2014

The Presence of Cyberbullying in Rural Middle Schools: Advanced Technology, School Initiatives, and Parent Involvement

Amy Painter
Walden University

Walden University

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Amy Painter

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Philip Griswold, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty
Dr. Genniver Bell, Committee Member, Education Faculty
Dr. George Smeaton, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2014

Abstract

The Presence of Cyberbullying in Rural Middle Schools:

Advanced Technology, School Initiatives, and Parent Involvement

by

Amy Foltz Painter

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

November 2014

Abstract

This descriptive study used preexisting student and parent surveys to examine cyberbullying in two rural middle schools. This study was guided by the social dominance theory, which says that individuals establish themselves in social hierarchies, and by the social-ecological framework theory, which suggests that behavior is influenced by many related systems. This study identified the rates of occurrence of methods used for cyberbullying, types of Internet access available, parental awareness, intervention, and resolution of cyberbullying issues. A simple random sample of 162 parents and 213 students completed the survey. Compared to national results, more local students (9.9%) admitted cyberbullying in the past 30 days, and more local survey students (14.1%) reported being cyberbullied in the past 30 days. For 9 of the 18 methods of cyberbullying examined, chi-square tests revealed that the local usage rates were significantly higher than national rates. Results from the parent survey suggested that parents were aware of the use of social media and that cyberbullying was taking place. Of those surveyed, 24% reported some knowledge of cyberbullying, and 75.6% of parents were concerned that their children could be cyberbullied. Results of this survey study helped in designing a project action plan to educate, to provide professional development for teachers, and to offer parent workshops to assist with preventing cyberbullying. Efforts to accomplish a positive social change may evolve after successful implementation of anti-cyberbullying programs in the middle schools.

The Presence of Cyberbullying in Rural Middle Schools:

Advanced Technology, School Initiatives, and Parent Involvement

by

Amy Foltz Painter

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

November 2014

Acknowledgments

Completing my doctoral study was a time-consuming a cumbersome process. However, the pride that it gave my parents to say that their daughter was getting her doctorate degree was worth it. The memories and fun times that my mother and I shared in Atlanta on my residency trip were priceless!

Thank you to Hannah and Mason, for every time that I had to make you wait, because mommy was writing her paper. I hope I can make it up to you and I truly appreciate your understanding every time that I said, "Just ten more minutes."

Thank you to my husband Tony, for listening to me talk about my paper, the methodology, sampling procedures, chi square analysis, and all the other conversations that you had no idea what I was talking about...but you listened anyway.

Finally, thank you to Dr. Phil Griswold, my chairperson. Your wisdom, humor, and understanding made the entire process easier.

Table of Contents

Section 1: The Problem

Introduction

With the increase of technology in today's society, bullying extends beyond the playground, bathrooms, and hallways of schools. Bullying can now take place via cellphones and computers, in the form of texts, tweets, and cyber posts (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2009). Furthermore, while traditional, or face-to-face, bullies' identities are usually known by the victims, cyberbullies can remain anonymous while intimidating their victims (CDC, 2009). Many middle school students are familiar with both traditional and electronic forms of bullying.

The objective of this project study was to implement positive social change, by addressing the existence and forms of cyberbullying that take place in middle schools. The following section concentrates on defining cyberbullying, while raising awareness of students' motives for exhibiting bullying behaviors.

Definition of the Problem

In 2008, Congress passed the Protecting Children in the 21st Century legislation, which protects children from traditional bullying and cyberbullying (Snakenborg, Van Acker, & Gable, 2011). Traditionally, bullying consists of negative acts to cause its victims fear or distress (Holladay, 2010). Until recent years, bullying usually took place on school playgrounds and buses, in school bathrooms and hallways. Today, students can become a cyberbully via electronic communication and social networking sites, sometimes even without having to reveal their identity (Bauman, 2009). Cyberbullying,

like traditional bullying, helps the perpetrator gain a sense of power and social status (Holladay, 2010). It can be more pervasive than traditional bullying because, using electronic means a larger number of people can be affected (Thomas & McGee, 2012).

According to Internet World Stats (2012), approximately 78.6% of Americans have access to the Internet, a 153.3% growth since 2000. With more students having access to social networking sites and other means of electronic communication, there has been an increase of accusations of cyberbullying by middle and high school students. For instance, a study revealed that of the 1431 adolescents who took a questionnaire about cyberbullying, 44.1% responded that they had been exposed to at least one act of cyberbullying (Calvete, Orue, Estévez, Villardón, & Padilla, 2010). According to another study, among 1673 students, aged 12–19 years, 53.7% reported being cyberbullied in the prior year (Fenaughty & Harré, 2013).

The school district studied consisted of approximately 3,600 students and was comprised of nine schools: four elementary schools, two middle schools, two high schools, and a technical center. Nestled between two mountains, the school district was in a primarily agricultural area, where there were few local employment opportunities. As a result, 51.4% of the population was disadvantaged (as determined by free or reduced lunch status). The district's demographics were as follows: 94% of the student population was White, 6.4% minority, 12.1% special education, and 0.8% English as a second language (J.P., personal communication, June 30, 2013).

In the local school district, discipline referrals for bullying were not consistently catalogued in the discipline tracker system. Only one of the two middle schools used a computer-based system that stored and analyzed school-wide discipline. That source indicated that bullying and/or cyberbullying could have been categorized under the following three categories: disrespect to students, improper use of a cell phone, or fighting/aggression. Using these same three categories, the percentage of discipline referrals in the 2011-2012 school years were as follows: 26% disrespect, 8% improper use of a cell phone, and 13% fighting/aggression (D.A., personal communication, June 1, 2013). For the 2012-2013 school year, discipline referrals included 49% for disrespect and 19% for fighting/aggression (P.W., personal communication, June 7, 2013). There were no logs for the improper use of a cell phone in the 2012-2013 school year (P.W., personal communication, June 7, 2013). Because two different administrators logged the discipline referrals for these two schools, the referrals may have been categorized differently (personal communication, P.W., June 7, 2013).

Within the last month of the 2012-2013 school year, at one of the school district's middle schools, an eighth grade student was suspended for cyberbullying. According to a written statement by the victim, "She had no right to post those things on Facebook. She doesn't even know me, but she is threatening to beat me up at school. Now everyone is calling me those names" (P.W., personal communication, June 7, 2013). The parent of the suspended student was not even aware that her child had a Facebook account. A

printout of the Facebook page had to be provided to the parent as evidence of the incident (P.W., personal communication, June 7, 2013).

Moreover, students in the studied middle schools also have a prevalence of current technology at their fingertips. The school is equipped with five computer labs, a mobile classroom laptop cart, and several classroom sets of iPads. Also, most middle school students sport a cell phone in their back pocket, which allows for texting, emails, pictures, and uncensored Internet access. While there is a cell phone use policy in the school handbook, it includes no policy on cyberbullying; nor is there any district policy (P.J., personal communication, July 1, 2013).

Despite the fact that cyberbullying was on the rise, there were no anti-bullying programs available at the middle and high school levels. Only one of this district's four elementary schools offered an anti-bullying program. According to Couvillon and Ilieva (2011), it is the role of schools and educators not only to foster academic success, but to instill values and to implement measures to promote mutual respect, civility, and acceptance among students. It is important to instill these values in students through implementation of anti-cyberbullying measures in the school district.

Rationale

Research has shown associations between bullying and the long-term effects experienced by victims. Children that have been exposed to bullying throughout school have reported problems with anxiety, depression, low self-esteem, absenteeism, and reduced school achievement (Hunt, Peters, & Rapee, 2012). Klomek, Marrocco,

Kleinman, Schonfeld, and Gould (2007) have also identified suicidal behaviors as another strong stressor associated with bullying. Schaeffer, Petras, Ialongo, Poduska and Kellam (2003) concluded that boys that had experienced bullying during elementary schools were at a higher risk for being arrested as juveniles, developing conduct disorders, and antisocial personality disorders. Another study also indicated that children that are bullied at age eight are more inclined to commit criminal acts as an adult (Ayenibiowo & Akinbode, 2011). A study by Ronning et al. (2009) concluded that frequent bullying behavior is an indicator of present and future psychopathology. Additionally, the findings concluded that early detection and prevention of bullying by schools during adolescence is critical to deter adverse outcomes for bullies and victims.

After a thorough literature review and examination of local data, information on parental awareness of cyberbullying was found sparingly. Hence, a descriptive study was used to generate data for developing guidelines to educate students, teachers, and parents on cyberbullying prevention. These guidelines would entail informing school policy makers of the bullying problem to gain additional funding to access available resources and implement anti-bullying campaigns to educate students on appropriate and acceptable interactions while using technology. These proactive programs would include professional development for teachers and enhance school board policy. Additionally, as a result of this study's findings, a campaign will be developed to educate parents on the methods of electronic communication and the social media outlets that are available to their children.

Definitions

There are numerous special terms that are key concepts within this descriptive study that require definitions. Some common tools, methods, and technology used by students committing acts of cyberbullying are included in the following terms:

Chat rooms: These are online environments with comments being posted in real time (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009).

Cyberbullying: This is also termed electronic aggression, which is "any type of harassment or bullying that occurs through email, a chat room, instant messaging, a website, text messaging, or videos or pictures posted on websites or sent through cell phones" (CDC, 2009, p. 3).

Direct cyberbullying: This involves messages being sent from the bully to the victim (Snakenborg et al., 2011).

Email: Bullies use electronic mail to send threatening messages and may forward a confidential email to others (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009).

Indirect cyberbullying by proxy: This occurs when a bully enlists others to bully the victim (Snakenborg et al., 2011).

Instant messaging: Also known as text messaging, this act is conducted by using a cell phone to send derogatory slurs via instant messaging or text messaging (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009).

Photoshopping: This is an application used on cell phones and computers and is used to alter a photo or recreate an image (Cyberbully Alert, 2009).

Sexting: Sexting includes sending and sharing pictures of sexual images and/or texts using a cell phone (Brunker, 2009).

Social networking: Also referred to as social communication websites, such as MySpace, Facebook, YouTube, or Twitter, social networks are used to communicate via the Internet under registered personal accounts (Wong-Lo et al., 2011).

Traditional bullying: These are repeated acts of aggression that are intentionally carried out by one or more persons toward a person that cannot easily defend him- or herself (Olweus, 1993).

Significance

For the school year of 2010-2011, the Virginia Annual Report on Discipline, Crime, and Violence (2012) reported that of 14,357 reports of incidents against students, bullying constituted for 42.61%. The annual report does not distinguish between traditional and cyberbullying. However, a study by Wang, Ionnotti, and Nansel (2009) indicated that approximately 70% of students in the United States have been subjected to cyberbullying. This research used data collected from the Health Behavior in School-Aged Children Survey to determine bullying and cyberbullying behaviors in students in Grades 6 through 10 (Wang et al., 2009). Snakenborg et al. (2011) stated that the majority of cyberbullying is an expansion of face-to-face bullying of the same participants. Even though cyberbullying usually takes place off school grounds, schools can work to control the behavior or speech as the learning environment at school is disrupted because of the cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009).

In the local setting, a rural school district, it is essential to determine the current existence and methods of cyberbullying that have occurred to students in the middle schools. The only prior study associated with bullying in this school division was the Pride Survey, a needs assessment that was last reported for the years 2002-2007. The Pride Survey is conducted every 5 years for students in the school district's middle and high schools to measure student behavior and perceptions. It is a paper survey that is administered to all students that have parental permission; the data are used to assess current programs and needs for future interventions in the areas of drugs, alcohol, sexual behavior, and crime. The latest Pride survey which was conducted in September 2012 and data has not been released yet. The survey identified bullying as a potential, growing problem in our school district with an average of 20 reported acts of bullying per school year (Barnes Technologies International, 2008).

There has been no research conducted in this school district on cyberbullying. Whereas, it is an important role of the schools to assist students in developing their social behaviors, including appropriate methods of communication using technology. While character education is taught at the elementary levels, bullying is addressed at only one of the four elementary schools. Therefore, the proposed study could contribute to positive social change because its data would lead to developing and implementing programs at the middle or high school levels to combat bullying, both traditional and cyber.

Research Questions

Bullying behaviors, such as teasing, name-calling, and harassment, exist in middle schools; yet, incidents of bullying, especially cyberbullying go unreported and few or no interventions may are place to deter such behaviors (Juvonen & Gross, 2008). This study was guided by the following research questions, which were based on these findings:

1. Are the rates of occurrence of methods used for cyberbullying at the local level measured by the local student survey similar to the rates of cyberbullying at the national level to those obtained from a national study of student cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010)?
2. What types of Internet access do parents report that their students have access to?
3. Are parents aware of their students' experiences with cyberbullying over social media?
4. Have parents intervened in their students' cyberbullying experiences?
5. Whose responsibility do parents feel should resolve cyberbullying issues?

Review of the Literature

The literature review was conducted with the following databases: Education Research Complete, Ed/ITLib Digital Library, ProQuest Central, PsycINFO, Academic Search Complete, EBSCO, Google Scholar, Educational Research Information Center (ERIC), and SAGE. The following keywords were used: *bullying, cyberbullying, harassment, stalking, digital, aggression, middle school, prevention, adolescent,* and

technology. While there is limited research on this recent phenomenon, the following sections provide insight into theoretical perspectives, traditional bullying, and current research on cyberbullying. Due to the high White student population in this study, race was not addressed.

Theoretical Framework on Aggression and Bullying

During early childhood, aggression is considered to be a part of a normal child development process (Liu, Lewis, & Evans, 2013). However, the manners in which aggression is portrayed changes throughout a person's life. Young children predominantly use physical aggression because of the emerging development of verbal skills (Tremblay et al., 2004). By the age of 2, most children have begun experiencing onsets of physical aggression, such as crying, screaming, biting, kicking, and throwing objects (Tremblay et al., 2004). These outbursts are typically aimed towards parents, while as social interactions increase between children, the acts of aggression may be aimed at their peers (Greydanus, Pratt, Greydanus, & Hoffman, 2003). These behaviors may be displayed as fighting, teasing, bullying, and cruelty to animals (Greydanus, Pratt, Greydanus, & Hoffman, 2003). Socialized aggression in adolescents usually involves increased levels of violence, such as gang activities, organized stealing, and other participation in delinquent cooperative behaviors (Liu, 2004).

Walcott, Upton, Bolen, & Brown (2008) suggested that the social dominance theory could explain physically and socially aggressive forms of bullying. According to Hawley (1999), the social dominance theory means that individuals usually establish

themselves in social hierarchies; children compete for their peers using both coercive and cooperative strategies. Patchin and Hinduja (2006) found that 37% of the teens in their research study indicated that they would say things electronically that they would never say in person, adding to the need for hierarchy and feeling on dominance.

A distinction between bullying and acts of aggression is an imbalance of power between the victim and bully (Dooley, Pyzalski, & Cross, 2009). In terms of cyberbullying, power imbalance can also be assessed by level of technology skills that a bully has (Dooley et al., 2009). Another factor that lends itself to power imbalance is the cyberbully's ability to remain anonymous. The inability to identify the cyberbully may add to the victim's fear, as there may be several victims involved (Bauman & Tatum, 2009). In traditional bullying, the victim has an escape from the bully by staying at home, whereas cyberbullying can reach the victim at any time or place via technology (Bauman & Tatum, 2009).

An additional component of bullying that relates to social dominance theory is group membership and that peers have an influence on bullying (Jones, Manstead, & Livingstone, 2009; Olweus, 1978). In traditional bullying, the group that takes part is usually limited to those that are physically present. Cyberbullying poses the risk of the behaviors being observed by much larger groups due to the limitless audience that social networks and Internet permits (Dooley et al., 2009).

The core principle of the social learning theory is that aggression is a learned behavior. This perspective was introduced by Bandura (1973) when he conducted

experiments with children and a Bobo doll. The children first observed a model being aggressive with the Bobo doll, and then the children mimicked the same aggressive behaviors in their play with the doll (Bandura, 1973). Bandura (1977) explained that people learn through observing the behaviors of others, including the outcomes of the observed behaviors. Olweus (1993) confirmed a relation between social learning theory and bullying, because bullies need to gain dominance over their victim. Olweus (1993) noted that a victim of bullying can be deemed as mentally weak emotionally, not just in a physical sense. Other motives for bullying associated with the social learning theory are external reinforcement, vicarious reinforcement, and self-reinforcement (Bandura, 1977). Baldry (2003) added that family background characteristics contribute to involvement in bullying behavior by learning bullying behaviors through observation, role modeling, and reinforcement.

Aggression is a normal part of early childhood development. While aggression may begin as predominately physical as a young child, it emerges into forms of physical and verbal aggression. The social dominance theory supported that individuals use aggression to gain social status and gain peer relationships. The social learning theory added that aggression is a learned behavior, which aids in the understanding of dominance used in bullying behaviors.

History of Bullying and Traditional Bullying Behaviors

It is important to begin current research of cyberbullying by directing focus to the groundbreaking bullying studies of Dr. Dan Olweus. Olweus (1993) is recognized as a

leading expert on bullying, beginning with a large-scale study in the 1970s involving bullying problems among adolescents. In 1983, Olweus (1993) conducted the first large-scale, study of bullying in Norway with more than 40,000 students. Results of the 1983 study concluded that 15% of students reported that they had been involved in acts of bullying as perpetrators and/or victims (Olweus, 1993). Of the 15%, 9% of students had been bullied, 7% of students had bullied others, and approximately 1.5% of students had participated in both bullying and bullying others (Olweus, 1993).

Following the 1983 study, another Norwegian study in was started in 2001 of 11,000 students concurred with the earlier results of Olweus (Solberg, Olweus, & Endresen, 2007). This study portrayed two increasing trends in bullying, with the age of students being bullied had increased by 50% between 1983 and 2001 (Solberg, Olweus, & Endresen, 2007).

In 2001, the first nationally representative study of bullying in the United States was conducted (Nansel et al., 2001). The study included more than 15,000 students in middle and high schools and discovered that 17% of students reported being bullied (Nansel et al., 2001). Additionally, 19% of those students studied reported that they had bullied others (Nansel et al., 2001).

According to Olweus (1993), bullying is comprised of repeated acts of harassment, with an imbalance of power, and intentionality. Typical bullying behaviors include teasing, name-calling, using physical force, taunting, threats, exclusion, and the spreading of rumors (Olweus, 1993). Olweus (1993) added that bullying is a behavior

that causes a child to be "exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students (p. 9). The negative action that Olweus (1993) refers to can take the form of verbal or physical abuse. These forms of abuse have been grouped into two types of bullying: direct bullying and indirect bullying (Powell & Ladd, 2010). Direct bullying consists of open and straightforward physical attacks on a victim, whereas indirect bullying consists of social and intentional exclusion of the victim (Powell & Ladd, 2010). Traditional bullying can be carried out by a single individual or a group, as well as victims of bullying can be individual or groups (Powell & Ladd, 2010). Olweus (1993) stressed that bullying must include an imbalance of power and/or strength and not merely a disagreement resulting in a fight.

Olweus (1978) also created a psychological profile of bullies in his original study. Typical bullies have an average to above average self-esteem, more positive attitude toward violence, more physical strength than their victims, and tend to be more popular among classmates (Olweus, 1978). On the contrary, a study by Connolly and O'Moore (2003) used questionnaire research of 228 children and declared that bullies have greater emotional inhibition and make more negative statements about themselves compared to others. Additionally, on personality tests, results founded that bullies scored higher on extraversion, psychoticism, and neuroticism scales (Connolly & O'Moore, 2003).

The majority of conventional bullying takes place on the playgrounds, classrooms, and corridors of schools (Olweus, 1993; Smith et al., 1999; Monks et al., 2009). In a recent study by Turner, Finkelhor, Hamby, Shattuck, and Ormrod (2011), a

representative sample of 2,999 adolescents, ages 6–17, were surveyed with 2008 National Survey of Children's Exposure to Violence. Results from the study confirmed these same traditional bullying results with 53% of those children studied received their most recent victimization on school property (Turner et al., 2011). According to a review of literature by Smith and Slonje (2010), during adolescence, incidences of traditional bullying decreases, however, cyberbullying behaviors increase throughout secondary schooling. Additionally, unlike traditional bullying, cyberbullying typically takes place off school grounds (Mark & Ratliffe, 2011).

The Secret World of Cyberbullying

Cyberbullying, also termed electronic aggression, is "any type of harassment or bullying that occurs through email, a chat room, instant messaging, a website, text messaging, or videos or pictures posted on websites or sent through cell phones" (CDC, 2009, p. 3). Siegle (2010) specified that the Internet and other high-tech communication devices are best suited for forms of non-violent bullying.

Cyberbullying has become more prevalent, as it can take place in a technological method hidden from adults. Research by Gable, Ludlow, Kite, and McCoach (2011) revealed that one in five middle-school students had been victims of cyberbullying, while one in five students had used technology to bully others. A study by Li (2006) confirmed the existence of cyberbullying that almost half of the students were victims of bullying, and one in four students were subjected to cyberbullying. In a survey study by Estell, Farmer, Irvin, Crowther, Akos, and Boudah (2009), it was found that general education

and gifted students were less likely to be bullied than students with disabilities. On the contrary, a study by Peterson (2009) concluded that 67% of gifted sixth grade students reported being bullied.

Sharples, Graber, Harrison and Logan (2009) conducted empirical research on e-safety and found that 13% of respondents had pictures posted of them that they did not consent to. Additionally, 10% of those participating in the surveys and interviews reported that others had posted unacceptable statements about them online (Sharples et al., 2009). In a study by Paul, Smith, and Blumberg (2010), students identified their biggest concern of cyberbullying was the hacking into of personal social networking sites or bombarding their mobile phones with text messages. Moreover, research conducted by Mark and Ratliffe (2011) found that 54% of those students surveyed reported to be the victims of cyberbullying and indicated that they use the Internet on a daily basis.

One study revealed that females were more likely to be involved in cyberbullying confrontations, with 33% of females reporting being the victim or bully, whereas only 20% of males reported being the victim or bully (Mark & Ratliffe, 2011). Wang et al. (2009) reiterated that females are more likely to be involved in cyberbullying than males. Cassidy, Brown, and Jackson (2012) also confirmed in their study that females were significantly more often involved in cyberbullying than males. Conversely, Popović-Ćitić, Djurić, and Cvetković (2011) discovered in their research that males are more likely to be involved in cyberbullying than females.

In addition, cyberbullying involves the distribution of cyberbullying materials, whether text messages, photos, and/or videos. Slonje, Smith, and Frisén (2012) reported that 39.1% of the bullies in their study showed the texts or photos to others, 15.6% reported uploading the material to the Internet, and 4.1% of participants replied in an open-ended questions that they have commented on Facebook pictures for others to see.

Another characteristic of cyberbullying is the anonymity of the cyberbully. Cyberbullies can use pseudonyms or post anonymously, which can lead to bullies saying things that they would not say face-to-face (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009). In a survey study by Mark and Ratliffe (2011), 48% of the students that reported being the victims of cyberbullying stated that they did not know who the cyberbully was. Concurrently, a study by Kowalski and Limber (2007) agreed that 48% of their study's respondents did not know the identity of the cyberbully. However, Juvonen and Gross (2008) reported from their research that 73% of their participants were certain of their bully's identity.

Advances in Technology

The influx of new technology in today's world has helped everyone to learn and connect with others in ways that were once unimaginable. However, with these benefits of technology come the repercussions of its misuse. Cyberbullying has become difficult for schools and parents to monitor due to the various types of available technology. The most common avenues for cyberbullying include cell phones (via texting, phone calls, and picture mail), emails, Internet chat rooms, Instant Messenger, social networking sites (such as Facebook and MySpace), online games, and video broadcasting websites (Li,

2006; Sourander, Brunstein Klomek, Ikonen, Lindroos, Luntamo, Koskelainen et al., 2010; Mark & Ratliffe, 2011).

Adolescents of the 21st century have access to cell phones and technology. According to the Pew Internet and American Life Project conducted in 2012, 78% of adolescents aged 12-17 have a cell phone, with 47% of those surveyed owning smartphones (Pew Research Center, 2013). Additionally, 93% of teens have access to a computer (Pew Research Center, 2013). In a study by Mark and Ratliffe (2011), 96% of the survey participants indicated that they have access to Internet on home computers, with 33% of the students reported daily online activity. Regarding cell phone ownership, 88% of students stated that they have a personal cell phone, with 43% of students reported daily usage (Mark & Ratliffe, 2011). There is evidence that students have access to and the ability to use mobile communication devices and technology on a daily basis.

The Role of Schools and Parents

Wang et al. (2009) conveyed that the chances of an adolescent becoming a cyber-victim or bully decreases when a strong school and family support system exists. Parents and educators have the obligation to understand the potential problems that may arise from new technology and steer young people to use technology responsibly.

Mark and Ratliffe (2011) stated that schools and parents may unintentionally contribute to instances of bullying by implying that students should solve the problem on their own. A study by Juvonen and Gross (2008) revealed that 90% of students do not tell their parents that cyberbullying is taking place. On a similar note, Kite, Gable, and

Fillipelli (2010) found in their research study that 44% of students would tell an adult if they were being bullied online. Sharples et al. (2009) surveyed 121 parents of the understanding of technology as compared to their children. Only 13% of the surveyed parents felt that their children had more knowledge of technology than they do (Sharples et al., 2009). Additionally, 66% of the polled parents specified that they had measures in place to protect their children from accessing websites that they did not approve of (Sharples et al., 2009).

Mark and Ratliffe (2011) reported in their study that 48% of the students that were victims of cyberbullying stated that the bullying ended on its own without interventions from others. Twenty-three% of these students reported that the cyberbullying ended after friends, parents, or teachers intervened. Of those students surveyed that reported they were the cyberbully, 44% stated that they ended the cyberbullying behaviors after they realized that it was inappropriate (Mark & Ratliffe, 2011). Regarding awareness, 83% of the surveyed students thought that their teachers would stop any occurrences immediately (Mark & Ratliffe, 2011). On the other hand, 80% of the students did not feel that their parents would intervene if their parents knew about the cyberbullying (Mark & Ratliffe, 2011).

Schools have been criticized for not having forceful anti-bullying and Internet safety programs in place (Miller, Thompson, Franz, & Pomykal, 2009). Bhat, Chang, and Linscott (2010) stated that the policies should clearly define what types of behaviors are specified as cyberbullying and the consequences for their occurrence. A national survey

in England of 206 teachers, in schools with advanced technology, of students aged 11-16 revealed that 55% of teachers stated that their school had an Internet safety policy, 3% of teachers stated there was no policy, and 42% of teachers did not know (Sharples et al., 2009). In addition, 42% of the teachers in the study reported that they never taught students about online safety, with only 11% of teachers doing do on a frequent basis (Sharples et al., 2009). Fourteen of 17 teachers viewed prevention of cyberbullying in schools as either "extremely important" or "important" (Cassidy, Brown, & Jackson, 2012). In a comparative study by Ryan, Kariuji, and Yilmaz (2011), it was discovered that even though teachers expressed concern about cyberbullying and were able to identify cyberbullying behaviors, less than half of these teachers knew what to do to assist the students that were experiencing cyberbullying.

In addition, students have a perception that nothing can be done to minimize cyberbullying occurrences (Parris, Varjas, Meyers, & Cutts, 2011). Because of this misconception, schools and parents need to provide students with knowledge of strategies and resources to prevent or decrease cyberbullying (von Marées & Petermann, 2012). Schools and parents must become educated about cyberbullying, with schools and parents becoming proactive in reducing the damage of cyberbullying (Popović-Ćitić et al., 2011).

Group discussions in a qualitative study by Paul et al. (2010) concluded that students supported the following anti-bullying interventions for schools: teacher training, bully clubs, thematic projects, information booklets, and guidance on reporting practices. Congruent with the ecological systems model, which states there are multiple levels of

influence on whether or not a person will develop aggressive or positive social skills (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), they determined after implementation of a school-wide anti-bullying program that students in the intervention group were significantly more likely than other students to report being bullied after 12 months in the program (Cross et al. 2011). Additionally, results from a study of whole-school approaches to cyberbullying provided evidence of a connection between positive school social climates and reduced incidences of bullying (Richard, Schneider, & Mallet, 2011). Another study by Ttofi and Harrington (2011) found that after an enactment of a school-based, anti-bullying program, rates of the number of bullies dropped 20-23% and rates of being bullied victims decreased by 17-20%. Kowalski, Morgan, and Limber (2012) added that bullying intervention has the most benefit when both traditional bullying and cyberbullying interventions are integrated. Finally, results of a study by Perren and Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger (2012) indicated implications that interventions programs need "to promote moral growth including a deeper understanding of why (cyber) bullying is morally wrong" (p. 207).

Previous Research Surveys on Cyberbullying

While there are many research studies surfacing regarding cyberbullying, survey research in this field has been mostly limited to students. Only a few studies (e.g., Moreno, Egan, & Bare et al. (2013), Wong (2010), and Lee and Chae (2012) surveyed other stakeholders in the school, including parents, teachers, and clinicians. The following descriptions outline cyberbullying survey instruments being used in current

research. An assessment of available student and parent surveys was conducted for the purpose of possible inclusion in this study as a validated published measure.

Student/young adult surveys. Sixth grade students participated in a bullying and cyberbullying questionnaire in an exploratory study by Accordino and Accordino (2011) to assess student experience with cyberbullying. Participants in the study consisted of 124 students and were a sample of convenience. The sixth grade students had also previously taken part in an online bully prevention program which heightened their awareness of bullying past (Accordino & Accordino, 2011). The survey instrument used consisted of demographics, technology use, parent-child relationship closeness, and coping mechanisms used by students (Accordino & Accordino, 2011). Survey questions assessed students' experiences with bullying behaviors, quality of family relationships, and methods for dealing with bullying behaviors in the past (Accordino & Accordino, 2011). While the journal article did not reference traditional bullying behaviors on the survey, an examination of the actual survey questions revealed that traditional face-to-face bullying was also questioned. Statistical analysis of data was conducted via multiple regression analyses past (Accordino & Accordino, 2011). Survey results included that students with close parental relationships were not bullied as often, students who have bullied others are also more likely to be bullied, and that involvement in Internet social media increases chances of being cyberbullied (Accordino & Accordino, 2011).

Similarly, another survey study by Kite, Gabel, and Filippelli (2010) assessed middle school students' knowledge of their online conduct and consequences. A 34-item

questionnaire was given to assess knowledge of inappropriate behavior on social networking sites, bullying behavior, and Internet use to a convenience sample of 588 seventh and eighth grade students (Kite, Gabel, & Filippelli, 2010). The journal article did not disclose analysis procedures. However, results divulged that only 10% of students divulged that they have been bullied online, that 70% of students thought that their parents were aware of their social networking accounts, and approximately 80% of participants stated that have not bullied someone else electronically (Kite, Gabel, & Filippelli, 2010).

The Associated Press-NORC Center for Public Affairs Research and MTV conducted a national survey to assess current trends on digital use and abuse (Tompson, Benz, & Agiesta, 2013). The survey was conducted with 1,297 teens and young adults aged 14 and 24 in the United States (Tompson, Benz, & Agiesta, 2013). Contrary to the results in the previous survey by Kite, Gabel, & Filippelli (2010), results concluded that almost half of those surveyed reported being harassed electronically, 40% reported forms of digital dating abuse, and 11% of those surveyed involved in sexting (Tompson, Benz, & Agiesta, 2013).

Parent surveys. Wong (2010) completed survey research on parenting in relation to Internet risks, such as cyberbullying. Household surveys were given to 2,579 families in Hong Kong to evaluate parenting techniques and their influence on Internet behaviors and methods to reduce Internet risks (Wong, 2010). Findings of the study suggested that parent education, authoritative parenting style, active involvement in Internet use, and

discussions regarding online activity had a positive influence on online behavior of children (Wong, 2010).

Likewise, a survey study by Lee and Chae (2012) also found a positive correlation between parental influence on student use of social media and online risks, such as cyberbullying. The study revealed that with increased parental mediation and higher levels of Internet skills, online risks also decreased (Lee & Chae, 2012). Survey findings suggested that online education for children should include Internet skills, awareness of online risks, and use of filtering software to diminish online risks (Lee & Chae, 2012).

A survey study by Moreno, Egan, and Bare et al. (2013), provided perspectives of stakeholders to identify the appropriate age in which Internet education should begin. Surveys were given to teachers, clinicians, parents, and adolescents. Results of the study reported that while stakeholder consensus was that students should receive Internet education at a young age, parents were identified as the most appropriate "teachers" of the Internet education (Moreno et al., 2013).

Finally, the American Osteopathic Association carried out a survey of parents in June of 2011 (American Osteopathic Association [AOA], 2011). The purpose of the study was to use data collected in support of new organizational policy on cyberbullying (AOA, 2013). The sample of participants was gathered from a national opt-in panel for those over 18 years of age that have agreed to participate in survey research (AOA, 2011). A total of 1,131 adults participated in the survey and results were stratified by parental age, income, and urban/rural location status (AOA, 2011). The parent survey

was used to assess their children's use of social media and the parent perceptions of online harassment and measures used to prevent online abuse (AOA, 2011). Survey results indicated that over 85% of students are on social media with more than 52% of parents fearful that their children will be the victims of cyberbullying (AOA, 2011). As reported in the Moreno et al. (2013) study, 91.7% of parents surveys in the AOA (2011) study agreed that it is the responsibility of parents to resolve online acts of bullying while less than half of parents feel that it is a school responsibility (AOA, 2011).

After an extensive review of current peer-reviewed literature on cyberbullying and validate published surveys used for students and parents, I feel that I can make a reflective and proactive decision on research design and approach to answering the specified research questions. Being a rural school district, with a significant economically disadvantaged population, no study of traditional or cyberbullying has occurred. Any and all evidence and data collected in this study will aid in the creation of a project to have a positive impact on reduction of cyberbullying in the school district.

Implications

The findings of this descriptive survey study will help develop (a) revised school board policies (which would include informative sessions for both staff and parents), (b) bullying intervention programs, and (c) parent education workshops to better inform them of advances in technology, and (d) staff and parent workshops that would allow collaboration on ways to prevent cyberbullying.

Summary

Issues of occurrences of bullying, including cyberbullying, in middle schools are not uncommon. While cyberbullying is assumed to be an extension of traditional bullying, schools sometimes view cyberbullying as nothing to do with school responsibilities since it generally occurs on personal cell phones and on home computers (Goddard, 2008). Whereas traditional bullying behaviors typically occur face-to-face, cyberbullying does not and is sometimes perpetrated anonymously, presenting a challenge for schools and parents trying to intervene (Wong-Lo & Bullock, 2011). Hinduja and Patchin (2009) added that there have been difficulties in convincing the general public of the precedence, severity, and significance of the cyberbullying problem. Positive social change can occur when intervention programs are implemented to address traditional and electronic bullying, to educate students, parents, and schools. After a review of literature to aid in its design, a descriptive survey study will assist in identifying the frequency of reported incidences of cyberbullying, including methods used. Additionally, an awareness of these students' parents' awareness of cyberbullying will be disclosed and parents' suggestions for targeting cyberbullying behaviors.

Section 2 explains the research methodology used to obtain the quantitative data that guided the development of the project. Section 3 explains the proposed project, including its rationale and goals. Section 4 reflects on the project's strengths and limitations, as well as on future research. The project itself is given in Appendix A; it

consists of the survey instruments and the details of the cyberbullying prevention workshop.

Section 2: The Methodology

Research Design and Approach

This quantitative survey study used a descriptive design to determine the degree of cyberbullying in the target middle schools, the method most used for cyberbullying, and parental rates of social media supervision (Creswell, 2009; Fink, 2009). The survey design allowed for a quantitative collection of trends and viewpoints in regards to a particular topic (Creswell, 2009). Fink (2009) also noted that surveys are also used to collect information on behavior, in this case, cyberbullying. Intentions of the study were to determine the degree of cyberbullying taking place in the middle schools being surveyed, method most used for cyberbullying, and parental rates of social media supervision.

Data were collected at a single point in time—a cross-sectional design—which provided a snapshot of the group and described current trends and/or behavior, which allowed for easier implementation of the surveys (Fink, 2009). Two surveys, as described in the Instrumentation section, were administered to both students and parents.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This exploratory descriptive study was guided by the following research questions and hypotheses:

1. Are the rates of occurrence of methods used for cyberbullying at the local level measured by the local student survey similar to the rates of cyberbullying at the

national level to those obtained from a national study of student cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010)?

H_0: There is no difference between the rates of occurrence of the cyberbullying methods used at the local level measured by the local student survey compared to those obtained from a national study of student cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010).

H_1: There is a difference between the rates of occurrence of the cyberbullying methods used at the local level measured by the local student survey compared to those obtained from a national study of student cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010).

2. What types of Internet access do parents report that their students have access to?
3. Are parents aware of their student's experiences with cyberbullying over social media?
4. Have parents intervened in their students' cyberbullying experiences?
5. Whose responsibility do parents feel should resolve cyberbullying issues?

Setting and Sample

The rural school district in which the study took place consisted of nine schools. The school district had approximately 3,600 students with a disadvantaged population of 51.4%, which was derived from students receiving free or reduced lunch. Middle School A had approximately 450 students with a disadvantaged population of approximately 54%. Other demographics for the school included a student population of 94% White, 4%

Hispanic, less than 1% Black, less than 1% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1% two or more races. Ten percent of the student body received special education services and less than one% of the student body received English as a second language (ESL) services. Middle School A, while in Title I school improvement, had received accreditation by the state and met all federal annual measurable objectives (AMOs; J.P., personal communication, November 15, 2013).

Middle School B had approximately 375 students, with a disadvantaged population of 50%. Demographics for the school included 91% White, 1% Hispanic, 3% Black, less than 1% Asian/Pacific Islander, less than 1% American Indian/Alaskan Native, and 4% two or more races. Approximately 2% of the student body received ESL services and nine% received special education services. This school was also home to regional autism and multiple disabilities classrooms. The school was also fully accredited by the state and met all federal AMOs (J.P., personal communication, November 15, 2013.)

Sampling Procedure

The principals of the two middle schools in a rural school district in Virginia were approached about each respective school participating in the study. Students identified to be in the study were selected using a random sampling technique. This involved the following procedures: Student names were exported from the schools' database and assigned a number from 001 to the maximum number of students, such as 825. Next, using a random number generator by StatTrek (2014), a table of random numbers was

generated. Prior to exporting students, any students with language barriers were excluded per IRB requirements. Using this sampling method, each student had an equal opportunity for selection for the study (Fink, 2009; Triola, 2012). A simple random sampling was used; a stratified random sample was not required as population of students is proportionate in gender and economic status and all students had an equal opportunity to be selected (Fink, 2009). Using an online survey sample calculator, with an approximate student population of 825 between the two middle schools, at a confidence level of 95% within a range of ±5 points on the total score, the sample size needed was 262 students (Creative Research Systems, 2012). For the parent survey, the same sampling methods were used to get data from the parents of middle school students surveyed in the study as described later in the Data Collection and Analysis section.

Instrumentation

Two surveys were used for this descriptive exploratory study. Both surveys were designed by other researchers and permission was granted to use and/or adapt the surveys. Measures for selection of surveys and reliability and validity of the chosen surveys were explained in the following subsections.

Student Survey

The student survey selected for this study was created by Patchin and Hinduja in 2010 (see Appendix B). Patchin is Co-Director of the Cyberbullying Research Center, an online resource center for schools, parents, law enforcement and youth (Cyberbullying Research Center [CRC], 2013). A renowned researcher, Patchin is an Associate Professor

of Criminal Justice at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire and has been publishing books and journal articles focusing on cyberbullying and social networking among teens (CRC, 2013). Hinduja, also a Co-Director of the Cyberbullying Research Center, is an Associate Professor in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Florida Atlantic University (CRC, 2013). As a member of the Research Advisory Board for Harvard University's Internet Safety Task Force, Hinduja works nationally and internationally with branches of education, business, law enforcement, parents, and youth to reduce cyberbullying and online offenses (CRC, 2013).

To enhance credibility of these researchers, through their research Hinduja and Patchin have collected data from over 12,000 middle and secondary students regarding their experiences with social networking and cyberbullying (CRC, 2013). Through a personal email contact with Patchin, Patchin provided the student survey and permission to be used in this study (electronic communication, Patchin, October 21, 2013). This survey was the least invasive into actual experiences with cyberbullying situations and sought to estimate the level of cyberbullying experiences by students in a school. Other student surveys that were examined in the literature review asked for detailed information about specific cyberbullying experiences, which was unacceptable to the Walden Institutional Review Board due to possible psychological and emotional distress to students.

The student survey by Hinduja and Patchin (2010) measured cyberbullying victimization and cyberbullying offending behaviors. The survey was utilized in four

different studies between 2007 and 2010, and involved over 12,000 adolescents ages 11-18, in over 90 schools. The survey consisted of 12 closed-ended questions.

Reliability and validity. Hinduja and Patchin (2010) conducted various tests of validity and reliability and concluded that the survey was valid and reliable. The student survey by Hinduja and Patchin (2010) was selected due to its established reliability and construct validity. As noted in Appendix C, internal reliability of victimization was established with a Cronbach's alpha range of 0.926-0.935 and cyberbullying offending scale using Cronbach's range of 0.956-0.969. A factor analysis of cyberbullying uncovered a factor called victimization with an eigenvalue range of 6.07-6.40 (67.53-71.52% of variance), and a factor called offending with an eigenvalue range of 7.21-7.34 (80.11-81.57% of variance). All inter-item correlations had an average of 0.30 or better, that resulted in an exemplary rating (Robinson, Shaver, & Wrightsman, 1991).

Parent Survey

To assess parents, a survey created by the American Osteopathic Association was revised. The survey, administered in 2011, was conducted to collect quantitative data from parents of students aged 13 to 17 on the youth's use of social media, the parents' monitoring of social media, and cyberbullying (AOA, 2011). Grady, Media Relations Manager of the AOA, granted permission for its use and revision of the survey to meet the needs of this doctoral study (N. Grady, electronic communication, November 6, 2013).

The AOA parent survey consisted of 43 questions regarding social media use among teens, parental oversight of social media, and cyberbullying (AOA, 2011). The survey consisted of many questions unrelated to the guiding research questions of this study. The survey was revised and only included 12 of the original 43 questions to answer the research questions (see Appendix D). Questions were included in this parent as written in the original AOA survey with the exception of changing ages in the questions: The survey specified "13-17," which was changed to "11-15" to fit the age bracket of the middle school students in this doctoral study.

Reliability and validity. The American Osteopathic Association (AOA) survey was a pre-existing survey. According to Grady (electronic communication, January 13, 2014) a validity and reliability study on the AOA survey was conducted by an outside agency and concluded that most questions on the survey were moderately to very high in reliability and validity.

Since the original AOA parent survey was revised from its original format, it was important to pretest the survey to establish the content validity of the 12 close-ended questions selected for the survey to improve the format and questions on the survey (Creswell, 2009). Before using the revised parent survey, they were pretested with a panel of 10-12 colleagues, including school administrators, counselors, lead teachers, and a school psychologist. Those on the pretest panel evaluated the surveys for format, wording, and content, and did not take the survey.

Data Collection and Analysis

The researcher met with the principals of the two studied middle schools, superintendent of the school district, and the district's school board in which the study took place for permission to implement the study via a letter of cooperation (see Appendix E). A confidentiality agreement (Appendix F) was completed by information technology (IT) personnel whom extracted the sample of students.

Parent and Student Survey Data Collection

The researcher received a list of students from the IT personnel to provide with parental consent to participate letters. To minimize the potential of perceived coercion to participate by the researcher, information for survey participation for parents was mailed to the parent entitled "Parent/Student Cyberbullying Survey Study Consent Form."

The mailing contained information regarding the study and consent information. There was a survey link provided on the consent form to direct parents to a web-based parent survey via surveymonkey.com. Parents that decided to participate accessed the website. The purpose and intent of the parent survey was provided on the consent page. Both the parent and student survey included an opening and closing statement on the survey stating that the data collection was for research and that survey responses would remain anonymous. Initial compilation of parent survey data was completed by the online survey website, with further analysis conducted by the researcher.

Parents that consented to their child's participation provided the information provided in the letter and link to the student survey via an online survey website,

surveymonkey.com. There was a reminder at the beginning of survey of the purpose of the survey and that all responses are anonymous. Names were not assigned to the surveys to protect confidentially of participants. Students could close out of the survey at any time if they revoked their assent to participate.

Parent survey and student surveys were taken at home if consent/assent was given. Information for obtaining Internet access was provided to participants if they had not Internet access. Paper consent/assent forms were not returned to either school. Neither parent or student surveys asked for specific incidences or names, and remained anonymous with no open-ended questions or comment sections. As was the case for the parent survey, initial compilation of survey data was completed by the online survey website, with further analysis conducted by the researcher.

Assumptions, Limitations and Delimitations

When designing research, it was important to resolve from being naïve throughout the planning, instrumentation, and analysis of the research. It was imperative to be aware and reflective of the assumptions, limitations, and delimitations of a study. The following subsections provided my considerations when designing and implementing the descriptive study.

Assumptions

First and foremost, I assumed that the selected sample was representative of the student and parent population in which wanted to make inferences. Another assumption was that all students and parents would answer truthfully and not embellish the data with

false reports of cyberbullying. Patton (2011) advised that a disadvantage of surveys is that participants sometimes are swayed by social desirability, even if not accurate responses. With that, I also assumed that when parents completed the consent form for their child, they would also agree to participate in the survey via the online parent survey. Anonymity and confidentiality were preserved throughout the study and participants could withdraw at any time from this study. Finally, I assumed that cyberbullying would continue exist to some degree even after the study was completed and interventions were put into place.

Limitations

Limitations, or potential weaknesses in the study, are found in all research and out of the researcher's control (Lodico et al., 2010). The sampling method used in this study provided limitations on generalizing data to gender and/or economic class. Both Middle School A and B had a homogenous percentage of races in the student population. The research method in itself, being a one-shot survey, was a limitation, as the data collected was dependent on the conditions of that one specific point in time. Finally, while online surveys generated data more quickly and was more convenient for most participants, participants may not have had access to an Internet source (Patton, 2011). To keep this limitation from possibly impeding parental participation, those randomly selected parents were offered access to the Internet on school grounds if needed.

Delimitations

Unlike limitations, the delimitations of this study limited the scope and defined the boundaries of this study, which were in my control. The purpose of this study was to measure the extent of cyberbullying in the studied middle schools, the methods used for cyberbullying, and determined parental awareness of cyberbullying. The problem of cyberbullying was targeted as there was existence of a local problem in this area and a growing interest by local and state governments to target this quandary. In addition, while the study set out to find the scope and severity of cyberbullying behaviors in the middle schools of this school district, this study did not insure extinguishment of the cyberbullying problem. Finally, the results of this study were generalizable to students' ages 11-15 enrolled in a middle school in a rural school district in an eastern state in the United States.

Ethical Considerations

The ethical considerations of this study took into account informed consent and participant confidentiality. Creswell (2009) stated that in order to gain the support of the participants, those participants must be provided with the purpose of the study, be informed of the nature of the research, and what the collected data will be used for. Details of this described informed consent were provided to participants in the parental consent form for students, student assent form, and the adult consent form (see Appendices F, G, and H). With a sensitive issue, such as cyberbullying, I ensured that participants were protected from harm as much as possible. After consultation with

Walden's IRB requirements, in the event that a student felt uncomfortable with the survey, the student could exit the survey and be referred to the school counselor or school psychologist for guidance and/or therapy. I did not have direct contact with any of the participants in the study, respected for participants' autonomy and right to volunteer was acknowledged, and no data was collected that was specific to individuals (Creswell, 2009).

Analysis and Results of Survey Data

The following sections contain analysis and discussion of the data collected in both the student and parent surveys. The student survey data were used to address one research question while testing a null and alternative hypothesis using a goodness-of-fit test. The parent survey data were used to answer four research questions using exploratory, narrative explanations and tables of results.

Descriptive statistics were used for the data collected in both the student and parent surveys. A cross-sectional design was implemented, signifying that the survey data would only be obtained from the students and parents at one point in time (Creswell, 2009; Fink, 2009; Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtle, 2010). The parent/student survey invitations were mailed to 262 families. Parents that gave consent for their middle-school aged children to participate forwarded the student survey link and information to their children. The response rate for the parent survey was 57.04% and 75.0% for the students' survey (see Table 1).

Table 1

Survey Response Rate

	Invited	Participated	%
Parents	284	162	57.04
Students	284	213	75.0

Note. Student participation was dependent upon parent consent. A parent may have had multiple middle-school aged children in their household or was not informed enough to participate.

The sample size of the parent survey was 163 participants. Most participants, 53.7%, reported having only one middle school child between the ages of 11-15. Forty-four percentage of parents reported having two or three children between the ages of 11-15, with only 4.9% reporting having four or more children ages 11-15. Table 2 below reports the breakdown of ages of middle-school children on the participants reporting in the parent survey.

Table 2

Number of Children Between the Ages of 11-15 Years Old

	Frequency	%
One	87	53.7
Two or three	67	41.4
Four or more	8	4.9
Total	162	100.0

Data from both surveys were extracted from the online survey engine and entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS®), version 21, for descriptive statistics. Lodico et al., (2010) specified that non-experimental research, such as this descriptive exploratory study, does not require manipulation of variables due to no

interventions being put into place. However, hypothesis testing was conducted to examine a claim, such as existence of cyberbullying, about a population (Triola, 2012). The research questions and tested hypotheses are outlined below with descriptive statistics that was used to analyze the data.

Student survey. The student survey was used to address one research question (Are the rates of occurrence of methods used for cyberbullying at the local level measured by the local student survey similar to the rates of cyberbullying at the national level to those obtained from a national study of student cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010) and test hypotheses. Survey Questions 4, 5, 8, and 9 were used to test the null and alternate hypothesis. Results from this local survey's data collection were compared to that of a national survey. The sample size of this study's survey was 213 participants.

Research Question 1. Are the rates of occurrence of methods used for cyberbullying at the local level measured by the local student survey similar to the rates of cyberbullying at the national level measured by the same (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010)? The null hypothesis states that "There is no difference between the rates of occurrence of the cyberbullying methods used at the local level measured by the local student survey compared to those obtained from a national study of student cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010)." The alternative hypothesis is there is a difference between these rates.

For RQ1, a Pearson chi-square test (χ^2) was used to test these hypotheses as it is one of the most commonly used forms of nonparametric tests that involve nominal, or

categorical, data (Lodico et al., 2010). Chi-square tests are "used to test whether the observed frequencies from the data show a true difference from the frequencies expected if all categories are equal" (Lodico et al., 2010, p.257).

Using a contingency table, or two-way frequency table, a goodness-of-fit test was conducted to test the null hypothesis (Triola, 2012). The degrees of freedom, anticipated frequency counts, test statistics, and the *p*-value associated with the test statistic were determined. If the *p*-value was less than the significance level of 0.05, the null hypothesis was rejected (Triola, 2012). If the *p*-value was greater than or equal to the significance level of 0.05, then I could not reject the null hypothesis (Triola, 2012). Data analysis results and survey comparisons are presented in narrative form and as tables and figures.

The first item to assist in answering RQ1 was student survey question #4, which asked if the student had been cyberbullied in the last 30 days. Student responses that had experienced cyberbullying in the last 30 days were: 7.5% had been cyberbullied once, 6.6% stated they had been cyberbullied multiple times, while 85.9% of students reported never being cyberbullied. The combined percentage of students that had been cyberbullied once or multiple times was in the local survey was 14.1%, which was greater than the national survey percentage of 7.5%. For this survey item the chi square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 12.44$ $p < .05$. Chi square results exceeded statistical significance, rejecting the null hypothesis, which predicted no change, for this survey item that the local students reported more cyberbullying than the national group.

Student survey item #5 consisted on 9 sub-questions describing the methods used for cyberbullying against the student. The first method was "someone posted mean or hurtful comments about me online." Students experiencing this method of cyberbullying were 7.0%, compared to 14.3% at the national level. Chi square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 8.68$ $p < .05$. Chi square results again exceeded statistical significance, rejecting the null hypothesis for this survey item. For this item, the local students' percentages were less likely to be cyberbullied than the national percentages using this strategy.

The second method of cyberbullying was "Someone posted a mean or hurtful picture online of me." Students experiencing this method of cyberbullying at the local level were 3.7%, compared to 5.0% at the national level. Chi square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 0.51$ n.s. Chi square results failed to reject the null hypothesis for this survey item, which indicates that the sample percentage did not statistically differ from the national percentage.

The third method of cyberbullying on student survey question #5 was "someone posted a mean or hurtful video online of me." Students experiencing this method of cyberbullying at the local level were 0.5%, compared to 2.9% at the national level. Chi square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 6.98$ $p < .05$. Chi square results again exceeded statistical significance, rejecting the null hypothesis for this survey item. For this item, the local students' percentages determined that the students were less likely to experience this type of cyberbullying than the national percentage.

The fourth method used to cyberbully was “someone created a mean or hurtful web page about me.” Students experiencing this method of cyberbullying were 2.8%, with no data reported at the national level. A chi square analysis could not be conducted for this method. There were no data to determine whether local students were more or less likely to be cyberbullied using this strategy compared to the than the national percentages.

The fifth method of cyberbullying was “someone spread rumors about me online.” Students experiencing this method of cyberbullying at the local level were 7.0%, compared to 13.3% at the national level. Chi square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 6.80$ $p < .05$. Chi square results exceeded statistical significance, rejecting the null hypothesis for this survey item. Interpretation of the data revealed that the local students’ percentages were less likely to cyberbully than the national percentages using this strategy.

The next method of cyberbullying was “someone threatened to hurt me through a cell phone text message.” At the local level, students experiencing this method of cyberbullying were 5.2%, compared to 8.4% at the national level. Chi square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 2.43$ n.s.. Chi square results failed to reject the null hypothesis for this survey item, indicating that the sample percentage did not statistically differ from the national percentage. The seventh method of cyberbullying on student survey question #5 was “someone threatened to hurt me online.” Students experiencing this method of cyberbullying at the local level were 3.7%, compared to 7.2% at the national level. Chi

square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 3.40$ n.s.. The null hypothesis was not rejected based on the chi square results. Interpretation of data revealed that the local students' percentage did not differ significantly from the national percentage.

The final method of cyberbullying for survey question #5 was "someone pretended to be me online and acted in a way that was mean or hurtful." At the local level, students experiencing this method of cyberbullying were 3.2%, compared to 6.7% at the national level. Chi square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 3.63$ n.s.. Chi square results failed to reject the null hypothesis for this survey item and the local students' percentages did not statistically differ from the national percentages.

Survey question #8 asked if the student had cyberbullied other students in the last 30 days. Student responses that they had cyberbullied other students in the last 30 days were: 6.6% had cyberbullied others once, 3.3% stated they had cyberbullied others multiple times, while 90.1% of students reported never cyberbullied others. The combined percentage of students that had cyberbullied others once or multiple times in the local survey was 9.9%, while the national survey percentage was 8.6%. For this survey item the chi square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 0.31$ n.s.. Chi square results failed to reject the null hypothesis for this survey item. For this item, the local students' percentages did not significantly differ from the national percentages.

The final student survey question to assist in answering RQ1 was item #9, which consisted of nine sub-questions describing the methods used for cyberbullying against other students. The first method was "I posted mean or hurtful comments about someone

online." Students implementing this method of cyberbullying were 2.9%, compared to 8.8% at the national level. Chi square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 8.52$ $p < .05$. Chi square results exceeded statistical significance, rejecting the null hypothesis for this survey item. For this item, the local students' percentages were less likely to cyberbully using this strategy than the national percentages.

The second method of cyberbullying was "I posted a mean or hurtful picture online of someone." Students using this method to cyberbully others at the local level were 1.4%, compared to 3.43% at the national level. Chi square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 2.74$ n.s.. Chi square results failed to reject the null hypothesis for this survey item, determining that local students' percentages were less likely to using this strategy when cyberbullying than the national percentages.

The third method of cyberbullying on student survey question #5 was "I posted a mean or hurtful video online of someone" Students using this method to cyberbully others at the local level were 0.9%, compared to 3.1% at the national level. Chi square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 2.74$ n.s.. Chi square results failed to reject the null hypothesis for this survey item. For this item, the local students' percentages did not statistically differ from national percentages using this strategy.

The fourth method used to cyberbully others was "I created a mean or hurtful web page about someone." This method of cyberbullying used by students at the local level was 0.5%, compared to 2.9% at the national level. Chi square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 3.55$ n.s.. Chi square results did not exceed statistical significance, failing to reject

the null hypothesis for this survey item. The local students' percentages did not statistically differ from the national percentages.

The fifth method of cyberbullying was "I spread rumors about someone online." Students using this strategy to cyberbully others at the local level was 0.5%, compared to 6.8% at the national level. Chi square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 12.36$ $p < .05$. Chi square results exceeded statistical significance, rejecting the null hypothesis for this survey item. Compared to the national percentages, the local students' percentages were less likely to cyberbully using this strategy.

The next method of cyberbullying was "I threatened to hurt someone through a cell phone text message." At the local level, students implementing this method of cyberbullying were 1.0%, compared to 5.4% at the national level. Chi square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 10.70$ $p < .05$. Chi square results exceeded statistical significance, rejecting the null hypothesis for this survey item. For this item, the local students' percentages were less likely to cyberbully using this strategy than the national percentages.

The seventh method of cyberbullying on student survey question #5 was "I threatened to hurt someone online." Students using this method of cyberbullying at the local level were 1.0%, compared to 5.2% at the national level. Chi square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 10.23$ $p < .05$. The null hypothesis was rejected based on the chi square results. Chi square results exceeded statistical significance, again rejecting the null

hypothesis for this survey item. Furthermore, the local students' percentages were less likely to cyberbully using this strategy than the national percentages.

The final method of cyberbullying for survey question #5 was "I pretended to be someone else online and acted in a way that was mean or hurtful to them." At the local level, students employing this method of cyberbullying were 0.5%, compared to 4.6% at the national level. Chi square results were $\chi^2(df = 1; n = 213) = 7.25$ $p < .05$. Chi square results exceeded statistical significance, rejecting the null hypothesis for this survey item. For this item, the local students' percentages were less likely to cyberbully using this strategy than the national percentages.

In summary, while addressing RQ1, nine of 18 (or 17 that had comparative national data) survey items had exceeded statistically significant outcomes (see Table 3). Four of nine survey items in the first set of questions were statistically significant. Students in the local sample were more likely to be cyberbullied (30.03%) compared to the national sample (15.98%). However, no significant differences between local and national occurrence percentages were obtained for the following methods: posting mean or hurtful comments, posting mean or hurtful videos, spreading rumors, making threats to harm via a text message, making threats to harm online, pretending to be someone else online in a way that was mean or hurtful. No data were available for the national average for one survey item, a mean or hurtful webpage was created about them, yet the local sample reported an average of 4.86%.

In the second set of questions in the student survey, six of nine survey items were statistically significant. Five of nine survey items in the first set of questions were statistically significant. Students in the local sample were more likely to cyberbully others (21.09%) compared to the national sample (18.32%). However, there was a chance occurrence that the local sample students were less likely to cyberbully using the following methods: posting mean or hurtful comments, posting mean or hurtful videos, creation of a mean or hurtful webpage, spreading rumors, making threats to harm via a text message, making threats to harm online, pretending to be someone else online in a way that was mean or hurtful.

As a result of the local student survey data collected regarding RQ1, the null hypothesis was rejected with the acceptance of the alternate hypothesis of "There is a difference between the rates of occurrence of the cyberbullying methods used at the local level measured by the local student survey compared to those obtained from a national study of student cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010)."

Table 3

Chi-Square Results of Student Survey Items: Local vs. National (df = 1)

Survey Item	Local Survey % Yes	National Survey % Yes	Difference Local - National	Chi-Square	Effect Size =*Phi (Φ)* for 2x2 tables
In the last 30 days, I have been cyberbullied:	30.03	15.98	+14.05	12.44*	0.24
Someone posted mean or hurtful comments about me online:	14.91	30.46	-15.55	8.68*	0.20
Someone posted a mean or hurtful picture online of me:	7.88	10.65	-2.77	0.51	0.05
Someone posted a mean or hurtful video online of me:	2.98	12.57	-9.59	6.98*	0.18
Someone created a mean or hurtful web page about me:	4.86%	No data	---	No data	---
Someone spread rumors about me online	14.91	28.33	-13.42	6.80*	0.18
Someone threatened to hurt me through a cell phone text message:	11.08	17.89	-6.81	2.43	0.11
Someone threatened to hurt me online:	7.88	15.34	-7.46	3.40	0.13
Someone pretended to be me online and acted in a way that was mean or hurtful:	6.82	14.27	-7.45	3.67	0.13

(table continues)

Survey Item	Local Survey % Yes	National Survey % Yes	Difference Local - National	Chi-Square	Effect Size =*Phi (Φ)* for 2x2 tables
In the last 30 days, I have cyberbullied others:	21.09	18.32	+2.77	0.31	0.04
I posted mean or hurtful comments about someone online:	6.18	18.74	-12.56	8.52*	0.20
I posted a mean or hurtful picture online of someone:	2.98	8.31	-5.33	2.74	0.11
I posted a mean or hurtful video online of someone:	1.92	6.60	-4.68	2.74	0.11
I created a mean or hurtful web page about someone:	1.07	6.18	-5.11	3.55	0.13
I spread rumors about someone online:	1.07	14.48	-13.41	12.36*	0.24
I threatened to hurt someone through a cell phone text message:	0.21	11.50	-11.29	10.70*	0.22
I threatened to hurt someone online:	0.21	11.08	-10.87	10.23*	0.22
I pretended to be someone else online and acted in a way that was mean or hurtful to them:	1.07	9.80	-8.73	7.25*	0.18

Note: *df* = 1, * $p < .05$; Effect Size (small = .10, medium = .30, large = .50); The Yate's continuity correction subtracts .5 from the absolute value of the differences before squaring them. This is said to correct for making Type I errors, i.e., rejecting the null H when it is true (Field, 2005). However, Howell (2002) argued that this over-corrects and results in smaller chi squares. Nevertheless, the Yate's was applied in the spirit of reducing Type I error.

Parent survey. The parent survey was used to answer four research questions, RQ2, RQ3, RQ4, and RQ5. Data analysis results and survey comparisons are presented using exploratory, narrative explanations and as tables and figures as created by SPSS® software. Tables assist review of data by showing relationships and changes, with asterisks indicating significant differences (Fink, 2009). Creswell (2009) added that a narrative interpretation of the results allows the researcher to explain the data and draw conclusions.

***Research Question 2*.** What types of Internet access do parents report that their students have access to?

RQ2 was answered using parent Survey Questions 2 and 3. Parent survey question #2 was "Do any of your children currently have a social media account (i.e. Facebook, Twitter, Myspace, etc.)?" Seventy-two of 162 parents or 44.4% of parents reported that "Yes" their children have social media accounts, 30.2% of parents reported "No," and 25.3% of parents reported that they were "Not Sure" if any of their children currently had a social media account (see Table 4).

Table 4

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	72	44.4
No	49	30.2
Not Sure	41	25.3
Total	162	100.0

Parent survey item #3 included "Where do your children (ages 11 to 15) access their social media account?" Parents could select multiple modes of Internet access (see

Table 5). Most parents reported that their children have Internet access via smartphone or cell phone, with 39.5%. Home computers were cited as 31.1% of Internet access points; and following by other Internet access (i.e. Internet over TV or gaming device) with 17.3% usage. Only 4.3% of parents reported that their students access social media via school computers.

Table 5

Parents Report of Children's Method Used for Social Media Access

Access		Frequency	Percent
Home computer	Yes	52	32.1
	No	110	67.9
Smartphone or cell	Yes	64	39.5
	No	98	60.5
School computer	Yes	7	4.3
	No	155	95.7
Other	Yes	28	17.3
	No	134	82.7

Research Question 3. Are parents aware of their student's experiences with cyberbullying over social media?

RQ3 was answered using Parent Survey Question 6, "Have any of your children (ages 11-15) ever been teased, harassed or bullied by others over social media?" As seen in Figure 1, only 24.7% of parents reported any knowledge of their children being

cyberbullied over social media, with 75.3% of parents saying that their children had not experienced cyberbullying over social media.

A cross-tabulation was performed measuring parents' concern that their children could be cyberbullied over social media compared to percentages of parents' reported knowledge of experiences with cyberbullying (see Table 6). Of 162 parent respondents, 75.6% of parents were concerned that their children could be cyberbullied over social media. This was almost the opposite of the reported knowledge of cyberbullying, with 24.7% of parents reported having any knowledge of their children being cyberbullied over social media, compared to 75.3% with no knowledge.

Results reported in the Table 6 compare what parents say they are aware of happening to their children compared to how concerned they are that these things are happening. There is an assumption that if parents are aware of things happening, then these parents would be concerned for their children. Thus, there would be a relationship between the responses from the two items, i.e., if they report yes on one item you would expect yes on the other, similarly for no/no. A chi-square tests for a similar pattern of yes/no on awareness with yes/no on concerned. A test for independence reflected the chi-square (corrected for continuity, i.e. the same Yate's correction factor as before) to be: $\chi^2 = 8.759$, $df = 1$, $p < 003$. Chi-square determines that there is a relationship between responding to awareness and to concern. When parents responded there was a similar pattern between the yes/yes percentage and the no/no percentage: if they are aware, they are concerned; if they are not aware, they are not concerned.

Table 6

Parents' Concern of Potential Cyberbullying Compared to Parent's Reports of Experiences with Cyberbullying

			Have any of your children (ages 11-15) ever been teased, harassed or bullied by others over social media?		
			Yes	No	Total
Are you concerned that any of your children (ages 11-15) could be teased, harassed or bullied through a social media site?	Yes	Count	38	86	124
		% of Total	23.5	53.1	76.5
	No	Count	2	36	38
		% of Total	1.2	22.2	23.5
Total		Count	40	122	162
		% of Total	24.7	75.3	100.0

Research Question 4. Have parents intervened in their students' cyberbullying experiences?

RQ4 was answered using parent survey question #8, "Have you ever had to take steps to resolve a bullying situation over social media involving any of your children (ages 11-15)?" Thirty-four of 162, or 21%, of parents stated that they have taken steps to resolve cyberbullying that involved their middle school children.

Research Question 5. Whose responsibility do parents feel should resolve cyberbullying issues?

RQ5 was answered using parent survey questions #9 and #10 (see Table 7). Parent Survey Question 9 was "Do you feel it is the responsibility of parents/guardians to

resolve bullying situations that occur over social media?" A percentage of 86.4 of parents agreed that it is the responsibility of parents to resolve cyberbullying situations that occur over social media sites. Only 13.6% of participants in the parent survey felt that it was not their responsibility to resolve cyberbullying situations involving their children that had occurred over social media. On the same note, an additional parent survey question asked, "Have you ever discussed cyberbullying with any of your children ages 11-15?" Interestingly, only 50.6% of parents had discussed cyberbullying with their child.

Parent Survey Item 10 included "Do you feel it is the responsibility of teachers or school officials to resolve bullying situations that occur over social media?" There was a split between parents that felt that it was the teachers' or school officials' responsibility is it to resolve bullying situations that occur over social media. Seventy-four of 162 parents, or 45.7%, considered it the teachers' or school officials' responsibility to resolve bullying situations that occur over social media, with 54.7% of parents deeming it not the responsibility of teachers or school officials.

Table 7 results compare whether parents believe that parents or teachers/school officials are responsible for intervening in bullying situations over social media. There is an assumption that if parents are intervening in bullying situations, then teachers/school officials are not intervening. A chi-square tests for a similar pattern of yes/no on parents with no/yes on teachers/school officials. A test for independence reflected the chi-square (corrected for continuity, i.e. the same Yate's correction factor as before) to be: χ^2 =

1.378, $df = 1$, $p < 003$. Chi-square determines that there is a relationship between parents and teachers/school officials.

Table 7

Parents' Perception of Responsibility to Intervene

		Frequency	%
Parents	Yes	140	86.4
	No	22	13.6
Teachers or School Officials	Yes	74	45.7
	No	88	54.3

In conclusion, the data collected from RQ2–RQ5, assisted in drawing conclusions about the parental opinion regarding social media use, cyberbullying experiences, and responsibility for resolution of cyberbullying over social media. One hundred and sixty-two parents (44%) reported in an online survey reported that their children have social media accounts. The most used methods for accessing social media was via Smartphone or cell phone (39.5%) and home computers (32.1%). Only 24.7% of parents confirmed that their middle school children ages 11-15 had experienced cyberbullying over social media, with merely 21% of parents, of those reporting cyberbullying experiences, taking steps to resolve the cyberbullying. When comparing parent concern and parent awareness, there was a relationship with yes/yes and no/no percentages. Furthermore, as far as the responsible party for resolving cyberbullying situations that occur over social media, 86.4% of parent survey participants felt that it was the parents' responsibility and

45.7% of parents also considered that teachers and school officials should resolve the situations.

Overview. When addressing RQ1, a chi square goodness-of-fit test was conducted to test the null hypothesis. The degrees of freedom, anticipated frequency counts, test statistics, and the *p*-value associated with the test statistic were determined. Compared to the national survey (8.6%) regarding admittance of cyberbullying others in the past 30 days, slightly more local survey participants (9.9%) did so; likewise, more local survey students (14.1%) reporting experiencing cyberbullying in the past 30 days compared to national survey percentage of 7.5%. Interestingly, more students reported being victims of cyberbullying as compared to perpetrators. Overall findings of 12 of 18 survey items were statistically significant, resulting in acceptance of the alternate hypothesis of "There is a difference between the rates of occurrence of the cyberbullying methods used at the local level measured by the local student survey compared to those obtained from a national study of student cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010)."

The last four research questions addressed by the parent survey were answered using exploratory, narrative explanations of the survey results, with no hypotheses suggested. Results indicated the following:

1. While almost half of parents (44.4%) acknowledged that their children do have social media accounts, 30.2% reported no and 25.3% reported that they were unsure if their children have social media accounts. Results suggest that over half of parents believe that that their middle-school aged children are

unsure of us or do not use social media. No data was collected from students concerning their social media accounts.

2. According to parents, their children access the Internet most frequently via Smartphone or cell phone (39.5%) and home computers (31.1%). Least used Internet access points included other Internet access (i.e. Internet over TV or gaming device) with 17.3% usage, and only 4.3% of parents reported that their students access social media via school computers. This data indicates that students are accessing the Internet independent of their parents and schools.
3. One-fourth or 24.7% of surveyed parents reported any knowledge of their children being cyberbullied over social media, with 75.3% of parents saying that their children had not experienced cyberbullying over social media. However, 75.6% of parents were concerned that their children could be cyberbullied over social media. Three-fourths of parents show concern for cyberbullying, but no conclusions can be made whether all students are reporting cyberbullying to their parents. A chi-square test for independence determined that there was a relationship between parents being aware and parents being concerned.
4. Twenty-one percent of parents reported that they have intervened in cyberbullying situations involving their children, with 86.4% of parents agreeing that it is the responsibility of parents to resolve cyberbullying

situations that occur over social media sites. Only 50.6% of parents reported that they had discussed cyberbullying with their children.

5. In addition, 45.7% of parents deemed cyberbullying intervention as the teachers' or school officials' responsibility, with 54.7% of parents deeming it not the responsibility of teachers or school officials. No data were collected regarding what parents felt that school officials should do in cases of cyberbullying concerning appropriate consequences and/or intervention.

Findings from the parent survey suggested that while parents are aware of social media use and experiences of cyberbullying taking place, few parents have intervened and feel it is the responsibility of both parents and schools to intervene.

Together with the student survey results, these findings will assist determining needed components of cyberbullying intervention/prevention for the doctoral study project in the next section.

Section 3: The Project

Introduction

Section 3 will encompass the following: description and goals of the project, rationale, a literature review that directed the development of the project, implementation plans, project evaluation, and implications for social change.

Description and Goals

Based on the results of the student and parent surveys used in this survey study, the project is one of school-community collaboration, focusing on professional development for school staff, parent/community workshops, and classroom lessons for student support. Based on the review of literature, schools must take a collaborative, active approach to tackling cyberbullying, involving all stakeholders, set goals and tasks for reaching a desired outcome, which may include evaluation of research-based programs. The objective of the project is to assist teachers, parents, and students in identifying cyberbullying, staying informed of current technology and social media, being proactive, and preventing cyberbullying through designing a program to fit the specific needs of the middle schools in the study.

Rationale

Cyberbullying was reported as occurring in the surveyed middle schools, with 9.9% of surveyed students admitting to cyberbullying others in the prior 30 days and 14.1% of those surveyed reporting that they have experienced cyberbullying in past 30 days. Additionally, surveyed parents expressed concern (75.6%) for their children being

subjected to cyberbullying over social media. While 86.4% of parents agreed that it is the responsibility of parents to resolve cyberbullying situations that occur over social media sites, 45.7% of parents also deemed intervention as the teachers' or school officials' responsibility as well.

With that said, the middle school student population which was surveyed does not currently have any cyberbullying prevention programs in place, with state laws being proposed to require such programs to take place (Anti-Defamation League, 2009). Cross et al. (2009), Pearce, Cross, Monks, Waters, and Falconer (2011) concluded whole-school approaches are most effective in preventing and managing cyberbullying behavior. Additionally, Couvillon and Ilieva (2011) stated that an effective, comprehensive model for addressing cyberbullying must consist of key stakeholders, including teachers, students, and parents. The purpose of this project was to provide an action plan for middle schools to design a cyberbullying prevention program to decrease acts of cyberbullying, provide reporting methods, provide training to school staff, and assist with educating parents and the community about cyberbullying.

Review of the Literature

The frequency of cyberbullying acts are likely to increase due to humanity's increasing dependence on technology in daily life (Horrigan, 2009; Yen, 2009). While the majority of cyberbullying acts occur off school property, school administrators are fearful of treading on this territory in concern of possible reprimand for their school districts (Stewart & Fritsch, 2011).

Theory

The most influential theory on the development of the project is the social-ecological framework theory. This framework theorizes that behavior is influenced by many related systems, consisting of family, friends, and the school setting (Espelage & Lowe, 2012). As suggested by the social learning theory of Bandura (1986), if and when teachers fail to intervene in bullying situations, the frequency of bullying increases. Following the social-ecological model, Swearer, Espelage, Vaillancourt, and Hymel (2010) added that school-wide focus on improving school climate and consistent intervention were key.

Proactive School-Wide Approach to Cyberbullying

Cyberbullying is defined as "willful and repeated harm inflicted through the use of computers, cell phones, and other electronic devices" (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009, p.5). A recent study by Patchin and Hinduja (2012a) discovered that using this afore-mentioned definition, approximately 20% of over 4,400 of 11-18 year olds selected for a 2010 survey reported being victims of cyberbullying at some point in their lives. In this study, the combined percentage of students that had been cyberbullied once or multiple times was in the local survey was 14.1%.

It is essential that any cyberbullying programs should include all stakeholders, including parents and community members, teachers, and students (Couvillon & Ilieva, 2011). Evidence has also concluded that compared to single-level prevention practices, that multi-level whole-school approaches are the most effective in preventing and

managing cyberbullying behavior (Cross et al., 2009; Pearce, Cross, Monks, Waters, & Falconer, 2011). Parents in this survey study also agreed, with 86.4% stating that it is the responsibility of parents to resolve cyberbullying situations that occur over social media sites. Comparatively, the study also uncovered that 45.7% of parents also considered it the teachers' or school officials' responsibility to resolve bullying situations that occur over social media.

In a primary school study by Tangen and Campbell (2010), data revealed that incidences of cyberbullying at the primary grades were equivalent to the same rates at the secondary level. Tangen and Campbell (2009) implied that students need to begin cyberbullying prevention at an earlier age and that students need to be taught explicitly about cyberbullying. When parents of the studied middle school students were asked if they had discussed cyberbullying with their child, only 50.6% of parents had done so.

A focus for the prevention program should include "developing, maintaining, practicing, and promoting appropriate behaviors" (Couvillon & Ilieva, 2011, p. 99). Moreover, with rapid advancement in technology, it is important for prevention programs to not focus on banning or restricting the use of technology, but to focus on teaching and learning the use of technology appropriately (Couvillon & Ilieva, 2011; Thomas & McGee, 2012).

Today's technology with cell phones provides both teachers and students with an electronic device that sustains classroom instruction by allowing for portable learning (Thomas & McGee, 2012). A recent study by Lenhart, Purcell, Smith, and Zicuhr (2010)

revealed that two-thirds of students go online after school via electronics every day, increasing chances for menacing. Most parents in this survey study reported that their children have Internet access via Smartphone or cell phone, with 39.5%. Home computers were cited as 31.1% of Internet access points and following by other Internet access (i.e., Internet over TV or gaming device) with 17.3% usage.

In addition to emphasizing on appropriate use of technology, programs will have to focus on maintaining and/or improving school climate. Besides promoting a positive climate at school, educators must also take time to assess the climate (O'Brennan, Bradshaw, & Furlong, 2014). Measures to assess school climate include: selection of a valid assessment tool, assessment annually, survey across perspectives, communication of the findings, and takin action based on results (O'Brennan et al., 2014).

Thapa, Cohem, Higgins-D'Alessandro, and Guffy (2012) recognize a positive school climate improves both academic and behavioral outcomes for students. Even though most cyberbullying occurs outside of the school setting, a hostile learning environment can be caused by the tension and anxiety associated with cyberbullying (Snakenborg et al., 2011). There are numerous benefits to having a positive school climate, which aids in combatting cyberbullying. Hinduja and Patchin (2011) listed the following ways to promote a positive school climate: establish emotional support, provide training support for technology to staff, hold meaningful student assemblies, implement peer mentoring, establish clear technology-driven rules, create specific cyberbullying polices, share cyberbullying information weekly, develop ways for

students to report cyberbullying anonymously, and encourage students to pledge against cyberbullying.

Steps for Schools to Address Cyberbullying

Rawana, Norwood, and Whitley (2011) concluded that the most successful bullying prevention programs invite a school wide approach to design and implementation, including administration, teachers, parents, and students. In addition, participation by these stakeholders throughout the program is essential as each stakeholder has a special role contributing to its success (Rawana et al., 2011).

Parents, students, and school staff should work collaboratively to establish a climate where bullying of all forms is denounced and formally sanctioned (Hinduja & Patchin, 2012.) Couvillon and Ilieva (2011) and Kiriakidis and Kavoura (2010) concurred that intervention programs for cyberbullying must include specific prevention plans and policies, both within and outside of the classroom. In a 2011 study by Ttofi and Farrington, their meta-analyses of the cyberbullying program and effect size discovered that a reduction of bullying was associated with classroom management and rules which specifically addressed cyberbullying. Sourander et al. (2010) added that their study found that students that were victims of cyberbullying reported that they felt no connection and ignored by their teachers.

Role of school staff. School staff needs to stay informed about new social media outlets and current electronic device functions (Feinberg & Robey, 2009). Cross et al., (2009) conveyed that through the *Australian* Covert Bullying Prevalence Study, it was

found that while most school staff did not tolerate bulling behavior, school staff felt that they needed more training to enhance their skills to deal with any issues that occurred. Feinberg & Robey (2009) added that this new knowledge needs to be communicated with all school staff, parents, and the community. Teachers and school staff should educate and model appropriate digital citizenship practices and social behaviors (Trolley & Hanel, 2009). Consequences for violating these expectations for appropriate conduct should be clearly communicated and carried out (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009).

Elledge et al. (2013) conducted a study of 16,634 students in grades 3-5 and 7-8 of predictors of cyberbullying. Interestingly, the findings of this study concluded that cyberbullying occurred more frequently in classrooms where students perceived their teachers ability to intervene as high (Elledge, 2013). However, Li (2010) conducted a study that found that more than 80% of students would not tell a teacher or other school staff that they were being cyberbullying, because the students said that it would not make a difference. Students added that the reports to school staff did not result in any efforts to stop the cyberbullying (Li, 2010).

Stauffer, Heath, Coyne, and Ferrin (2012) discovered that fewer than half of the studied high school teachers were in favor of implementing a cyberbullying intervention program in their schools. However, teachers warranted that the following strategies were most helpful in deterring cyberbullying: involving parent, student warnings, and increasing consequences for cyberbullying perpetration (Stauffer et al., 2012).

Role of parents. Ttofi and Farrington (2011) discovered that by implementing information-based assemblies to workshops to parents, a decrease occurred in acts of bullying others. Parent training was founded to be a component of cyberbullying associated with decreases in bulling (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). Pearce (2010) determined in a study that when schools increase their efforts to include parents in activities to reduce bullying, bullying incidences were reduced over a three year period. In addition, findings by Schroeder et al. (2012) indicated that the inclusion of parent input in the early stages of planning of prevention and implementation of bullying programs vital to the program's success.

Role of other stakeholders. It's important that schools embrace the entire school community to facilitate in a common vision for any implemented program (Pearce et al., 2011). Schools need to create new partnerships beyond the school and home, and include IT professional and law enforcement o assist with cyberbullying prevention methods (Pearce, et al., 2011, Schroeder et al., 2012).

Law enforcement also has a crucial role in preventing and responding to cyberbullying in schools. A study by Patchin and Hinduja (2012b) found that one-third of school resource officers were unsure if their state had a law against cyberbullying, resulting in a need to equip them with knowledge of state and local laws around cyberbullying.

Existing Comprehensive Prevention/Intervention Programs

School districts need to review bullying policies to consider whether school can discipline for the behaviors (Willard, 2010; Hinduja & Patchin, 2011). Willard (2010) added that if a cyberbullying incident occurs off school grounds, the school is still within the rights to discipline if the incident causes a significant disruption to the school. According to the Anti-Defamation League (2009), Congress passed the Protecting Children in the 21st Century legislation, along with 44 states adopting laws that protect from cyberbullying.

Cyberbullying prevention should not be a one-time event but implemented and sustained with school wide recognition. According to Couvillon and Ilieva (2009), successful programs begin in the design of the cyberbullying program. A diverse group should consist of school staff, parents, and students, with each component contributing (Couvillon & Ilieva, 2009). Schools considering development of a bullying prevention program should organize a committee consisting of school administration, school counselor or psychologist, teachers, parents, and students (Lazarus & Pfohl, 2010).

In 2011, the U.S. Department of Education reported that only 8% of anti-bullying programs implemented in U.S. schools are evidence-based. According to the Olweus (2012), cyberbullying only accounts for 4% of reports by males and only 6% of bullying reports made by females. Olweus (2013) added in a recent report that while cyberbullying requires further research, findings suggest that the media exaggerates its existence. Furthermore, schools should address cyberbullying, however, resources and attention should focus mainly on traditional bullying (Olweus, 2013).

One example of a traditional bullying program was a whole-school program based in Australian public schools, entitled "Friendly Schools," consisted of targeted intervention at the school, classroom, and home levels (Cross et al., 2011). A study of 1,968 students across 29 schools reported that students in the program were significantly less likely to bully or be bullied after 12 months in the program (Cross et al., 2011). While this program focused on traditional bullying, a secondary study called "Supportive Schools" noted that cyberbullying was a problem and needed to be addressed as part of the initiative (Cross et al., 2011). This next phase of the whole-school approach which targeted cyberbullying was named "Cyber Friendly Schools" with no results yet published (Cross et al., 2011). Table 8 is a comprehensive list of research-based programs with specific resources for cyberbullying. The National Education Association (2014) also offered two research-based programs on bullying prevention at its website www.nea.org/bullying with resources available to include cyberbullying, but not all-inclusive.

In summary, with laws being enacted to require intervention programs to deter cyberbullying, results of this survey study deem it necessary to develop and implement such as program (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). The social-ecological framework theorizes that behavior is influenced by many related systems, consisting of family, friends, and the school setting (Espelage & Lowe, 2012). With this in mind, it is necessary to include all stakeholders, consisting of parents, staff, students, and community members (Couvillon & Ilieva, 2011). The developed programs need to focus

on maintaining and/or improving school climate and recognize that a positive school climate improves both academic and behavioral outcomes for students (Thapa et al., 2012). Finally, the collaborative group of participants developing the plan should review other cyberbullying curricula as part of the process to devise the program Thapa et al., 2012).

Table 8

Comprehensive List of Research-Based Cyberbullying Prevention Programs

Program	Appropriate Age/Grade	Description	Source
iSAFE Internet Safety Program	Gr. K-12	Subscription-based, professional development offered to parents, personnel, and community members	i-SAFE, Inc. (2012)
The Cyber Bullying: A Prevention Curriculum	Gr. 6-12	Eight session curriculum, CD-ROM of reproducible materials	Kowalski and Agatston (2009)
Sticks and Stones: Cyberbullying	Gr. 9-12	Film with comprehensive teacher's guide for follow-up discussion	Chase Wilson (2009)
"Let's Fight it Together: What We All Can Do to Prevent Cyberbullying"	Ages 10-18	Curriculum using video segments with lesson plans, study guides, and activities.	Childnet (2007)
CyberALLY	6-12	Specific Cyberbully specific program for secondary students.	Anti-Defamation League (2014a)
Olweus Bullying Prevention Program	3-12	The curriculum for grades 3-5 has five sessions and 6-12 has eight sessions. A CD-ROM includes additional resources.	Olweus (2008a, 2008b)
Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Program	K-12	Components of the program include strategies for building healthy relationships, target problematic behaviors, and clinical assessments.	Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (2014)

Implementation

The project for this study is an action plan for developing and implementing a cyberbullying prevention program into the studied middle schools. The review of the literature directed the steps of the action plan for the cyberbullying prevention program. The project located in the appendix includes an action plan which contains responsibilities, resources, barriers, and communications plans.

Potential Resources and Existing Supports

Prospective resources for the development and creation on a cyberbullying prevention plan begin with the human resources that are already in place. Each of the middle schools has an administrative team, teachers, and school support staffs that are available. In addition, each of the studied schools has an active Parent Teacher Association (PTA) that has volunteers and parent support. School-business partnerships are already established and the local government has continued to be an active and willing support for the public school system.

Potential Barriers

The biggest potential barrier for the project is that those persons involved are committed to the process in its entirety. It will be a time commitment in the action plan to planning and carrying out the cyberbullying intervention program. Optimistically, the school-business partnerships that have already been established will provide monetary support and resources that are needed to effectively support the action plan.

Proposal for Implementation and Timetable

The project action plan consists of several stages that will take place over the course of a school year. Planning will begin in the summer months of June and July with implementation beginning in August. A more in-depth timetable and implementation schedule is provided in the Appendix.

Roles and Responsibilities of Student and Others

As a school administrator, I will serve as a facilitator of the planning groups. After the planning stages, I will defer the implementation of the cyberbullying prevention program to the teachers and school counselors.

Project Evaluation

An evaluation of the project will be conducted after the conclusion of a full school year of implementation. The type of evaluation used for this project will be summative. Summative evaluations are used to collect data to measure whether the project met its goals and can be completed in a variety of ways, including questionnaires and interviews (Lodico et al., 2010). Since this project includes the planning stages and implementation of a designed cyberbullying prevention program, a summative evaluation approach is taken to see the overall effect of the program. Like used for the precluding survey study, a survey could be given to both students and parents, as well as a questionnaire to those involved in the planning process. Interviews will not be conducted as they are time-consuming. After this summative data is collected, the planning group could use this data to tweak the program, add, or take away components to the program as needed.

Implications Including Social Change

Local Community

This project addresses the local problem of cyberbullying taking place in the area's middle schools and the need for education. The action plan for designing and implementation of the cyberbullying prevention program will address the need for parent education and educating students about cyberbullying and methods to deter it. The project will assist in creating a unified front between the home, community, and school to combat cyberbullying. The vision for the project's outcome is to provide the middle schools with a program that assists with the needs of the schools, parents, and community. Furthermore, community groups could embrace the attitude to combat cyberbullying and develop its own programs to support the cause.

Far-Reaching

While it is hopeful that surrounding schools and districts could adapt the action plan to fit their needs, the program could also benefit private schools and other groups as well. With the Internet and social media websites such as Pinterest and Facebook pages, highlights of the program could be posted that could benefit schools across the country and possibly in other sections of the world.

Conclusion

Section 3 described the project, including a review of literature to support the project. Following was an implementation plan which encompassed potential resources,

barriers, implementation measures, and roles/responsibilities of the students and others. The next section, Section 4, will address reflections and conclusions.

Section 4: Reflections and Conclusions

Introduction

The following section describes the project's strengths and limitations, along with my scholarship and my role as a researcher. The project's implications for social change and future research are also discussed.

Project Strengths

Plans for creation and implementation of the project were dependent on collaboration between all stakeholders. Couvillon and Ilieva (2011) stated that it is essential that any cyberbullying programs should include all stakeholders, including parents and community members, teachers, and students. Furthermore, compared to single-level prevention practices, multi-level whole-school approaches are the most effective in preventing and managing cyberbullying behavior (Cross et al., 2009; Pearce, Cross, Monks, Waters, & Falconer, 2011). Through involvement and participation by everyone invested in the students, there will be more support and fidelity in implementation and carry-through with the intervention program.

Recommendations for Remediation of Limitations

There are limitations of this project study to consider. While the study provided results from both middle schools in the division, the needs of each individual school may or may not be addressed. Additionally, the results from the student and/or parent surveys may not be generalizable to other students and/or parents that are no longer at the studied schools. Another limitation of the study is the validity of the survey results. Students

and/or parents may not have fully understood the questions. The survey questions are already selected based on prior research, so other questions beyond very general questions may be difficult to understand (Fink, 2009). Since the surveys used for this study were previously administered and tested for reliability and validity, validity of the survey questions should not be a limitation. Along these same lines, students and parents may have been choosing socially acceptable responses, known as social response set phenomena (Blasius & Thiessen, 2012).

One recommendation to remediate these limitations would be to signify the specific school when answering the surveys to make the results school-specific to address needs. The timeliness of the study is also a bonus, given the concern for bullying and the explosion of social media and smartphones, the results of this study is very relevant. While no research on cyberbullying was previously conducted in this school division, another recommendation would be to development further surveys to specifically address any new technology or more current methods for cyberbullying. As far as alternative to addressing the problem, school counselors could take on the problem as a whole and address in weekly guidance lessons during advisory classes. Furthermore, more parent involvement could be established by informing and involving parents in school issues and policy. By collecting parental views and proposing to involve parents in decision-making, the overall organization would be improved by allowing for investment by all stakeholders.

Scholarship

While scholars specialize in a specific area of study or body of knowledge, conducting a project study transformed me from a practitioner into a scholar. The project study enabled me to grow as a researcher as I unfolded scholarly research through the revised Bloom's taxonomy. The revised Bloom's taxonomy took me on a voyage of the cognitive processes as I worked through the research and results of the study.

Remember, understand, and apply were the first categories of Bloom's that I unfolded as I read, researched, and conducted the literature review and prepared for the survey data collection (Anderson et al., 2001). Throughout the study, I learned to find primary and secondary sources, credible websites, and acquired increased comprehension skills to read scholarly research articles and books. In addition, I became more adept at formulating research questions and hypothesis that addressed my local problem.

My ability to analyze, evaluate, and create allowed for analysis of results, evaluation of results and resources, and led to creation of the project (Anderson et al., 2001). The most challenging area was in the area of learning more about statistical analysis and conducting statistical analysis. Through reading about statistical tests and measures and using the formulas, I was able to better understand the results that my surveys produced. While conducting a project study was a lengthy, highly involved process, a commitment to the outcomes is necessary and a milestone of any scholar.

Project Development and Evaluation

When creating a project that is meant to have a positive and long-lasting impact on others, it is important to value and encourage feedback from others. Sometimes, it was helpful to orally discuss my ideas with others, even if they were not immediately involved with the project to assist with determining needed resources and opinions regarding whether the idea is a realistic approach. Other times, it takes others to read your work when you feel it is self-explanatory, that sometimes is need further explanation to assist with clarity and further attention to detail.

A thorough review of results and analysis of data is needed to provide direction for review of literature to guide the project. Reading and reviewing other researcher's work was insightful to see what is viewed as necessary components to address the needs of my study. Additionally, I found that there were more community resources that are available to schools than I was aware of, such as businesses that require their employees to volunteer a minimal number of hours each year. The evaluation of this project will not take place until after its implementation. After the action plan has been carried through, a survey of students will be conducted to assess current existence of cyberbullying and methods used. Following the survey, the cyberbullying prevention efforts will be evaluated via additional surveys and committee discussions followed by a revision to the existing plan. At that time, it will require the same commitment and desire that was at the beginning of the project.

Leadership and Change

Effective school leaders have to be well-read and willing to adapt to change. Being a doctorate student for the last few years, I have been more willing to stay abreast of current research, not just for my project but for the good of my school as well. It is essential to take time to review research and read about current trends in education. On the school administrator level, not only was it necessary to stay knowledgeable and committed to staying well-informed of increasing technology inside and outside of the classroom. Additionally, as a school administrator at schools with improvement plans, I have learned to examine data and use that data to implement changes in instruction as needed at school. These previously acquired skills in data disaggregation best-suited me when I had to be have experience in examining data and exploring trends in technology and those behaviors associated to social media.

Analysis of Self as Scholar

While I have always viewed myself as a life-long learner, I had never partaken of online classes. I knew that this would be a challenge compared to the traditional graduate classes that I had taken previously, due to not having a set time for class each week and no face-to-face communication. However, being a self-motivated individual and with a never-quit attitude, I looked forward to the online experience. While it was slightly intimidating to read about the demands of scholarly writing and reading research studies, I knew that one of my strengths has always been writing and I have had strong comprehension skills. All of the demands of reading current research and learning how to

locate and identify scholarly articles and websites aided me not only in my classwork, but in my professional work as well. As a school administrator, I share any relevant research and articles with my staff that may have a positive impact in instruction and school climate. Also, when perusing journals and websites, I sometimes come across new resources that my staff are interested in or related to their content area. My colleagues have been supportive in the entire process and have inspired me to complete the doctoral degree process.

Analysis of Self as Practitioner

As a practitioner, my work throughout the doctoral study has made built upon my strengths and built confidence in less developed areas. I now use richer vocabulary in my writing and I have found that my editing skills have improved, as I rarely have to refer to the American Psychological Association (APA) manual. By having experience working with schools in improvement which required research-based interventions, I have learned of more avenues for acquiring research-based interventions for schools. Additionally, while I have never been known as a procrastinator, I am even more adept at time management, managing my doctoral study requirements and role of school administrator, among other commitments.

Analysis of Self as Project Developer

Development of any respectable project is time consuming and difficult. However, the creation of the action plan for my project was the most enjoyable part of the entire process. I did not view it as tedious, but as a gratifying process as I knew it was

for the benefit of students, as I have always found pleasure in projects and project-based learning.

The Project's Potential Impact on Social Change

The project's action plan for bringing about the cyberbullying intervention program provides an opportunity for schools, families, and community to work together for a common cause. The school district that was studied has had no direction in terms of bullying and cyberbullying. The project has the potential to impact social change through increasing knowledge of technology use and methods for cyberbullying among all stakeholders. Another area of social change will come in the area of collaboration between the two middle schools and community members. The project in itself promotes data-guided decision making. Based on results of the survey and post-project implementation survey, data can be disaggregated, examined, and compared to make future decisions for the action plan. There will be the potential for improvements in school climate and improvement in relationships among students. Finally, the success of the program and its elements can be shared and implemented in other neighboring school divisions and distributed via conferences and over social media.

Implications, Applications, and Directions for Future Research

Collaboration among school stakeholders can assist with any problem and promote a whole-school approach to seeking improvement and success. Future researchers could develop new surveys and/or focus groups to assess the cyberbullying methods and existence that is concurrent with future technological developments. Further

research in this area could also be conducted beyond students and parents, and conducted with school staff. A combination of the new data from school staff with this study's findings may provide better insight. By discovering more about the youth who report bullying being willing to intervene and the school factors that may increase willingness to get involved, important questions for future research may arise.

Based on specific findings, the studied student sample differed statistically from national norms in several areas. Areas included admittance of cyberbullying others, experiencing cyberbullying, and more local students reported being victims of cyberbullying as compared to being perpetrators. Another study that further examines the local students in these categories may prove valuable to address these areas and to determine why the local area differed compared to the national sample. Since descriptive information was also gathered from parents, a study could be completed after implementation of the action plan to determine if parents have benefited from the information and training obtained. The study could be replicated across a wider range of ages or at the high schools to determine if there are the same needs as the middle schools. Furthermore, a study could be conducted which examines links between cyberbullying and achievement.

Conclusion

This section provided reflections of the doctoral study process and offered suggestions for further research in this area. While I was already a strong student, the knowledge and skills that I acquired at the doctoral level made me a more well-rounded

scholar and school administrator. As for the project, collaboration among all stakeholders assists with a whole-school approach which aids in implementation with commitment and fidelity. Locally, it is anticipated that after enactment of the cyberbullying intervention program, the studied middle schools will benefit from an improved school climate and better students relationships, with more increased knowledge of technology by all stakeholders. Outside of the district, it is expected that other school divisions will embrace the idea of intervening in cyberbullying and in effect, making schools, families, and communities all better digital citizens in this age of technology.

References

Accordino, D. B., & Accordino, M. P. (2011). An exploratory study of face-to-face and cyberbullying in sixth grade students. *American Secondary Education, 40*(1), 14-30. (EJ951225).

American Osteopathic Association (2011). *2011 Cyberbullying survey: Final results*. Relevant Research, Inc.

Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R., Airasian, P. W., Cruikshank, K. A., Mayer, R. E., Pintrich, P. R., ... & Wittrock, M. C. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives, abridged edition.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Ayenibiowo, K. O., & Akinbode, G. A. (2011). Psychopathology of bullying and emotional abuse among school children. *IFE Psychologia: An International Journal, 19*(2), 127-141. doi:10.4314/ifep.v19i2.69517

Anti-Defamation League. (2009). *Bullying, cyberbullying prevention law: Model statute and advocacy toolkit.* Chicago, IL: Author.

Anti-Defamation League. (2012). *Bullying prevention and intervention tips for families.* Retrieved from http://www.adl.org/combatbullying

Anti-Defamation League. (2014a). *CyberALLY: A cyberbully training model for middle and high-school age youth.* Retrieved from http://www.adl.org/assets/pdf/education-outreach/CyberALLY-Flier.pdf

Anti-Defamation League. (2014b). *The "grown folks" guide to popular apps in social media.* Retrieved from http://www.adl.org/education-outreach/bullying-cyberbullying/

Baldry, A. C. (2003). Bullying in schools and exposure to domestic violence. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 27*, 713−732. doi:10.1016/S0145-2134(03)00114-5

Bandura, A. (1973). Aggression: A social learning analysis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. New York: General Learning Press.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Barnes Technologies International. (2008). *Archival data analysis for the PC Public Schools needs assessment.* Harrisonburg, Virginia.

Bauman, S., & Tatum, T. (2009). Web sites for young children: gateway to online social networking. *Professional School Counseling, 13*(1), 1-7.

Bhat, C., Chang, S., & Linscott, J. A. (2010). Addressing cyberbullying as a media literacy issue. *New Horizons In Education, 58*(3), 34-43.

Blasius, J., & Thiessen, V. (2012). Assessing the quality of survey data. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. doi:10.4135/9781446251874.n6

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brunker, M. (2009). *Sexting surprise: Teens face child porn charges*. Retrieved from http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/28679588

Calvete, E., Orue, I., Estévez, A., Villardón, L., & Padilla, P. (2010). Cyberbullying in adolescents: Modalities and aggressors' profile. *Computers in Human Behavior 26*(1), 1128–1135. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2010.03.017

Cassidy, W., Brown, K., & Jackson, M. (2012). Under the radar: Educators and cyberbullying in schools. *School Psychology International, 33*(5), 520-532. doi:10.1177/0143034312445245

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2009). *Electronic media and youth violence: A CDC issue brief for researchers*. Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/pdf/Electronic_Aggression_Researcher_Brief-a.pdf

Chase Wilson. (2009). *Sticks and stones: Cyberbullying.* Retrieved from http://www.chasewilson.com/sticksandstones/project.html

Childnet International. (2007). *Let's fight it together: What we can all do to prevent cyberbullying.* London, England: Author.

Connolly, I., & O'Moore, M. (2003). Personality and family relations of children who bully. *Personality & Individual Differences, 35*(1), 559-567. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00218-0

Cornell, D. (n.d.). *Bullying assessment flow chart.* Retrieved from http://youthviolence.edschool.virginia

Couvillon, M. A., & Ilieva, V. (2011). Recommended practices: A review of school wide preventative programs and strategies on cyberbullying. *Preventing School Failure, 55*(2), 96-101. doi:10.1080/1045988X.2011.539461

Creative Research Systems. (2012). *Sample size calculator.* Retrieved from http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cross, D., Monks, H., Hall, M., Shaw, T., Pintabona, Y., Erceg, E., & ... Lester, L. (2011). Three-year results of the Friendly Schools whole-of-school intervention on children's bullying behaviour. *British Educational Research Journal*, *37*(1), 105-129. doi:10.1080/01411920903420024

Cross, D., Shaw, T., Hearn, L., Epstein, M., Monks, H., Lester, L., Thomas, L. (2009). *Australian covert bullying prevalence study* (ACBPS). Retrieved from http://www.deewr.gov.au/Schooling/NationalSafeSchools/Pages/research.aspx

Cyberbully Alert. (2009). *Photoshopping and cyberbullying information*. Retrieved from http://www.cyberbullyalert.com

Cyberbullying Research Center. (2013). *About us: Background and contact information.* Retrieved from http://www.cyberbullying.us/aboutus.php

Dooley, J. J., Pyzalski, J., & Cross, D. (2009). Cyberbullying versus face-to-face bullying: A theoretical and conceptual review. *Journal of Psychology, 217*(4), 182-188. doi:10.1027/0044-3409.217.4.182

Elledge, L. C., Williford, A., Boulton, A. J., DePaolis, K. J., Little, T. D., & Salmivalli, C. (2013). Individual and contextual predictors of cyberbullying: The influence of children's provictim attitudes and teachers' ability to intervene. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *42*(5), 698-710. doi:10.1007/s10964-013-9920-x

Espelage, D.L., & Low, S.M. (2012). Bullying among children and adolescents: Social-emotional learning approaches to prevention. In K. Nader (Ed.), *School rampage shootings and other youth disturbances: Early preventative interventions* (pp. 205-219). New York: Routledge.

Estell, D., Farmer, T., Irvin, M., Crowther, A., Akos, P., & Boudah, D. (2009). Students with exceptionalities and the peer group context of bullying and victimization in late elementary school. *Journal of Child & Family Studies*, *18*(2), 136-150. doi:10.1007/s10826-008-9214-1

Feinberg, T., & Robey, N. (2009). Cyberbullying. *Education Digest*, *7*(7), 26-31. (EJ857671).

Fenaughty, J. & Harré, N. (2013). Factors associated with distressing electronic harassment and cyberbullying. *Computers in Human Behavior 26*(1), 803-811. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2012.11.008

Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London: Sage Publications.

Fink, A. (2009). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gable, R. K., Ludlow, L. H., McCoach, D. B., & Kite, S. L. (2011). Development and validation of the survey of knowledge of Internet risk and Internet behavior. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 71*(1), 217-230.

Goddard, C. (2008). Cyber World Bullying. *Education Digest, 73*(7), 4-9. Retrieved from EJ799001 .

Greydanus, D. E., Pratt, H. D., Greydanus, S. E., & Hoffman, A. D. (2003). Corporal punishment in schools: A position paper of the Society for Adolescent Medicine. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 32*(5), 385-393. doi:10.1016/S1054-139X(03)00042-9

Hathcote, A. R., & Hogan, K. A. (2011). Resource guide on cyberbullying. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 55*(2), 102-104.

Hawley, P. H. (1999). The ontogenesis of social dominance: A strategy-based evolutionary perspective. *Developmental Review, 19*, 97-132. doi:10.1006/drev.1998.0470

Hinduja, S. & Patchin, J. W. (2009). *Bullying beyond the schoolyard: Preventing and responding to cyberbullying*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hinduja, S. and Patchin, J. W. (2010). *Cyberbullying and online aggression survey instrument: 2010 version*. Cyberbullying Research Center, *Jupiter, FL.*

Hinduja, S. & Patchin, J. W. (2011.) High-tech cruelty. *Educational Leadership, 68*(5), 48-52.

Hinduja, S. & Patchin, J. W. (2012). *School Climate 2.0: Preventing Cyberbullying and Sexting One Classroom at a Time*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Holladay, J. (2010). Cyberbullying: The stakes have never been higher for students-or schools. *Teaching Tolerance, 38*, 42-46.

Howell, D. (2002). *Statistical methods for psychology* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Duxbury.

Horrigan, J. (2009). *Wireless Internet use*. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/files/old-media//Files/Reports/2009/Wireless-Internet-Use-With-Topline.pdf

Hunt, C., Peters, L., & Rapee, R. M. (2012). Development of a measure of the experience of being bullied in youth. *Psychological Assessment*, *24*(1), 156-165. doi:10.1037/a0025178

i-Safe. (2012). *I-SAFE: e-safety curriculum (Grades K-12)*. Carlsbad, CA: Author.

Internet World Stats. (2012). Internet usage statistics. Retrieved March 12, 2013 from http://www.Internetworldstats.com/stats.htm

Jones, S. E., Manstead, A.S.R., & Livingstone, A.G. (2009). Birds of a feather bully together: Group processes and children's responses to bullying. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 27 (4),* 853-876. doi:10.1348/026151008X390267

Juvonen, J., & Gross, E. F. (2008). Extending the school grounds?—Bullying experiences in cyberspace. *Journal of School Health*, *78*(9), 496-505. doi:10.1111/j.1746-1561.2008.00335.x

Kiriakidis, S. P., & Kavoura, A. (2010). Cyberbullying: a review of the literature on harassment through the Internet and other electronic means. *Family & Community Health, 33*(2), 82-93. doi:10.1097/FCH.0b013e3181d593e4

Kite, S. L., Gable, R., & Filippelli, L. (2010). Assessing middle school students' knowledge of conduct and consequences and their behaviors regarding the use of social networking sites. *Clearing House, 83*(5), 158-163. doi:10.1080/00098650903505365

Klomek, A. B., Marrocco, F., Kleinman, M., Schonfeld, I.S., & Gould, M. S. (2007). Bullying, depression, and suicidality in adolescents**.** *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 46*(1), 40-49. doi:10.1097/01.chi.0000242237.84925.18

Kowalski, R. M., Limber, S.P. (2007). Electronic bullying among middle school students, *Journal of Adolescent Health, (41)*6, S22-S30. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.08.017

Kowalski, R.M., & Agatston, P.W. (2009). *Cyberbullying: A prevention curriculum for Grades 6-12.* Center City, MN: Hazeldon.

Kowalski, R. M., Morgan, C. A., Limber, S. P. (2012). Traditional bullying as a potential warning sign of cyberbullying. *School Psychology International, 33*(5), 505-519. doi:10.1177/0143034312445244

Lazarus, P. J., & Pfohl, W. (2011). *Bullying*. In A. Canter, L. Z. Paige, & S. Shaw (Eds.), Helping children at home and school (pp. S4H7-S4H9). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Lee, S. & Chae, Y. (2012). Balancing participation and risks in children's Internet use: The role of Internet literacy and parental mediation. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 15*(5). doi:10.1089/cyber.2011.0552

Lenhart, A., Purcell, K., Smith, A., & Zickuhr, K. (2010). Social media & mobile Internet use among teens and young adults: Millennials. *Pew Internet & American Life Project*. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2010/02/03/social-media-and-young-adults/

Li, Q. (2006). Cyberbullying in schools: A research of gender differences *School Psychology International, 27*(2), 157-170. doi:10.1177/0143034306064547

Li, Q. (2010). Cyberbullying in high schools: A study of students' behaviors and beliefs about this new phenomenon. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 19*(4), 372-392. doi:10.1080/10926771003788979

Liu, J. (2004). Concept analysis: Aggression. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 25*(7), 693–714. doi:10.1080/01612840490486755

Liu, J., Lewis, G., & Evans, L. (2013). Understanding aggressive behaviour across the lifespan. *Journal of Psychiatric & Mental Health Nursing, (20)*2, 156-168. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2850.2012.01902.x

Lodico, M., Spaulding, D., & Voegtle, K. (2010). *Methods in educational research: From theory to practice* (Laureate Education, Inc., custom ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Mark, L. & Ratliffe, K. (2011). Cyber worlds: New playgrounds for bullying. *Computers in the Schools, 28*(1), 92-116.

Miller, N. C., Thompson, N. L., & Franz, D. P. (2009). Proactive strategies to safeguard young adolescents in the cyberage. *Middle School Journal, 41*(1), 28-34. (EJ854568).

Moreno, M. A., Egan, K. G., Bare, K., Young, H. N., & Cox, E. D. (2013). Internet safety education for youth: stakeholder perspectives. *BMC Public Health, 13*(1), 1-6. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-13-543

Monks, C., Smith, P., Naylor, P., Barter, C., Ireland, J., & Coyne, I. (2009). Bullying in different contexts: Commonalities, differences and the role of theory. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 14*(2), 146–156. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2009.01.004

Nansel, T., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R., Ruan, W., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among U.S. youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 285*(16), 2094–2100. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2435211/pdf/nihms53619.pdf

National Education Association (2014). *NEA's bully free: It starts with me*. Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/home/neabullyfree.html

O'Brennan, L. M., Bradshaw, C. P., & Furlong, M. J. (2014). Influence of Classroom and School Climate on Teacher Perceptions of Student Problem Behavior. *School Mental Health*, *6*(2), 125-136. doi:10.1037/a0018450

Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys.* Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere (Wiley).

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at School: What we know and what we can do.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Olweus, D. (2008a). Cyber bullying: A prevention curriculum for grades 3-5 scope and sequence. Retrieved from http://www.violenceprevention-works.org/public/document/cyber_bullying_6-12_scope.pdf

Olweus, D. (2008b). Cyber bullying: A prevention curriculum for grades 6-12 scope and sequence. Retrieved from http://www.violenceprevention-works.org/public/document/cyber_bullying_3-5_scope.pdf

Olweus, D. (2012). Cyberbullying: An overrated phenomenon?. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *9*(5), 520-538. doi:10.1080/17405629.2012.682358

Olweus, D. (2013). School bullying: Development and some important challenges. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *9*, 751-780. doi:10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050212-185516

Parris, L., Varjas, K., Meyers, J., & Cutts, H. (2011). High school students' perceptions of coping with cyberbullying. *Youth Socie*ty, *44*(2), 284 –306. doi:10.1177/0044118X11398881.

Patchin, J. W. & Hinduja, S. (2006). Bullies move beyond the schoolyard: A preliminary look at cyberbullying. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, (4)*2, 148-169. doi:10.1177/1541204006286288

Patchin, J. W. & Hinduja, S. (2012). *Cyberbullying Prevention and Response: Expert Perspectives.* New York: Routledge.

Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2012). School-based efforts to prevent cyberbullying. *Prevention Researcher, 19*(3), 7-9. Retrieved from http://www.safeschooluniversity.com/pdfs/issues/Cyber/TPR19-3Patchin.pdf

Patchin, J., & Hinduja, S. (2013). *Words wound: Delete cyberbullying and make kindness go viral*. Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit Publishing.

Patton, M. (2011). *Questionnaire research: A practical guide.* (3rd ed.). Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.

Paul, S., Smith, P. K., & Blumberg, H. H. (2010). Addressing cyberbullying in school using the quality circle approach. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counseling*, *20*(2), 157-168. doi:10.1375/ajgc.20.2.157

Pearce, N. L. (2010). *Critical success factors for building school capacity to engage parents in school-based bullying prevention interventions* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Edith Cowan University, Perth, Western Australia. Retrieved from http://library.ecu.edu.au/record=b2074934

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 & Counselling, 21*(1), 1-21. doi:10.1375/ajgc.21.1.1

Perren, S. & Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, E. (2012). Cyberbullying and traditional bullying in adolescence: Differential roles of moral disengagement, moral emotions, and moral values, *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 9*(2), 195-209. doi:10.1080/17405629.2011.643168

Pew Research Center. (2013). *Teens and technology 2013*. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/~/media//Files/Reports/2013/PIP_TeensandTechnology2013.pdf

Popović-Ćitić, B., Djurić, S. & Cvetković, V. (2011). The prevalence of cyberbullying among adolescents: A case study of middle schools in Serbia. *School Psychology International, 32* (4), 412-424. doi:10.1177/0143034311401700

Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports. (2014). *Bully prevention in positive behavior support.* Retrieved from http://www.pbis.org/common/cms/files/pbisresources/bullyprevention_ES.pdf

Powell, M., & Ladd, L. (2010). Bullying: A review of the literature and implications for family therapists. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 38*(1), 189-206. doi:10.1080/01936180902961662

Rawana, J. S., Norwood, S. J., & Whitley, J. (2011). A mixed-method evaluation of a strength-based bullying prevention program. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, *26*(4), 283-300. doi:10.1177/0829573511423741

Richard, J. F., Schneider, B. H., & Mallet, P. (2012), Revisiting the whole-school approach to bullying: Really looking at the whole school. *School Psychology International, 33*(3), 263-284. doi:10.1177/0143034311415906

Robinson, J.P., Shaver, P.R., & Wrightsman, L.S. (1991). *Measures of personality and social psychology attitudes.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Ronning, J. A., Sourander, A., Kumpulainen, K., Tamminen, T., Niemela, S., Moilanen, I., . . . Almqvist, F. (2009). Cross-informant agreement about bullying and victimization among eight-year-olds: Whose information best predicts psychiatric caseness 10-15 years later? *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, (45)*1, 15-11. doi:10.1007/s00127-008-0395-0

Ryan, T., Kariuki, M., & Yilmaz, H. (2011). A comparative analysis of cyberbullying perceptions of preservice educators: Canada and Turkey. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 10*(1), 1–12. Retrieved from http://www.tojet.net/articles/v10i3/1031.pdf.

Schaeffer, C. M., Petras, H., Ialongo, N., Poduska, J., & Kellam, S. (2003). Modeling growth in boys' aggressive behavior across elementary school: Links to later criminal involvement, conduct disorder, and antisocial personality disorder. *Developmental Psychology, 39*(6), 1020–1035. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.39.6.1020

Schroeder, B. A., Messina, A., Schroeder, D., Good, K., Barto, S., Saylor, J., & Masiello, M. (2012). The implementation of a statewide bullying prevention program:

Preliminary findings from the field and the importance of coalitions. *Health Promotion Practice, 13*(4), 492–495. doi:10.1177/1524839910386887

Sharples, M. M., Graber, R. R., Harrison, C. C., & Logan, K. K. (2009). E-safety and web 2.0 for children aged 11–16. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 25*(1), 70-84. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2729.2008.00304.x

Siegle, D. (2010). Cyberbullying and sexting: Technology abuses of the 21st century. *Gifted Child Today, 33*(2), 14-16,.

Slonje, R., Smith, P., & Frisén, A. (2012). Processes of cyberbullying, and feelings of remorse by bullies: A pilot study. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 9*(2), 244-259. doi:10.1080/17405629.2011.643670

Smith, P. K., & Slonje, R. (2010). Cyberbullying: The nature and extent of a new kind of bullying, in and out of school. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. Espelage (Eds.), *The international handbook of school bullying* (pp. 249–262). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Smith, P.K., Morita, Y., Junger-Tas, J., Olweus, D., Catalano, R., & Slee, P. (1999). *The nature of school bullying: A cross-national perspective*. London & New York: Routledge.

Snakenborg, J., Van Acker, R., & Gable, R. A. (2011). Cyberbullying: Prevention and intervention to protect our children and youth. *Preventing School Failure,* 55(2), 88-95. doi:10.1080/1045988X.2011.539454

Solberg, M., Olweus, D., & Endresen, I. (2007). Bullies and victims at school: Are they the same pupils? *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 77*(2), 441–464, doi:10.1348/000709906X105689

Sourander, A., Klomek, A.B., Ikonen, M., Lindroos, J., Luntamo, T., Koskelainen, M. et al. (2010). Psychosocial risk factors associated with cyberbullying among adolescents: A population-based study. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 67, 720–728. doi:10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2010.79.

StatTrek. (2014). Random number generator. Retrieved from http://www.stattrek.com/statistics/random-number-generator.aspx

Stauffer, S., Heath, M., Coyne, S., & Ferrin, S. (2012). High school teachers' perceptions of cyberbullying prevention and intervention strategies. *Psychology in the Schools, 49*(4), 352-367. doi:10.1002/pits.21603

Stewart, D. M., & Fritsch, E. J. (2011). School and law enforcement efforts to combat cyberbullying. *Preventing School Failure, 55*(2), 79-87. (EJ915398).

Swearer, S. M., Espelage, D. L., Vaillancourt, T., & Hymel, S. (2010). What can be done about school bullying? Linking research to educational practice. *Educational Researcher*, *39*(1), 38-47. doi:10.3102/0013189X09357622

Tangen, D., & Campbell, M. (2010). Cyberbullying prevention: One primary school's approach. *Australian Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 20*(2), 225-234. doi:10.1375/ajgc.20.2.225

Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Higgins-D'Alessandro, A., & Guffey, S. (2012). School climate research summary: August 2012. *School Climate Brief*, (3).

Thomas, K. M. & McGee, C. D. (2012). The only thing we have to fear is…120 characters. *TechTrends, 56*(1), 19-33. doi:10.1007/s11528-011-0550-4.

Tompson, T., Benz, J. & Agiesta, J. (2013). The digital abuse study: A survey from MTV & the associated press-NORC center for public affairs research. Retrieved from http://www.apnorc.org/PDFs/Digital%20Abuse/AP-NORC%20Center%20and%20MTV_Digital%20Abuse%20Study_FINAL.pdf

Tremblay, R. E., Nagin, D. S., Séguin, J. R., Zoccolillo, M., Zelazo, P. D., Boivin, M., Pérusse, D., & Japel, C. (2004). Physical aggression during early childhood: trajectories and predictors. *Pediatrics, 114*(1), 43-50. doi:10.1542/peds.114.1.e43

Triola, M. F. (2012). *Elementary statistics: Technology update.* (11th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Trolley, B. C., & Hanel, C. (Eds.). (2010). *Cyber kids, cyber bullying, cyber balance*. Corwin Press.

Ttofi, M., & Farrington, D. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A systematic and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 7*(1), 27-56. doi:10.1007/s11292-010-9109-1

Turner, H. A., Finkelhor, D., Hamby, S. L., Shattuck, A., & Ormrod, R. K. (2011). Specifying type and location of peer victimization in a national sample of children and youth. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, *40*(8), 1052-1067. doi:10.1007/s10964-011-9639-5

U.S. Department of Education. (2011). Analysis of state bullying laws and policies. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/bullying/state-bullying-laws/state-bullying-laws.pdf

Virginia Department of Education. (2012). *Virginia annual report on discipline, crime, and violence.* Retrieved from http://www.doe.virginia.gov/statistics_reports/school_climate/discipline_crime_violence/10_annual_report.pdf

Von Marées, N. & Petermann, F. (2012). Cyberbullying: An increasing challenge for schools. *School Psychology International, 33* (5). 467-476. doi:10.1177/0143034312445241

Walcott, C. M., Upton, A., Bolen, L. M., & Brown, M. B. (2008). Associations between peer-perceived status and aggression in young adolescents. *Psychology in the Schools, 45*(6), 550-561. doi:10.1002/pits.20323

Wang, J., Iannotti, R. J., & Nansel, T. R. (2009). School bullying among adolescents in the United States: Physical, verbal, relational, and cyber. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 45*(4), 368-375. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.03.021

Willard, N. (2010). *School response to cyberbullying and sexting: The legal challenges.* Center for Safe and Responsible Internet Use. Retrieved from https://denver.issa.org/meetings/presentations/cyberbullyingsextinglegal.pdf

Wong, Y. C. (2010). Cyber-parenting: Internet benefits, risks and parenting issues. *Journal of Technology in Human Services, 28*, 252-273. doi:10.1080/15228835.2011.562629

Wong-Lo, M., & Bullock, L. M. (2011). Digital aggression: Cyberworld meets school bullies. *Preventing School Failure, 55*(2), 64-70. doi:10.1080/1045988X.2011.539429

Wong-Lo, M., Bullock, L. M., & Gable, R. A. (2011). Cyber bullying: Practices to face digital aggression. *Emotional & Behavioral Difficulties, 16*(3), 317-325. doi:10.1080/13632752.2011.595098

Yen, H. (2009). *Popularity of texting edging out cell phone calls*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/12/15/popularity-of-texting-edg_n_392721.html

Appendix A: The Project: Action Plan for Cyberbullying Intervention/Prevention

Purpose:

Surveys were administered to randomly selected students and parents at two rural middle schools. Compared to the national survey (8.6%) regarding admittance of cyberbullying others in the past 30 days, slightly more local survey student participants (9.9%) did so; likewise, more local survey students (14.1%) reporting experiencing cyberbullying in the past 30 days compared to national survey percentage of 7.5%. Results of the parent survey also suggested that over half of parents believe that that their middle-school aged children are unsure of us or do not use social media. Parent survey data indicated that students are accessing the Internet independent of their parents and schools. Results also revealed that 75.6% of parents were concerned that their children could be cyberbullied over social media. Regarding intervention of bullying, 86.4% of parents agreed that it is the responsibility of parents to resolve cyberbullying situations that occur over social media sites, with 45.7% of parents also declaring cyberbullying intervention as the teachers' or school officials' responsibility.

Intended Level of Learners:

This action plan is intended for all middle-school-age students, their parents, and faculty of staff of middle schools.

Description of the Project:

The project as outlined contains information to implement the Action Plan for Cyberbullying Intervention/Prevention. The layout includes the specific details to implement the plan, including objectives, specific actions, timeline, responsibilities and communication plan, resources, and potential barriers. Each section of the plan includes measures to evaluate if the specific objective was achieved. References materials identified in the plan are located in Appendix G.

Appendix A: Action Plan for Cyberbullying Intervention/Prevention

#	Action	Timeline	Responsibilities/ Communication Plan	Resources	Potential Barriers
Objective: To create an understanding of the existence of cyberbullying at the local level that leads to the development of an intervention program for the middle schools of the division.					
1.	Selection of participants for the planning group, including a stakeholder brainstorm.	1 week	School Administrators Phone calls and emails	Available: Staff Needed: Responses	Staff flexibility with schedules to schedule meeting; volunteers committed to the plan.
2.	Informational meeting for selected participants.	2 hours	Researcher Copies of survey data, presentation of data and needs based on data, discuss current research	Available: Location for meeting, technology, copier services Needed: Selection of a leader for the group for each school, a representative sample of school staff, parents, and business members, 100% attendance and participation at meeting.	Participation by all on selected committee, scheduling future planning meetings

#	Action	Timeline	Responsibilities/ Communication Plan	Resources	Potential Barriers
3.	Professional development: • Examine current research • Review websites • Review other research-based programs	3 meeting dates with 2-3 hours per meeting	Faculty and staff; community members and business leaders Google docs for further revisions and planning outside of meetings	Available: Location for meetings, technology, programs available and websites (see Appendix G) Needed: 100% attendance and participation at meeting and representative of each school	Participation by all on selected committee, commitment to take on planning outside of meetings via Google docs
Evaluation Measures: ✓ Planning group established, including a brainstorm of stakeholders ✓ Informational meeting of at least 2 hours with future meetings scheduled ✓ Professional development meetings held (at least 3) ✓ List of websites and research provided ✓ Google docs set up for revisions and outside planning					
Objective: To <u>initially</u> raise awareness about cyberbullying in the school, home, and community AND plan for action.					
4.	Selection of School Safety Committee, which encompasses acts of bullying: • Administrators • Teachers • Other school staff	2 weeks	Researcher, administration, and guidance	Available: Summer planning time Needed: Availability for all selected to meet	Flexibility and availability to meet

#	Action	Timeline	Responsibilities/ Communication Plan	Resources	Potential Barriers
	• Parents • Students • Community stakeholders				
5.	Hold an anti-bullying day at school.	Plan: 1 week Event: 1 day	School Leadership Team Weekly Newsletter School calendar	Available: Venue, tables Needed: Activities and games, volunteers for stations	Staff flexibility with schedules
6.	Host an anti-bullying community event.	Plan: 1 week Event: 1 day	Faculty and staff; community members and business leaders Weekly Newsletter School calendar	Available: Venue, tables Needed: Activities and games, volunteers for stations	Volunteers for event
Evaluation Measures: ✓ School Safety Committee established ✓ Anti-Bullying Day planned and advertised via newsletter and websites ✓ Anti-Bullying day occurred ✓ Bullying awareness newsletter created and sent via hard copy and electronic, as well as posted on school websites ✓ Anti-Bullying Community Event planned and advertised via newsletter and websites ✓ Anti-Bullying Event occurred					

#	Action	Timeline	Responsibilities/ Communication Plan	Resources	Potential Barriers
Objective: To prevent and respond to cyberbullying at the school level.					
7.	Develop, communicate, and enforce cyberbullying prevention polices and rules.	2-3 meetings	School Safety Committee School assemblies Newsletters Class meetings	Available: Current bullying policy, common advisory time to share policies with grade levels Needed: Attendance by members	Availability of meeting time that suits everyone.
8.	Develop an anonymous method for reporting acts or cyberbullying.	1 meeting	Administration, faculty and staff School website, class meetings	Available: Technology Needed: Staff to check, follow-up on reports	Staff that are responsible for checking reporting system and follow-up.
9.	Train school staff on intervention methods to use with students and evaluating bullying.	1-2 meetings	Administration and guidance counselors Binder of notes	Available: Materials (see Appendix G) Needed: Common planning time for each grade level, 100% attendance	Not all staff may attend
10.	Conduct team building exercises and class meetings for students in advisory classes with a	Once per week	Guidance, advisory teachers Email by guidance	Available: Lesson materials (see Appendix G) Needed: Supplies as	Staff to conduct the class meetings as presented in the material

#	Action	Timeline	Responsibilities/ Communication Plan	Resources	Potential Barriers
	focus on cyberbullying at least one time per month.		with material/lesson for each exercise or class meeting.	needed dependent on lesson	
11.	Sponsor Bullying Prevention Month in October: • Establish committee • Plan activities	Establish and plan: 1 week	Guidance, faculty and staff Email by guidance with any materials/info for each event; Weekly Newsletter; School calendar	Available: Technology, copier services, access to school websites Needed: Email addresses for parents; activities; volunteers for special events	Volunteers for any special events; monies for special materials
Evaluation Measures: ✓ Develop cyberbullying prevention policies and rules ✓ Communicate cyberbullying prevention and enforcement policies and rules via school assemblies, newsletters, and class meetings ✓ An anonymous cyberbullying reporting method is developed ✓ A binder of resources is developed and professional development is provided to staff for cyberbullying intervention ✓ Guidance counselors provide materials and lessons and classroom teachers conduct class meetings at least one time per month ✓ School sponsors Bullying Prevention Month in October, including establishing a committee and planning activities					
Objective: To prevent and respond to cyberbullying at home and in the community.					
12.	Lead a question/answer	1 meeting	Researcher,	Available: Venue, data,	Attendance by

#	Action	Timeline	Responsibilities/ Communication Plan	Resources	Potential Barriers
	session with stakeholders on local data and action for preventing and responding to cyberbullying in the schools.	of 2 hours	Administration, School Safety Committee Data, action plan	action plan Needed: Attendance by stakeholders	stakeholders and participation by those leading
13.	Sponsor parent/community workshops for preventing, monitoring, and responding to cyberbullying.	1 evening per quarter, 1-2 hours per meeting	Administration, School Safety Committee, ITRT personnel Binder of resources, Google docs, websites	Available: Venue, technology, materials (see Appendix G) Needed: Participation and attendance, may need a few dates per workshop to ensure attendance	Finding dates that are convenient for participants and session leaders.
14.	Keep parents updated on new technology.	Once per quarter	Administration, School Safety Committee, ITRT personnel Paper copies and via school websites	Available: Updates are provided to ITRT via state (see Appendix G) Needed: Unknown	Unknown
Evaluation Measures: ✓ Conducted a question/answer session with stakeholders on cyberbullying and share existing data ✓ Plan and conduct a parent workshop one time per quarter ✓ Send hard-copy and electronic copies of updated technology information to parents once per quarter					

#	Action	Timeline	Responsibilities/ Communication Plan	Resources	Potential Barriers
Objective: To assess, evaluate, and revise cyberbullying prevention program.					
15.	Conduct survey of students, parents, and staff to assess current existence of cyberbullying and methods used.	End of school year	Administration Website access to link	Available: survey (if using existing), technology Needed: survey (if require additional components), time for disaggregation	Access to technology if taken outside of school
16.	Evaluate cyberbullying prevention efforts and refine the existing plan.	2-3 weeks, including 2-3 meetings of 1-2 hours	Administration, School Safety Committee SPSS software	Available: Location for meetings, technology, survey data Needed: 100% attendance and participation at meeting	Time to analyze survey data
17.	Plan future meeting dates for next school year events.	Summer months prior to next school year	Administration Google calendar	Google calendar with reminders	Finding mutual dates.
Evaluation Measures:					

#	Action	Timeline	Responsibilities/ Communication Plan	Resources	Potential Barriers
✓ Survey conducted with students and analyzed ✓ Survey conducted with parents and analyzed ✓ Survey conducted with school staff and analyzed ✓ New data shared and existing action plan revised based on survey data and feedback ✓ Dates for upcoming school year scheduled with original planning group and School Safety Committee					

Appendix B: Student Survey

By completing this survey, I understand the purpose of the survey and agree to let Mrs. Painter use my results for her cyberbullying research project. I understand that my responses will remain anonymous and neither Mrs. Painter nor anyone else will know my responses. I may close out of the survey at any time that I feel uncomfortable and a counselor will be available to talk with me.

Cyberbullying and Online Aggression Survey Instrument[1]
2010 version
Sameer Hinduja, Ph.D. and Justin W. Patchin, Ph.D.

Cyberbullying Victimization

Cyberbullying is when someone repeatedly harasses, mistreats, or makes fun of another person online or while using cell phones or other electronic devices.

I have seen other people being cyberbullied.
Never
Once
A few times
Several times
Many times

In my lifetime, I have been cyberbullied.
Never
Once
A few times
Several times
Many times

In the last 30 days, I have been cyberbullied.
Never
Once
A few times
Several times
Many times

In the last 30 days, I have been cyberbullied in these ways...

[1] In the Public Domain - Hinduja, S. and Patchin, J. W. (2010). Cyberbullying and online aggression survey instrument: 2010 version. *Cyberbullying Research Center*.

Never
Once
A few times
Several times
Many times

Someone posted mean or hurtful comments about me online
Someone posted a mean or hurtful picture online of me
Someone posted a mean or hurtful video online of me
Someone created a mean or hurtful web page about me
Someone spread rumors about me online
Someone threatened to hurt me through a cell phone text message
Someone threatened to hurt me online
Someone pretended to be me online and acted in a way that was mean or hurtful to me

In the last 30 days, I have been cyberbullied in these online environments...
Never
Once
A few times
Several times
Many times

In a chat room
Through email
Through computer instant messages
Through cell phone text messages
Through cell phone
PictureMail or VideoMail
On MySpace
On Facebook
On a different social networking web site (other than MySpace or Facebook)
On Twitter
On YouTube
In virtual worlds such as Second Life, Gaia, or Habbo Hotel
While playing a massive multiplayer online game such as World of Warcraft, Everquest, Guild Wars, or Runescape
While playing online with Xbox, Playstation, Wii, PSP or similar device)

Cyberbullying Offending

Cyberbullying is when someone repeatedly harasses, mistreats, or makes fun of another person online or while using cell phones or other electronic devices.

In my lifetime, I have cyberbullied others.

Never
Once
A few times
Several times
Many times

In the last 30 days, I have cyberbullied others.
Never
Once
A few times
Several times
Many times

In the last 30 days, I have cyberbullied others in these ways...
Never
Once
A few times
Several times
Many times

I posted mean or hurtful comments about someone online
I posted a mean or hurtful picture online of someone
I posted a mean or hurtful video online of someone
I spread rumors about someone online
I threatened to hurt someone online
I threatened to hurt someone through a cell phone text message
I created a mean or hurtful web page about someone
I pretended to be someone else online and acted in a way that was mean or hurtful to them

In the last 30 days, I have cyberbullied others in these online environments...
Never
Once
A few times
Several times
Many times

In a chat room
Through email
Through computer instant messages
Through cell phone text messages
Through cell phone
PictureMail or VideoMail
On MySpace

On Facebook
On a different social networking web site (other than MySpace or Facebook)
On Twitter
On YouTube
In virtual worlds such as Second Life, Gaia, or Habbo Hotel
While playing a massive multiplayer online game such as World of Warcraft, Everquest, Guild Wars, or Runescape
While playing online with Xbox, Playstation, Wii, PSP or similar device)

By submitting this survey, I understand its purpose and its intended use and agree to use my responses anonymously for the research study.

Appendix C: Reliability/Validity of Hinduja and Patchin (2010) Student Survey

Psychometric Properties

Utilized in 4 different studies (2007-2010)
Over 12,000 11-18-year-old youth
Over 90 schools
Coefficients represent range across the 4 studies

Scale Construction

Cyberbullying Victimization Scale
Variety scale: recode to dichotomy (never=0; once or twice, a few times, many times, every day=1) range=0-9
Summary scale: never=0; once or twice=1; a few times=2; many times=3; every day=4. Sum responses with higher values representing more involvement in cyberbullying; range=0-36

Cyberbullying Offending Scale
Variety scale: recode to dichotomy (never=0; once or twice, a few times, many times, every day=1) range=0-9
Summary scale: never=0; once or twice=1; a few times=2; many times=3; every day=4. Sum responses with higher values representing more involvement in cyberbullying; range=0-36

Internal Reliability

Cyberbullying Victimization Scale – previous 30 days
(Cronbach's Alpha range 0.926-0.935)
I have been cyberbullied
Someone posted mean or hurtful comments about me online
Someone posted a mean or hurtful picture online of me online
Someone posted a mean or hurtful video online of me online
Someone created a mean or hurtful web page about me
Someone spread rumors about me online
Someone threatened to hurt me through a cell phone text message
Someone threatened to hurt me online
Someone pretended to be me online and acted in a way that was mean or hurtful

Cyberbullying Offending Scale – previous 30 days
(Cronbach's Alpha range 0.956-0.969)
I cyberbullied others
I posted mean or hurtful comments about someone online
I posted a mean or hurtful picture online of someone
I posted a mean or hurtful video online of someone
I spread rumors about someone online
I threatened to hurt someone online
I threatened to hurt someone through a cell phone text message
I created a mean or hurtful web page about someone
I pretended to be someone else online and acted in a way that was mean or hurtful to them

Factor Analysis

Cyberbullying Victimization Scale	Loadings
I have been cyberbullied	.686-.706
Someone posted mean or hurtful comments about me online	.770-.804
Someone posted a mean or hurtful picture online of me online	.880-.861
Someone posted a mean or hurtful video online of me online	.888-.900
Someone created a mean or hurtful web page about me	.889-.910
Someone spread rumors about me online	.771-.789
Someone threatened to hurt me through a cell phone text message	.808-.855
Someone threatened to hurt me online	.850-.870
Someone pretended to be me online and acted in a way that was mean or hurtful	.838-.866

All loaded onto 1 component; Eigenvalue range 6.07-6.40 (67.53-71.52% of variance)

Cyberbullying Offending Scale	Loadings
I cyberbullied others	.727-.762
I posted mean or hurtful comments about someone online	.838-.857
I posted a mean or hurtful picture online of someone	.940-.949
I posted a mean or hurtful video online of someone	.941-.949
I spread rumors about someone online	.890-.916
I threatened to hurt someone online	.914-.923
I threatened to hurt someone through a cell phone text message	.910-.924
I created a mean or hurtful web page about someone	.933-.942
I pretended to be someone else online and acted in a way that was mean or hurtful to them	.917-.933

All loaded onto 1 component; Eigenvalue range 7.21-7.34 (80.11-81.57% of variance)

Inter-Item Correlations

Cyberbullying Victimization Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. I have been cyberbullied								
2. Someone posted mean or hurtful comments about me online	.43-.57							
3. Someone posted a mean or hurtful picture online of me online	.36-.57	.62-.67						
4. Someone posted a mean or hurtful video online of me online	.30-.58	.56-.67	.80-.89					
5. Someone created a mean or hurtful web page about me	.37-.59	.59-.62	.80-.87	.83-.92				
6. Someone spread rumors about me online	.35-.51	.67-.72	.55-.63	.53-.62	.60-.69			
7. Someone threatened to hurt me through a cell phone text message	.37-.54	.62-.68	.60-.69	.60-.72	.62-.73	.65-.70		
8. Someone threatened to hurt me online	.50-.60	.64-.70	.63-.71	.62-.73	.67-.75	.61-.66	.75-.80	
9. Someone pretended to be me online and acted in a way that was mean or hurtful	.35-.55	.62-.64	.59-.77	.56-.77	.60-.78	.56-.66	.6.-.70	.69-.73

Cyberbullying Victimization Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. I cyberbullied others								
2. I posted mean or hurtful comments about someone online	.52-.68							
3. I posted a mean or hurtful picture online of someone	.45-.70	.72-.83						
4. I posted a mean or hurtful video online of someone	.53-.67	.71-.75	.90-.94					
5. I spread rumors about someone online	.49-.63	.72-.78	.82-.83	.82-.86				
6. I threatened to hurt someone online	.51-.66	.67-.78	.78-.83	.83-.85	.80-.84			
7. I threatened to hurt someone through a cell phone text message	.48-.64	.63-.75	.79-.84	.77-.84	.71-.83	.82-.88		
8. I created a mean or hurtful web page about someone	.51-.66	.69-.72	.86-.92	.88-.94	.82	.79-.83	.84-.85	
9. I pretended to be someone else online and acted in a way that was mean or hurtful to them	.46-.64	.65-.74	.85-.86	.86-.89	.79-.85	.78-.82	.82-.85	.88-.89

Replication using these measures is encouraged. Please contact us for proper attribution. Also, we would very much appreciate researchers who utilize our scales to send us the psychometric scores for their samples so we can continue to evaluate and refine the measures. Don't hesitate to contact us with questions.

Sameer Hinduja, Ph.D.
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
Florida Atlantic University
5353 Parkside Drive
Jupiter, FL 33458-2906
Phone: (561) 799-8227
Fax: (561) 799-8535
Email: hinduja@fau.edu

Justin W. Patchin, Ph.D.
Department of Political Science
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
105 Garfield - P.O. Box 4004
Eau Claire, WI 54702
Phone: (715) 836-4058
Fax: (715) 836-2944
Email: patchinj@uwec.edu

www.cyberbullying.us

General Rating Criteria for Evaluating Measures

Criterion Rating	*Exemplary*	*Extensive*	*Moderate*	*Minimal*
Inter-Item Correlation	Average of 0.30 or better	Average of 0.20 to 0.29	Average of 0.10 to 0.19	Average below 0.10
Alpha-Coefficient	0.80 or better	0.70 to 0.79	0.60 to 0.69	Less than 0.60
Test-Retest Reliability	Scores correlate more than 0.50 across a period of at least 1 year.	Scores correlate more than 0.40 across a period of 3–12 months.	Scores correlated more than 0.30 across a period of 1–3 months.	Scores correlated more than 0.20 across less than a 1 month period.
Convergent Validity	Highly significant correlations with more than two related measures.	Significant correlations with more than two related measures.	Significant correlations with two related measures.	Significant correlations with one related measure.
Discriminant Validity	Significantly different from four or more unrelated measures.	Significantly different from two or three unrelated measures.	Significantly different from one unrelated measure.	Different from one correlated measure.

Source: Robinson, J. P., Shaver, P. R., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1991). Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

From: Hamburger ME, Basile KC, Vivolo AM. Measuring Bullying Victimization, Perpetration, and Bystander Experiences: A Compendium of Assessment Tools. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, 2011. http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/BullyCompendiumBk-a.pdf

Appendix D: Parent Survey

Cyberbullying Parent Survey[2]

By completing this survey, I understand the purpose of the survey and agree to let Mrs. Painter use my results for her cyberbullying research project. I understand that my responses will remain anonymous and neither Mrs. Painter nor anyone else will know my responses.

1. How many children between the ages of 11-15 years old currently live in your household?
   One
   Two
   Three
   Four or more

For the remaining questions about children, please refer to only those children between the ages of 11-15 that are currently living in your household.

2. Do any of your children currently have a social media account (i.e. Facebook, Twitter, Myspace, etc.)?
   Yes, all or some children have a social media account
   No, none of my children have a social media account
   Not Sure

3. Where do your children (ages 11 to 15) access their social media account?
   Computer at home
   Computer at school
   Smart phone or cellular device
   Other (i.e. Internet over TV or gaming device)

4. Do you monitor the security setting levels of your children's accounts?
   Yes, I monitor the security setting levels of their accounts
   No, I do not monitor the security setting levels of their accounts

5. Are you concerned that any of your children (ages 11-15) could be teased, harassed or bullied through a social media site?

[2] In the Public Domain - American Osteopathic Association (2011). *2011 Cyberbullying survey: Final results*. Relevant Research, Inc.

Yes
No

6. Have any of your children (ages 11-15) ever been teased, harassed or bullied by others over social media?
   Yes
   No

7. Has your child been teased, harassed or bullied by others over social media more than once?
   Yes
   No

8. Are you concerned that any of your children (ages 11-15) could tease, harass or bully other children over a social media site?
   Yes
   No

9. Have you ever had to take steps to resolve a bullying situation over social media involving any of your children (ages 11-15)?
   Yes
   No

10. Do you feel it is the responsibility of parents/guardians to resolve bullying situations that occur over social media?
    Yes
    No

11. Do you feel it is the responsibility of teachers or school officials to resolve bullying situations that occur over social media?
    Yes
    No

12. Have you ever discussed cyberbullying with any of your children ages 11-15?
    Yes
    No

By submitting this survey, I understand its purpose and its intended use and agree to use my responses anonymously for the research study.

Appendix E: Letter of Cooperation

Letter of Cooperation from a Community Research Partner

_____ Public Schools
Street Address
City, State, Zip

August 15, 2013

Dear Amy Painter,

Based on my review of your research proposal, I give permission for you to conduct the study entitled *The Presence of Cyberbullying in Rural Middle Schools: Advanced Technology, School Initiatives, and Parent Involvement* within _____ Public Schools. As part of this study, I authorize you to conduct a random sample of middle school students to conduct survey research to both students and parents, including collection of data via surveys. Data and results shared among school and/or district level administration. Individuals' participation will be voluntary and at their own discretion.

We understand that our organization's responsibilities include: _____ Public Schools will allocate approximately 10 minutes of non-instructional time per selected consented student to complete an online survey once during the study.

_____ Public Schools reserves the right to withdraw from the study at any time if our circumstances change.

I confirm that I am authorized to approve research in this setting.

I understand that the data collected will remain entirely confidential and may not be provided to anyone outside of the research team without permission from the Walden University IRB.

Sincerely,

Appendix F: Confidentiality Agreement

Confidentiality Agreement

Signer's Name:_____

During the course of my activity in collecting data for this research: *The Presence of Cyberbullying in Rural Middle Schools: Advanced Technology, School Initiatives, and Parent Involvement*. I will have access to information, which is confidential and should not be disclosed. I acknowledge that the information must remain confidential, and that improper disclosure of confidential information can be damaging to the participant.

By signing this Confidentiality Agreement I acknowledge and agree that:

1. I will not disclose or discuss any confidential information with others, including friends or family.
2. I will not in any way divulge, copy, release, sell, loan, alter or destroy any confidential information except as properly authorized.
3. I will not discuss confidential information where others can overhear the conversation. I understand that it is not acceptable to discuss confidential information even if the participant's name is not used.
4. I will not make any unauthorized transmissions, inquiries, modification or purging of confidential information.
5. I agree that my obligations under this agreement will continue after termination of the job that I will perform.
6. I understand that violation of this agreement will have legal implications.
7. I will only access or use systems or devices I'm officially authorized to access and I will not demonstrate the operation or function of systems or devices to unauthorized individuals.

Signing this document, I acknowledge that I have read the agreement and I agree to comply with all the terms and conditions stated above.

_____ _____

Signature **Date**

Appendix G: Resources

Anti-Defamation League. (2012). *Bullying prevention and intervention tips for families.* Retrieved from http://www.adl.org/combatbullying

Anti-Defamation League. (2014b). *The "grown folks" guide to popular apps in social media.* Retrieved http://www.adl.org/education-outreach/bullying-cyberbullying/

Cornell, D. (n.d.). *Bullying assessment flow chart.* Retrieved from *http://youthviolence.edschool.virginia*

Hathcote, A. R., & Hogan, K. A. (2011). Resource guide on cyberbullying. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 55*(2), 102-104.

Patchin, J., & Hinduja, S. (2013). *Words wound: Delete cyberbullying and make kindness go viral*. Free Spirit Publishing.

Curriculum Vitae

Amy Foltz Painter

Education

Walden University 2011 - present
- Doctorate of Education - Administrative Leadership
- 4.0 GPA
- Expected graduation in 2014

James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA 2008 - 2009
- Post-Masters Educational Leadership Certificate
- 4.0 GPA
- SLLA assessment score of 196/200

Eastern Mennonite University, Harrisonburg, VA 2002 - 2004
- Masters of Education Degree in Curriculum & Instruction
- 4.0 GPA

Eastern Mennonite University, Harrisonburg, VA 1996 - 1999
- Major: Liberal Arts, Minor: History & Social Science
- Education Certification: NK - 8

Elon College, Elon College, NC 1995 - 1996
- Undecided major
- Leadership scholarship

Administrative Experience

Rockingham County Public Schools 2014 - Present

Principal, Linville-Edom Elementary School, Linville, VA
- Responsible for all aspects of the school as the sole administrator
- Responsible for selecting and evaluating school staff
- Responsible for discipline and attendance
- Responsible for allocation and proper use of all school funds and monies
- Collects and disaggregates instructional data for academic improvement
- Conducts School Council meetings bi-monthly
- Leader of Professional Learning Communities

Page County Public Schools 2010 - 2014

Assistant Principal/Athletic Director, Page County Middle School, Shenandoah, VA

- School-site test coordinator for local and state assessments
- Served on Division Technology Committee
- UVA's Project SCOPE VII Cohort
- Athletic Director responsibilities included scheduling, obtained referees, announced games, collected and handled Athletic Department monies
- Organized Page County District Spelling Bees
- School Process Manager for Indistar School Improvement Plan
- Scheduled and held attendance meetings for tardy/truant students
- Conducted FBAs, write BIPs, and 504 plans as appropriate
- Trained to score VAAPs
- Responsible for discipline, attendance, and teacher evaluations
- Collected and disaggregated instructional data for academic improvement
- Collected evidence to support School Improvement indicators and tasks
- Interviewed candidates for school vacancies

Assistant Principal, Luray Elementary School, Luray, VA

- One year, 12 month contract, One year, 10.5 month contact
- Member of UVA's Project SCOPE VII Cohort
- Responsible for discipline, attendance, and teacher evaluations
- Collected and disaggregated instructional data for academic improvement
- Collected evidence to support School Improvement indicators and tasks
- Interviewed candidates for school vacancies
- Served on the school Response to Intervention (RtI) team
- Served on School Improvement Team
- Served on District School Improvement Team
- School-site test coordinator for local and state assessments

Teaching Experience

Page County Public Schools 1999 - 2010

3rd Grade, Stanley Elementary School, Stanley, VA

- 7 years in inclusive classroom
- Grade level chairperson for 2 years

4th Grade, Stanley Elementary School, Stanley, VA

- 4 years in departmentalized grade level
- Language arts teacher

Related Experience

Field Placement Supervisor - University of Phoenix Jan-May 2011

- Advisor for student teacher

- Responsible for student teacher support/evaluations

Administrative Designee 2008-2010
- Responsible for discipline in Principal's absence

Student Study Chairperson for Stanley Elementary School 2005 - 2010
- Received referrals, plan, and implement meetings
- Referred students to Child Study if suspected disability
- Worked closely with teachers and school psychologists

21st Century Community Learning Based Grant 2007 - 2008
- After-School Program
- Role of Teacher & Coordinator

Cooperative Teacher for JMU Students 2007 - 2008
- Every Monday for Fall Semester of 2007
- Every Tuesday and Thursday for Fall Semester of 2008
- Provided feedback & support to student

Professional Affiliations
- Member of Page County Education Association
- Member of Virginia Education Association
- Member of National Education Association
- Member of Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development

CommunityAffiliations
- Member of Calvary Independent Church of the Brethren
- Active coach, participant, and volunteer in Page County's Recreation Department programs