

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF FACE-TO-FACE AND CYBERBULLYING IN SIXTH GRADE STUDENTS

Authors

DENISE B. ACCORDINO, Ph.D., is a Special Services Psychologist for West Springfield Public Schools in West Springfield, Massachusetts.

MICHAEL P. ACCORDINO, D.Ed., CRC, LMHC, is an Associate Professor for the Department of Rehabilitation and Disability Studies in the School of Health Science and Rehabilitation Studies at Springfield College in Springfield, Massachusetts.

Abstract

In a pilot study, sixth grade students ($N = 124$) completed a questionnaire assessing students' experience with bullying and cyberbullying, demographic information, quality of parent-child relationship, and ways they have dealt with bullying/cyberbullying in the past. Two multiple regression analyses were conducted. The multiple regression analysis of the number of times in their lifetime that students were bullied yielded an R^2 of .18 and two significant predictors. Telling a parent when a victim of bullying was related to an increase in bullying, and having a history of bullying others was associated with a significantly higher rate of being bullied. The analysis of being cyberbullied in one's lifetime revealed an R^2 of .29 and three significant predictors. Students with close parental relationships were bullied less often, internet chat/social network frequency was positively associated with an increase in being cyberbullied, and students who participated in cyberbullying were cyberbullied more often.

Keywords: bullying, cyberbullying, middle school, adolescence, and parental relationships

Adolescent school violence often involves students bullying their peers. Recent studies (Slonje & Smith, 2008; Smith et al., 2008) have indicated that cyberbullying ranks as one of the most common forms of harassment among adolescents. Hay and Meldrum (2010) indicate that bullying and cyberbullying can lead to self-harm and suicidal ideation. For the purpose of this study, bullying is defined as face-to-face coercion, intimidation, and aggression toward peers, and cyberbullying is defined as repeatedly misusing technology to intimidate, harass, terrorize, or bully others (Franek, 2006). Technology includes but is not limited to e-mail, text messaging, chat rooms, cellular phones, camera phones, web sites, blogs, and social networks such as Facebook and MySpace (Brown, Jackson, & Cassidy, 2006).

The prevalence of becoming a victim of face-to-face bullying during one's time in school has been identified as between eight and 20% (Davidson & Demaray, 2007). Kowalski and Limber (2007) found the prevalence rates for various forms of cyberbullying between 11 and 16%. To put these percentages in perspective, according to the 2010 Census, the population of children between the ages of 10 and 14 was 20,677,194 and from ages 15 to 19 was 22,040,343 (US Census, 2011). Face-to-face bullying often takes an emotional toll on the victims. Recent studies have shown that adolescents who are bullied are at significant risk for depression and suicide (Klomek, Marrocco, Kleinman, Schonfeld, & Gould, 2008) as well as academic achievement problems (Beran, 2009; Hoglund, 2007).

Cyberbullying is a problem that has reached a global scale with incidents occurring in the United States, Canada, Japan, Scandinavia and the United Kingdom, as well as in Australia and New Zealand (Campbell, 2005). One of the major reasons why cyberbullying has expanded so quickly is because it has some major differences with traditional face-to-face bullying, especially the aspect of disinhibition.

Review of Literature

Face-To-Face Bullying

Face-to-face bullying is a common problem across the globe. Due et al. (2005) studied 28 countries and found a strong association between face-to-face bullying and physical symptoms such as headache and stomachache, and psychological symptoms such as anger management problems, sleep disorders, and feelings of loneliness and helplessness. Clearly, bullying is a problem that affects children from many different countries in similar ways despite cultural differences. Bullies also seem to share a similar social position in middle school.

Olweus (1999) reports that face-to-face bullies tend to enjoy violence,

like to dominate others, and have a low capacity for empathizing with victims. Veenstra et al. (2005) found that children who engaged in face-to-face bullying in the elementary grades tended to be socially ineffective aggressors who were ultimately more likely to be bullied themselves as they entered middle school. Gutman and Brown (2008) found similar results to Veenstra et al. regarding the characteristics of face-to-face bullies. Solberg, Olweus, and Endresen (2007) conducted a detailed analysis of the phenomenon and found that, while the trend of face-to-face bullies becoming victims is apparent, it is a small segment of the population of face-to-face bullying victims. Furthermore, it is more likely to happen to males than females.

Davidson and Demaray (2007) found that parental and social support serves as a buffer between victimization and distress from face-to-face bullying. Specifically, the more support that a victim perceived from family and school, the lesser the internalized effects of the bullying. Males tend to benefit from school-related support (i.e., teachers, classmates) whereas females benefit from parental support when dealing with the distress of being a victim of bullying.

Wei and Jonson-Reid (2011) found that having friends is not necessarily a guarantee that one will avoid being bullied or feel supported. Wei and Jonson-Reid found that almost one third of bullying events actually occurred in the context of friendship or the perception of friendship. The authors reasoned that some adolescent friends can be skilled manipulators as well as aggressive or abusive. As a result, more research is warranted for identifying protective factors in face-to-face bullying.

Cyberbullying

As previously mentioned, disinhibition is a major problem in cyberbullying. Willard (2003) has identified five theoretical factors that help explain the issue of disinhibition. First, when a student uses technology, he or she is virtually invisible. The opportunities for anonymity as well as false identities are many and can give the opportunity to behave in ways that might not occur if one's identity were known. Second, cyberbullies cannot easily receive visual feedback of the pain they are inflicting via technology, which results in a lack of need for empathy. Third, today's social norms seem to promote online misbehavior, which acts like a supportive mechanism. Fourth, students have the opportunities to assume the role of "avatar", which is an online personality. If students can bully through an online personality, they may be less likely to feel personally responsible for the bullying and hide behind the avatar. Last, students who feel more comfortable communicating online than in person tend to see cyberbullying as a viable option,

especially students who have been victims of face-to-face bullying. Such students can use technology as a medium for revenge.

Dehue, Bolman, and Vollink (2008) studied cyberbullying and found that the practice was generally anonymous, individual in nature, and most often took place at home. They found that the majority of the cyberbullying took place in chat rooms while a smaller amount took place on cell phones via text messages. Over one-third of those cyberbullied did not know the identity of the bully. Some of the coping techniques that were studied included ignoring the bully, avoiding school, telling a parent(s), telling a friend, and telling a teacher. Parents were also surveyed and reported setting rules for internet behavior but not being aware of the harassment that their children experienced.

Ybarra and Mitchell (2004b) conducted a large study on the characteristics of youth engaging in cyberbullying by surveying 1,501 males and females between the ages of 10 and 17, as well as one of each of the youth's caregivers. They found that many children who reported participating in cyberbullying also had poor parent-child relationships. In fact, 44 percent of cyberbullies reported poor emotional attachment to their caregivers in comparison to 16 percent of cyberbullies who reported more stable relationships with their parents. Ybarra and Mitchell concluded that a poor parent-child relationship is a key identifier of cyberbullies.

In addition, Ybarra and Mitchell (2004a) have posited that cyberbullies are more likely than non-cyberbullies to engage in frequent daily internet use, which in turn leads to more opportunities for cyberbullying. The authors also found that students who reported cyberbullying were also targets of face-to-face bullying. Ybarra, Mitchell, Wolak, and Finkelhorn (2006) found a similarly strong association between being an aggressor and victim of such behavior.

The objective of this exploratory study is to add to a growing amount of research on the problem of cyberbullying. Few studies have looked at the factors that lead to becoming a victim of face-to-face bullying and cyberbullying in a parallel manner. Consequently, this paper will describe a study that assessed predictors of lifetime bullying and cyberbullying frequency in sixth grade students.

Method

Participants

A total of 124 (76 females [61%] and 48 males [39%]) sixth grade students completed a questionnaire assessing bullying and cyberbullying. The sixth grade was chosen for this exploratory study because it is seen as the entrée

to middle school. Moreover, the sixth grade students had recently taken part in Build Respect, Stop Bullying, a computer program that helps middle school students increase respect of others and reduce participation in all forms of bullying (Channing Bete Company, 2004). As a result, awareness of bullying and cyberbullying was heightened among sixth graders and their parents. It is important to note that this sample was not randomly assigned.

This sample was out of 301 possible sixth graders, providing a 41% response rate. In terms of ethnicity, there were 100 (81%) Caucasian, four (3%) Black or African American, 10 (8%) Hispanic and 10 (8%) students considered as "Other." Eight (7%) students received Special Education services.

Procedure

Three hundred and one sixth grade students at a suburban middle school were provided a brief verbal summary of the project in order to obtain student consent. We then distributed informed consent forms to interested students requesting parental consent to allow student to participate in a voluntary research project. To encourage involvement in the study, all participants were entered into a drawing for one of four movie tickets. Students who assented and returned the parent-signed consent forms ($N = 124$) were read brief statements on the aforementioned definitions of bullying and cyberbullying by their homeroom teachers and given an ad hoc questionnaire (see Appendix).

Instrument

The rationale for inclusion of the items in the survey was based on existing literature on bullying (Davidson & Demaray, 2007), cyberbullying (Dehue et al., 2008; Subrahmanyam & Greenfield, 2008) and how parental closeness has an impact on both bullying and cyberbullying (Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004a, 2004b). The survey assessed students' demographic information, technology use, closeness of parent-child relationship (on a scale from one to seven with one = "Not close" and seven = "Very close") and coping mechanisms, which were patterned after those analyzed in a recent study by Dehue et al. Internal consistency reliability of the instrument was assessed. The survey is presented in the Appendix.

Demographics included (a) gender, (b) age, (c) grade, (d) ethnicity, and (e) being a recipient of Special Education services. Technology questions pertained to having an e-mail account and hours spent using (a) cell phones, (b) instant messaging, and (c) chatrooms/social networking sites. Students' confidence in knowledge of technology (on a Likert scale from one to seven with one = "No confidence" and seven = "Very confident") was also assessed. Lastly, students were asked about the number of times

they were bullied and cyberbullied in their lifetime, and how they coped or would cope with these problems (i.e., ignore the situation, tell a friend, tell a teacher, avoid school, tell a parent, tell a counselor, and fight back). The final two items asked if students thought that bullying and cyberbullying were problems at the middle school.

Table 1. Frequencies of Strategies to Cope with Bullying ($n = 39$) and Cyberbullying ($n = 16$)

Variable	Bullying <i>N</i>	Valid %	Cyberbullying <i>n</i>	Valid %
Ignore				
Yes	18	51	6	38
No	19	49	10	62
Tell a Friend				
Yes	23	62	10	62
No	14	38	6	38
Tell a Teacher				
Yes	15	41	7	44
No	22	59	9	56
Tell a Parent				
Yes	26	70	12	75
No	11	30	4	25
Tell a Counselor				
Yes	19	51	11	69
No	18	49	5	31
Fight Back				
Yes	12	32	8	50
No	25	68	7	44
Avoid School				
Yes	0	0	0	0
No	39	100	16	100

Statistical Analyses

Two multiple regression analyses were used to identify significant predictors of lifetime incidences of being bullied and cyberbullied. In terms of being bul-

lied, the variables assessed were: (a) gender, (b) ethnicity (dummy coded as 1 = Caucasian and 0 = Non Caucasian), (c) recipient of Special Education Services, (d) relationship with parents, (e) ignore situation, (f) tell a friend, (g) tell a teacher, (h) tell a parent, (i) tell a counselor, (j) fight back, (k) avoid school, and l) have you ever bullied another person. Items (e) through (l) were dummy coded as yes = 1 and no = 0. For being cyberbullied, variables studied included: (a) gender, (b) ethnicity, (c) recipient of Special Education Services, (d) relationship with parents, (e) hours per day using a cell phone, (f) hours per day instant messaging, (g) hours per day spent in chat rooms/social networks, (h) have you ever cyberbullied another person, (i) tell a parent, (j) ignore, and (k) tell a teacher (telling a counselor and fighting back were highly correlated with the other independent variables and were omitted from the analysis). Items (h) through (k) were dummy coded as yes = 1 and no = 0. Avoiding school was omitted as a variable since none of the students reported using it as a strategy. A power analysis found that in analyzing 11 predictors with an alpha of .025 (Bonferroni correction method = .05/2 analyses), to achieve a power level of .81 that could detect an effect size as low as .15, (medium; Cohen, 1988), a sample size of 124 participants was required.

Table 2. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Frequency of Being Bullied Face-to-Face			
Variable	B	SE B	β
Gender	1.15	.56	.19
Ethnicity	.95	.94	.08
Receiving Special Education services	1.45	1.10	.12
Relationship with Parents	-.28	.20	-.13
Ignore the Bully	.73	.85	.12
Tell a Friend	.08	.57	.01
Tell a Teacher	.24	.72	-.10
Tell a Parent	1.61	1.00	.15*
Tell a Counselor	2.10	.99	.21
Fight Back	1.25	.93	.12
Admitted to Bullying	2.00	.91	.18*
R^2	.18		
F	2.17		

Note. * $p < .025$.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

In terms of technology use, students reported spending an average of 1.51 hours ($SD = 2.75$) using a cell phone, 1.13 hours ($SD = 1.79$) instant messaging, and .76 hours ($SD = 1.61$) in chatrooms/social networking sites per day. Students reported an average confidence in their knowledge of technology rating of 4.94 ($SD = 1.23$); the minimum confidence was two and the maximum was seven. Ninety students (73%) reported having an e-mail account while 51 (27%) did not. Regarding relationship with parents, the average closeness rating was 5.91 ($SD = 1.43$), with a minimum rating of one and a maximum of seven.

Within the sample, 39 students (32%) reported being the target of bullying an average of 1.28 times ($SD = 3.01$). Sixteen students (13%) reported being cyberbullied an average of .52 times ($SD = 1.85$). Thirty-one students (25%) reported bullying another person and six students (5%) admitted participating in cyberbullying. Only eight students (7%) reported knowing the identity of the perpetrator. Seventy-six (61%) students felt that bullying was a problem at the middle school whereas 40 (32%) students felt that cyberbullying was a problem. The internal consistency reliability for the instrument was $\alpha = .81$.

Multiple regression analyses. The multiple regression analysis of face-to-face bullying yielded an R^2 of .18 and two significant predictors (see Table 2). Specifically, students who reported telling a parent when bullied experienced an increase in being a victim of bullying compared to students who did not tell (about 1.6 more times). In addition, students who had a history of bullying others were themselves bullied an average of 2 times more than those who never bullied. The effect size for this analysis was $f^2 = .22$, which is in the medium range of effect (Cohen, 1988).

The analysis of cyberbullying revealed an R^2 of .29 and found three significant predictors (see Table 3). Students who reported a close parental relationship were cyberbullied .25 times less for every unit increase in their rating of closeness (from one to seven) than those who reported a distant relationship with parents. For every increase of one hour of internet chat/social networking time, the frequency that a student was cyberbullied increased by .20. Finally, students who reported participating in cyberbullying were more likely to be victims of the practice (about 1.6 more times). The effect size for this multiple regression analysis was $f^2 = .41$ and is in the large range of effect (Cohen, 1988).

The finding that students who were cyberbullies had a higher frequency of being the target of face-to-face bullying has been discussed in the litera-

ture. Ybarra and Mitchell (2004a) and Willard (2003) have theorized that students who are victims of traditional face-to-face bullying may tend to engage in cyberbullying as a source of revenge. In order to assess whether the current study supported the contention by Ybarra and Mitchell (2004a) that cyberbullies are more likely than non-cyberbullies to be targets of face-to-face bullying, a post-hoc bivariate correlation was conducted between the variables of participating in cyberbullying and how many times they were bullied face-to-face. However, this analysis revealed results that were statistically insignificant. It is possible that the insignificant results were due to the small and nonrandom sample. Furthermore, in line with the research of Solberg et al. (2007), there simply may not have been a large number of cyberbullies who were face-to-face bullying victims.

Table 3 . Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Frequency of Being Cyberbullied

Variable	B	SE B	β
Gender	-.24	.23	-.09
Ethnicity	.17	.27	.06
Receiving Special Education services	-.24	.43	-.05
Relationship with Parents	-.25	.07	-.28**
Hours per Day using Cell Phone	.03	.04	.06
Hours per Day Instant Messaging	.043	.07	.06
Hours per Day in Chat Rooms/Social Networks	.20	.07	.26**
Ignore	-.11	.22	-.04
Tell a Parent	.01	.27	.01
Tell Teacher	.17	.24	.07
Admitted to Cyberbullying	1.61	.54	.25**
R^2	.29		
F	4.12		

Note. * $p < .025$. ** $p < .01$.

Discussion

As supported by previous research (Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004b, Subrahman-yam & Greenfield, 2008), this study revealed that students who indicated that they had distant parent-child relationships tended to have higher incidences of bullying and/or cyberbullying. One explanation might be that

students who have distant or problematic relationships with their parents may not have developed the strategies necessary to avoid and effectively deal with bullying/cyberbullying. Furthermore, such students may lack parental support or guidance. The research of Davidson and Demaray (2007) revealed the protective qualities of parental and social support, which can mediate the effects of face-to-face bullying. Support from family, which females seem to benefit well from, and school, which can be quite helpful for males, can lessen the fear and isolation created by bullying.

Telling a parent was found to be a maladaptive coping technique for face-to-face bullying in this study. Currently, no studies could be found that analyzed this pattern. One hypothesis of the authors is that when parents are aware that their children are being bullied and get involved, their influence may exacerbate the situation temporarily by causing repercussions against the bully. Such a problem is likely if a parent handles the situation inappropriately. For example, if a parent confronts a child's bully, the bully may in turn feel humiliated, which could exacerbate the intensity of future bullying. Furthermore, when parents become over-involved in their child's bullying situation, they may hinder the child's ability to effectively learn the proper skills of dealing with the problem. However, informing parents would seem important as a response to bullying and both the victim and parents should develop a strategy that allows for both parental advocacy and victim autonomy.

The finding that the amounts of time students spend in chat rooms/social networking contributed to cyberbullying supports the results found by Dehue et al. (2008), Hinduja and Patchin (2008), and Ybarra and Mitchell (2004a). Their research indicated that cyberbullying is more prevalent when using the internet for extended periods of time. Based on these results, it would seem prudent to focus on parents setting limits with regard to online activities and electronic media (e.g., cell phone texting).

In this study, students who reported taking part in both face-to-face bullying and cyberbullying were also significantly more likely to be victims of the same practices. Although Willard (2003) discussed how cyberbullying could be a mode of revenge for students who are victims of face-to-face bullying, that trend was not found in this study. It may be possible that cyberbullying can also be used as revenge against being cyberbullied, especially when anonymity is ensured. Similarly, it may be that students who are victims of face-to-face bullying may respond by assimilating some of the same methods towards others as a way of regaining personal control and increasing self-worth. As mentioned earlier, Veenstra et al. (2005) found that children who engaged in face-to-face bullying while in elementary school

were often lacking in social skills, which in turn, made them targets for bullying in middle school. Gutman and Brown (2008) and Solberg et al. (2007) found similar results. It may be that both bullies and cyberbullies can be vulnerable to reciprocal treatment as the result of having a marginal social position in middle school.

Limitations

The current study is limited to a nonrandom, convenience sample of students from one community who attended a single middle school. The 41% response rate was also somewhat low. Ethnic minority groups were underrepresented and may have affected the generalizability of the results in unexpected ways. Furthermore, there were only a small percentage of students (7%) receiving Special Education services in this sample; close to 17% of the entire sixth grade received such services. The current study is also limited by its reliance on self-report data. Given the fact that parents had to consent prior to their child's participation in this study, it is possible that the respondents had a rather close parent-child relationship. Therefore, the students who did not respond may have also experienced face-to-face bullying and cyberbullying. However, this is a hypothesis of the authors without supportive empirical evidence at the present time. The measure also did not assess the number of perpetrators that victims faced in the bullying/cyberbullying incidents. Such information would be useful in learning the particular dynamics of the bullying. Another limitation to note was that the participants had just received a bullying prevention program, which may have influenced their responses. Furthermore, asking students to produce retrospective data such as recalling the number of times they were bullied/cyberbullied may have been a difficult task given their age and development. Finally, more psychometric data and validity research on the ad hoc instrument was needed in order to assess if the instrument was adequately measuring the constructs that were included.

Implications for future research. Additional research is needed with middle school students in order to assess if the incident level of bullying and cyberbullying is increasing, decreasing, or remaining stable. The current study obtained the opinion of students; however, future research could include parent and/or teacher assessment of the extent of bullying/cyberbullying in their school as well as the quality of response to such incidences. Research by Sutton and Smith (1999) recognizes bullying as a group process, meaning that many students play some sort of role in the bullying incident. Thus, group problem-solving interventions should be explored. It is important to study the effects of bullying and cyberbullying on students as well as

the factors that lead individuals to engage in bullying behavior (Campbell, 2005). More research regarding the trauma that victims experience as well as the detrimental effects on their school performance is needed.

Implications for practice. As mentioned earlier, it is critical to provide methods for improving student-parent relationships. A major aspect of a good relationship between middle school students and parents is positive and open communication. In this study, while telling a parent may have exacerbated the situation with face-to-face bullying, it remains an important avenue to explore. Many strategies reported in the literature focus on parental involvement and how it can mitigate the negative effects of bullying. However, when the parent-child bond is weak or dysfunctional, interventions need to be directed more toward the student. Building upon a teacher-student or counselor-student relationship should also be pursued.

It would also seem useful for future intervention programs to bring exposure to the emotional distress that bullying and cyberbullying victims face. The National Association of School Psychologists (Desrochers, 2008) presents various tips for supporting children's mental health through rules and conduct that include: (a) easily understood rules of conduct and fair discipline practices; (b) ensuring an adult presence in common areas (i.e., hallways, cafeteria, locker rooms, playgrounds, computer rooms) and reinforcing the availability of adult support; (c) teaching children to work together to support victims and stand up to bullies; and (d) encouraging students to reach out to excluded or lonely peers. These are relatively easy to implement interventions in that they involve practical rather than financial obstacles.

According to the literature, caution needs to be exercised when addressing the treatment of both forms of bullying (Veenstra et al., 2005). When dealing with face-to-face bullying and cyberbullying, an undesired result is that the bully, in addition to his or her punishment, is not accepted and often times is rejected from one's peer group as well as the school population at large. It is important that these consequences be considered due to the detrimental effects of such treatment on a students' educational and emotional/behavioral development (Veenstra et al.).

In terms of cyberbullying, involving students in prevention efforts is a systematic intervention that helps both the bully and victim. Given that students today have more confidence in using technology, this arena seems important to address. Such efforts would include educating students regarding safe internet behavior via a code of ethics, providing ways to report early indications of possible bullying behavior, instructing students in avoidance and de-escalation techniques, and posting a list of contact personnel or

developing a school task force on cyberbullying to address when an incident has reached a harmful level. Students would also benefit from critical thinking skills when viewing material on the internet. For example, when students view a photograph that was altered or a video that was edited to make another student look unfavorable, they should have the skill to see through the manipulation and quickly report it to a school official. Overall, it is important for students to feel connected and cared for, whether at school or home. Students who do not have strong connections tend to be more vulnerable to both forms of bullying (Bamford, 2005).

There are several intervention programs that have been developed to reduce bullying and cyberbullying. One notable intervention is *The Bullying Prevention Program: Blueprints for Violence Prevention* (Olweus, Limber, & Mihalic, 1999). This program is a comprehensive approach that seeks to prevent bullying and improve the social climate of a school by instituting new rules and a thorough monitoring system of the problem. Two objectives of the Olweus et al. program are an increased awareness of bullying school wide as well as empathy for students who are targets. Another program with similar objectives is the *Build Respect, Stop Bullying* (Channing Bete Company, 2004) mentioned previously. This intervention seeks to promote awareness of the effects of bullying by having victims share their negative experiences.

Stephens and Spears (2006) found that having students who have been victims of bullying tell their stories via video (*Promoting Positive Peer Relationships [P3R]*) tended to increase the amount of empathy that viewers had toward the victims. Such an intervention seems promising to address the problem of the lack of empathy, especially in face-to-face bullying, discussed by Olweus (1999) and cyberbullying, discussed by Willard (2003). By allowing students to put themselves in the place of someone who has been bullied, the chances of becoming a bully would seem to be reduced (Campbell, 2005). Furthermore, by raising the sensitivity of students toward the victims of bullying, the chances of students supporting these victims should also increase. Consequently, positive peer relationships among students would potentially ensue.

References

- Bamford, A. (2005). Cyber-bullying. *Classroom*, 25(1), 18-19.
- Beran, T. (2009). Correlates of peer victimization and achievement: An exploratory model. *Psychology in the Schools*, 46(4), 348-361.
- Brown, K., Jackson, M., & Cassidy, W. (2006). Cyber-bullying: Developing policy to direct responses that are equitable and effective in addressing this special form of bullying. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, Issue 57, 1-35.

- Campbell, M. A. (2005) Cyber bullying: An old problem in a new guise? *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counseling*, 15(1), 68-76.
- Channing Bete Company. (2004). *Build respect, stop bullying®: A Success in stages® for middle students*. South Deerfield, MA: Author.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Davidson, L. M., & Demaray, M. K. (2007). Social support as a moderator between victimization and internalizing-externalizing distress from bullying. *School Psychology Review*, 36, 383-405.
- Dehue, F., Bolman, C., & Vollink, T. (2008). Cyberbullying: Youngsters' experiences and parental perception. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 11, 217-223.
- Desrochers, J. (2008). Supporting children's' mental health: Tips for parents and educators, *NASP Communiqué*, 36, Insert.
- Due, P., Holstein, B., Lynch, J., Gabhain, S., Currie, C., Scheidt, P., et al. (2005). Bullying and symptoms among school-aged children: International comparative cross sectional study in 28 countries. *European Journal of Public Health*, 15(2), 128-132.
- Franeck, M. (2006). Foiling cyberbullies in the new wild west. *Educational Leadership*, 63(4), 39-43.
- Gutman, L., & Brown, J. (2008). *The importance of social worlds: An investigation of peer relations* (Research Report 29). London: Centre for Research on the Wider Benefits of Learning (020 7612 6291).
- Hay, C., & Meldrum, R. (2010). Bullying victimization and adolescent self-harm: Testing hypotheses from general strain theory. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 39, 446-459.
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2008). Cyberbullying: An exploratory analysis of factors related to offending and victimization. *Deviant Behavior*, 29(2), 129-156.
- Hoglund, W. L. (2007). School Functioning in early adolescence: Gender-linked responses to peer victimization, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(4), 683-699.
- Klomek, A. B., Marrocco, F., Kleinman, M., Schonfeld, I. S., & Gould, M. S. (2008). Peer victimization, depression, and suicidality in adolescents. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 38, 166-180.
- Kowalski, R. M., & Limber, S. P. (2007). Electronic bullying among middle school students. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41, 22-30.
- Olweus, D., Limber, S. P., & Mihalic, S. (1999). *The bullying prevention program: Blueprints for violence prevention*, Vol. 10. Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence: Boulder, CO.
- Olweus, D. (1999). Sweden. In P. K. Smith, Y. Morita, J. Junger-Tas, D. Olweus, R. Catalano & P. Slee (Eds.), *The nature of school bullying: A cross-national perspective* (pp. 7-27). London: Routledge.
- Slonje, R., & Smith, P. K. (2008). Cyberbullying: Another main type of bullying? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 49, 147-154.
- Smith, P., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S. Russell, S., & Tippett, N. (2008). *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 49, 376-385.
- Solberg, M. E., Olweus, D., & Endresen, I. M. (2007). Bullies and victims at school: Are they the same pupils? *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(2), 441-464. doi:10.1348/000709906X105689

- Stephens, R., & Spears, B. (2006). *Changing attitudes to bullying: The 'Stories of Us' video intervention*. Unpublished with Honors Thesis: University of South Australia.
- Subrahmanyam, K., & Greenfield, P. (2008) Online communication and adolescent relationships. *Future of Children, 18*, 119-146.
- Sutton, J., & Smith, P. (1999). Bullying as a group process: An adaptation of the participant role approach. *Aggressive Behavior, 25*, 97-111.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2011). *Age and sex composition: 2010*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Oldehonkel, A. L., DeWinter, A. F., Verhulst, F. C., & Ormel, J. (2005). Bullying and victimization in elementary schools: A comparison of bullies, victims, bully/victims, and uninvolved preadolescents. *Developmental Psychology, 41*, 672-682.
- Wei, H., & Jonson-Reid, M. (2011). Friends can hurt you: Examining the coexistence of friendship and bullying among early adolescents. *School Psychology International, 32*(3), 244-262.
- Willard, N. (2003). Off-campus, harmful online student speech. *Journal of School Violence, 1*(2), 65-93.
- Ybarra, M. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2004a). Online aggressor/targets, aggressors, and targets: A comparison of associated youth characteristics. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 45*, 1308-1316.
- Ybarra, M. L., & Mitchell, K. (2004b). Youth engaging in online harassment: Associations with caregiver-child relationships, Internet use, and personal characteristics. *Journal of Adolescence, 27*, 319-336.
- Ybarra, M. L., Mitchell, K. J., Wolak, J., & Finkelhor, D. (2006). Examining characteristics and associated distress to Internet harassment: Findings from the Second Youth Internet Safety Survey. *Pediatrics, 118*, 1169-1177.

Appendix

FACE-TO-FACE & CYBERBULLYING QUESTIONNAIRE

Gender: Male ____ Female ____ Age: ____ Grade: ____

Ethnicity: Caucasian ____ African American ____ Hispanic ____ Other ____

Do you use a cell phone or pager to send text messages? Yes ____ No ____

If yes, how many hours per day do you use it? ____

Do you have an e-mail account? Yes ____ No ____

Do you instant message? Yes ____ No ____

If yes, how many hours per day do you do it? ____

Have you ever visited a chat room or social networking site (such as MySpace or FaceBook) on the computer? Yes ____ No ____

If yes, how many hours per day do you do it? ____

Do you use technology (e.g., computer, cell phone, telephone, etc.):

- a.) to access your homework? Yes ____ No ____
- b.) to complete your homework? Yes ____ No ____
- c.) to communicate with friends about homework? Yes ____ No ____

How many hours per night do you usually spend on homework? _____

Using the scale below, rate how confident you are about your knowledge of technology.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No confidence	Slightly Less Than Average		Average Confidence		Slightly More Than Average	Very Confident

How many close friends do you have? _____

Have you ever been the target of bully? Yes ____ No ____

If yes, how many times did this happen? _____

Did you tell anyone? Yes ____ No ____

If yes, who did you tell? _____

Have you ever been the target of a "cyberbully?" For instance, have you ever been taunted or belittled by others on the computer or been sent messages over the phone or computer which made you feel unsafe? Yes ____ No ____

If yes, how many times has this happened? _____

Did you tell anyone? Yes ____ No ____

If yes, who did you tell? _____

Do you know the identity of the person who cyberbullied you?

Yes ____ No ____

Have you ever bullied another person? Yes ____ No ____

Have you ever participated in "cyberbullying?" Yes ____ No ____

Using the scale below, rate how confident you are about dealing with a bully.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No confidence	Slightly Less Than Average		Average Confidence		Slightly More Than Average	Very Confident

Using the scale below, rate how confident you are about dealing with a "cyberbully."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No confidence	Slightly Less Than Average		Average Confidence		Slightly More Than Average	Very Confident

How would you deal with the bully or "cyberbully?" Check (X) all that apply.

Ignore the situation _____	Tell a parent _____
Tell a friend _____	Tell a counselor _____
Tell a teacher _____	Fight back _____
Avoid school _____	Other _____

Rank order who you feel would be helpful in assisting you if you were the target of a bully or "cyberbully." Use 1 as most helpful, 2 as next helpful, etc.

Friends _____	Guidance counselor _____
Principal _____	Adjustment counselor _____
Vice Principal _____	Nurse _____
Teacher _____	Police officer _____
Parent _____	Other _____

Using the scale below, rate your relationship with your parent(s)/guardian.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not Close	Slightly Less Than Average		Average Confidence		Slightly More Than Average	Very Close

Do you feel that bullying is a problem in the Middle School?

Yes ____ No ____

Do you feel that "cyberbullying" is a problem in the Middle School?

Yes ____ No ____

*If you have felt uncomfortable or threatened while completing this questionnaire, please ask to speak with an adjustment counselor, guidance counselor, or the school psychologist.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.