student's death incident which is widely exposed by media. In July 2007, an elementary student in Bali died from being beaten by his friends due to the impact of harmful sporting events aired in Indonesia at that year. Ironically, this incident happened in school environment which is commonly perceived as great place to educate youths (Carvalhosa, 2009). In fact,

the school bullying mostly happens in elementary and secondary level. It does not happen solely in students but also teachers as well as school staffs (Bradshaw *et al.*, 2007; Perron, 2013; Hanif *et al.*, 2011). Same issues happen in almost all countries throughout the world regardless socio-economic status or even ethnics (Chirila, 2012). Meanwhile in Indonesia in spite of widely numerous studies conducted there has not yet been elaborated data as in other countries. Therefore, it is likely that school bullying has not yet become main issue despite its phenomenal impacts.

Further, most of Indonesian students have reported receiving insults, blasphemies, scorn, isolation, beatings and kicks or punches from their schoolmate (Graham, 2016; Gourneau, 2012). It means that schools can be a dangerous and unsafe place for children due to varied violence (Pack *et al.*, 2011). Moreover, it also indicates that the violence on children in school has ranked second after the violence on children in household. This condition has been confirmed by findings of UNICEF research which figures out that Indonesian violence rate in either family, school or social environment is significantly high.

The one of cause of school bullying is the non-conducive school atmosphere (Rigby, 2003, 2004; Braybrook, 2012). Lack of teachers/parents monitoring during break time 19,26, the ignorance of both teachers

---

and students on bullying and massive inconsistent anti-bullying programs are major conditions leading into school bullying.

To handle this conditions, teacher's role is necessarily required in solving school bullying and creating conducive learning environment (Rigby, 2014; Vacca and Kramer-Vida, 2012; McVie, 2014). Unluckily, many teachers remain not aware of the massive bad impact of this school bullying upon both victims and doers. Especially in this case, Junior High School 17 of Kendari has three school counselors with proper certificate in counseling education yet there is still school bullying happened in this school, whether it happens in male or female students (Teresa *et al.*, 2014).

The impact of school bullying varies among students (McVie, 2014), starting from reluctance to go to school, decreased academic performance for no apparent reason (Juvonen *et al.*, 2011), reluctance to socialize (Wolke *et al.*, 2013; Cassidy, 2009), depression to suicidal tendencies even in certain cases the victims will be either killed or killing. The upmost emerging impact of school bullying is that the victims will feel uncomfortable at school and therefore will not fully concentrate on their academics as well as social interaction (Guzman and Zepeda, 2013). Besides, the impact of school bullying does not merely stop at victims 30. Instead, it emerges as ripple effect to surrounding people, family and even school.

Generally, almost all schools in Indonesia have students as bullying victims despite the existence of counseling program within the schools. From preliminary interview with students at Junior High School 17 of Kendari, it was found >20 students experienced bullying. The intervention has been performed in several stages, starting from guidance from homeroom teachers, religion teachers and finally school counselors under the involvement of parents. Concerning on varied way of bullying such as beatings, punches, money bullying and group conflicts, this study primarily focused on the model implemented by school counselors in handling bullying victims.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was an analytical descriptive study. It described both facts and conditions accurately and systematically, encompassing any phenomena happened while this study was taken place. The sample in this study was called as interviewee or participant instead of respondent. This study moreover, used purposive sampling technique in which the data collection was conducted by considering the most well-knowledge

interviewee related to the expected information. The data about school bullying behaviors were gained from three school counselors, one religion teacher assigned as counselor for bullying victims, bullying perpetrators and their peers, students and school staffs who witness and have information about bullying at Junior High School 17 of Kendari.

The data collection method used in this study was divided into three phases: interview, observation and documentation. The analysis of the data was conducted in several stages: data reduction, display and verification and data triangulation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Since, its first establishment in last 2004, it has apparently emerged a bullying phenomenon despite the unclear time when it emerged. However, due to the integrated model applied by school counselors as well as other parties such as: homeroom teachers and school principal, the bullying cases have been always well-handled (information gained from interview with school counselors accompanied by school principal). In specific details, several bullying behaviors found in this study are.

Money bullying: According to the students at Class VII-8, students demonstrating money bullying are mostly from Class VII-6 (initials Dn) Class VII-4 (initials Dd) and several classes from 9th grade (RY, Interview at May 30, 2016). Other informants express as follows: "I know that several students in Class IX-6, VII-1, VII-3, VII-4 are still demonstrating money bullying clandestinely. For instance, behind Class VII-4 (in front of the laboratory of Bahasa Indonesia) (UL, Interview at May 31, 2016).

Parent's name mocking: The tendency on mocking parent's name is dominantly done by male students which mostly ultimately leads to the beatings (fighting) each other. "Usually, male students love reciprocally mocking parent's name one another which mostly ends up with fighting," said one of the informants (Sar, Interview at May 3, 2016).

Social media bullying: Sometimes, a student intentionally shares his friend's photos through one of social media. It triggers mocking among students in social media and eventually is brought before the school environment.

Beatings (kicking, punching, slapping and pinching): According to the school principal, many bullying perpetrators have strong connection with other parties

outside the school. They are "Genk" and mostly doing money bullying upon other students. The attempt in handling this bullying is done by mutating them to another school. It happened in 2015 (Interview with school principal at May 25, 2016).

The impact of school bullying (Demanet and Van, 2014; Eggertson, 2011; Waasdorp *et al.*, 2012) may extend not only for both perpetrator and victim but also for school environment, family, peer groups. It also embodies both psychological and health state (Brank *et al.*, 2012; Wang *et al.*, 2016; Braybrook, 2012). Then, the intervention on bullying perpetrators has triggered school counselors to critically figure out an effective model to create deterrent effects (Nickerson *et al.*, 2014; Hunt *et al.*, 2010). It is apt to use the combination between counseling and religion in several phases as follows.

Submitting a letter of agreement: To handle the bullying perpetrator, school counselors at Junior High School 17 Kendari have agreed to investigate the students after being reported by victim. The intervention model is applied by handing down a letter of agreement to the perpetrator in order to create deterrent effects. This model offers maximal outcomes yet sometimes could not meet the expectation. Therefore, it takes the succeeding phase which is inviting parents over.

Inviting parents: Parents as teacher partner in handling bullying perpetrators should be involved in the intervention process. School counselor invites parents over to the school through several procedural options such as: via phone, direct invitation letter or verbal request (And Interview at May 10, 2016).

Home visiting: Besides handing down a letter of agreement and inviting parents over to the school, home visiting has also been used as last model in handling school bullying at Junior High School 17 Kendari. As what the teachers said "We usually visit their (students who violate the school rules) house. Often we receive various responses. Sometimes, their parents are grateful for our visit. They are grateful for being informed about their son's behaviors in the school. But sometimes the parents show their disagreement. Above all, the major issue we encounter the most is that we do not meet them at all."

Numerous intervention models (Nickerson *et al.*, 2014; Hunt *et al.*, 2010) done by school counselors in handling bullying perpetrators as what have been mentioned above, indicate that the main focus on this intervention is rather on perpetrators than victims. Counseling theory suggests to mainly concern on victims instead of perpetrators. It however, does not necessarily mean that perpetrators should be ignored. The intervention on victims mainly aims to avoid victim's behavior disorder due to the bullying actions such as: threat, intimidation and torture. These actions might trigger the victim to isolate himself, experience over-anxiety, even murders or commits suicide.

The intervention models proposed by school counselors at Junior High School 17 Kendari could apparently make the victims feel safe. Therefore, the teachers perceive the perpetrator-focused intervention models are more effective compared to the victim-focused. In other words, the intervention is done by directly involving among parties, perpetrator and victim in discussion (Jimenez-Barbero *et al.*, 2016). It was expressed by one of the bullying victims that he "felt safe after being handled by school counselors". One religion teacher is also assigned as school counselor and has implemented 5 treatments to the victims:

- It is suggested for the victim to report the bullying actions to the school counselor or homeroom teacher
- It is suggested for the victim to avoid the bullying perpetrator inside or outside the school environment
- Once the school hours are over, it is suggested for the victim not to get back home alone
- It is suggested for the victim to ask for protection from peer groups
- It is suggested for both victim and perpetrator to get direct mediation in the counseling room

From the 5 treatments mentioned above, the first point is hardly done for it makes the victim even feel threatened (Walton, 2013; Rose, 2012). Therefore, most victims do not report and instead squelch the bullying actions.

The result of both interview and observation figures out that the "confrontation" model is the most effective intervention model compared to others. The victim feels safer and comfortable from various threats. It also provides better solution for the bullying issue, since it involves the agreement letter consisting many commitments for the perpetrator. This agreement letter will then create deterrent effect and prevent the same bullying actions emerging again.

As a school commitment in terms of the character building in 2016 the school has created "special class" under the name "Kelas Model" consisting of 27 students (20 troublemakers, two of which are bullying perpetrators; and rest 7 students as "enlightenment" agencies). Based on findings in this study, there are two major issues during the invention process.

After counseling process, all parties agree to conduct home visiting. This agreement is built by school principal, homeroom teachers and the bullying perpetrator. The emerging issue mostly appears from the parent side; they often are not at home. Another issue is that most parents have not yet been sure (even denying) what their son does in the school.

The homeroom teachers assume that they could handle the bullying perpetrator themselves. If they could not solve the issue they then bring it before the school counselor. In other words, the homeroom teachers do not necessarily involve the school counselor to solve the issue once they have successfully handled it.

CONCLUSION

The intervention on bullying victims is expected to minimize student's problems in school, family or society. The most effective intervention model at Junior High School 17 of Kendari-Southeast Sulawesi is "confrontation" model. It implies an agreement letter, parent's invitation and home visiting. Furthermore, it makes the bullying victim feel safer from various threats due to the commitment letter signed by the bullying perpetrator. It ultimately creates deterrent effect and thus preventing the same bullying actions emerging again.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Bradshaw, C.P., A.L. Sawyer and L.M. O'Brennan, 2007. Bullying and peer victimization at school: Perceptual differences between students and school staff. J. Sch. Psychol. Rev., 36: 361-382.

Braybrook, D.E., 2012. The impact of bullying on the mental health of young gay men. Intl. J. Mens Health, 11: 258-258.

Carvalhosa, S., 2009. Prevention of bullying in schools: An ecological model. J. Psychol. Health, 24: 175-176.

Cassidy, T., 2009. Bullying and victimisation in school children: The role of social identity, problem-solving style and family and school context. Social Psychol. Educ., 12: 63-76.

Chirila, T., 2012. Social and psychological implications of bullying in schools. J. Psychol. Educ. Res., 20: 59-67.

Demanet, J. and H.M. Van, 2014. The impact of bullying. Am. J. Health Educ., 43: 104-113.

Eggertson, L., 2011. Targeted the impact of bullying and what needs to be done to eliminate it. Can. Nurse, 107: 16-20.

Fekkes, M., F.I. Pijpers and S.P. Verloove-Vanhorick, 2005. Bullying: Who does what, when and where? Involvement of children, teachers and parents in bullying behavior. Health Educ. Res., 20: 81-91.

Gourneau, B., 2012. Students perspectives of bullying in schools. Contemp. Issues Educ. Res., 5: 117-117.

Graham, S., 2016. Victims of bullying in schools. Theory Pract., 55: 136-144.

Guzman, L.G.D. and F.J.A. Zepeda, 2013. Bullying a manifestation of deterioration in social interaction among peers. J. Ra Ximhai, 9: 65-80.

Hanif, R., M. Nadeem and S. Tariq, 2011. Bullying in schools: Attitudes of children, teachers and parents. Interdisc. J. Victimization Stud. Relationsh. Contemp. Res. Bus., 3: 1055-1061.

Hunt, C.M., M.J. Davidson, S.L. Fielden and H. Hoel, 2010. Reviewing sexual harassment in the workplace an intervention model. Personn. Rev., 39: 655-673.

Jacobsen, K. and S. Bauman, 2007. Bullying in schools: School counselors responses to three types of bullying incidents. Prof. Sch. Counsel., 11: 1-9.

Jimenez-Barbero, J.A., J.A. Ruiz-Hernandez, L. Llor-Zaragoza, M. Perez-Garcia and B. Llor-Esteban, 2016. Effectiveness of anti-bullying school programs: A meta-analysis. Child. Youth Serv. Rev., 61: 165-175.

Juvonen, J., Y. Wang and G. Espinoza, 2011. Bullying experiences and compromised academic performance across middle school grades. J. Early Adolesc., 31: 152-173.

Kousholt, K. and T.B. Fisker, 2015. Approaches to reduce bullying in schools: A critical analysis from the viewpoint of first-and second-order perspectives on bullying. Children Soc., 29: 593-603.

McVie, S., 2014. The impact of bullying perpetration and victimization on later violence and psychological distress: A study of resilience among a Scottish youth cohort. J. Sch. Viol., 13: 39-58.

Nickerson, A.B., A.M. Aloe, J.A. Livingston and T.H. Feeley, 2014. Measurement of the bystander intervention model for bullying and sexual harassment. J. Adolesc., 37: 391-400.

Pack, C., A. White, K. Raczynski and A. Wang, 2011. Evaluation of the safe school ambassadors program: A student-led approach to reducing mistreatment and bullying in schools. J. Educ. Strat. Issues Ideas, 84: 127-133.

Perron, T., 2013. Peer victimisation: Strategies to decrease bullying in schools. Br. J. Sch. Nurs., 8: 25-29.

Rigby, K., 2003. Consequences of bullying in schools. Can. J. Psychiatry, 48: 583-590.

Rigby, K., 2004. Addressing bullying in schools: Theoretical perspectives and their implications. Sch. Psychol. Intl., 25: 287-300.

Rigby, K., 2014. How teachers address cases of bullying in schools: A comparison of five reactive approaches. Educ. Psychol. Pract., 30: 409-419.

Rose, D., 2012. The method of shared concern: A positive approach to bullying in schools. Intl. Sch. J., 14: 1-65.

Side, J. and K. Johnson, 2014. Bullying in schools: Why it happens, how it makes young people feel and what we can do about it. Educ. Psychol. Pract., 30: 217-231.

Strohmeier, D. and G.G. Noam, 2012. Bullying in schools: What is the problem and how can educators solve it?. N. Direct. Stud. Leadersh., 2012: 7-13.

Teresa, S.F., F. Sergio and M. Helena, 2014. Bullying in guimaraes schools: Types of bullying and gender differences. J. PsiLogos, 12: 25-42.

Vacca, J.S. and L. Kramer-Vida, 2012. Preventing the bullying of foster children in our schools. Child. Youth Serv. Rev., 34: 1805-1809.

Waasdorp, T.E., C.P. Bradshaw and P.J. Leaf, 2012. The impact of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports on bullying and peer rejection: A randomized controlled effectiveness trial. Arch. Pediatr. Adolesc. Med., 166: 149-156.

Walton, G., 2013. The method of shared concern: A positive approach to bullying in schools. Can. J. Educ., 36: 454-456.

Wang, W., H. Brittain, P. McDougall and T. Vaillancourt, 2016. Bullying and school transition: Context or development?. Child Abuse Neglect, 51: 237-248.

Wolke, D., W.E. Copeland, A. Angold and E.J. Costello, 2013. Impact of bullying in childhood on adult health, wealth, crime and social outcomes. Psychol. Sci., 24: 1958-1970.

Yerger, W. and C. Gehret, 2011. Understanding and dealing with Bullying in schools. Educ. For., 75: 315-326.