

CHAPTER ONE

Bullying: Past, Present, and Future

The New Adolescent Aggression

All I saw on Facebook was: “she deserved it . . . I hope she’s dead . . . I hope she dies this time and isn’t so stupid.” I’m constantly crying now. Every day I think “why am I still here?” I’m stuck . . . what’s left of me now . . . nothing stops. I have nobody . . . I need someone.

—Amanda, 15, British Columbia*

AMANDA’S STORY

Many girls look forward to their sixteenth birthday with a great deal of anticipation and joy. It is supposed to be such a special day of celebration and even life-long memories. Unfortunately, young Amanda Todd from Port Coquitlam, British Columbia, never got to have this experience—in part because of the hate and harassment she experienced online, in school, and in her community. Amanda was a typical seventh-grader who, along with her friends, started using her webcam to meet new people across the nation and world. However, her life turned upside down when she met a guy online who sweet-talked her into taking off her top. Without really considering the implications of

Authors’ Note: *All of the quotes used in this book are real stories shared by real people. Some of them have been edited for spelling and distracting grammatical errors. The substance of the quotes, however, has not changed.

2 ● Bullying Beyond the Schoolyard

her shortsighted action, Amanda naively went along with it. This decision ended up drastically affecting the course and outcome of her life.

Approximately one year after exposing herself via webcam, Amanda received a message on Facebook from the guy she had flashed. He threatened to distribute her topless picture unless she revealed more of herself to him. This did not seem like an empty threat as her blackmailer told her he knew her address and the names of her family and friends. When Amanda didn't comply, he did as promised—and Amanda and her family were awakened at 4 a.m. by local police officers who informed them that the picture was being distributed across the Internet. Soon after, it made its way around her school, and she had to deal with malicious taunts and tremendous cruelty from her peers (e.g., “porn star,” “whore,” “slut”). As a result, Amanda developed anxiety, major depression, and panic disorder and started abusing drugs and alcohol. Things didn't seem like they could get any worse, and so she decided it would be best to switch to a different school in the hopes of moving on with her life.

Sadly, the nightmare was far from over. Her blackmailer (and now stalker) tracked her to her new school, created a Facebook profile with Amanda's exposed breasts as the main profile picture, and then contacted her new classmates. This led to continued bullying and cyberbullying from schoolmates, which took its toll as Amanda fell into a deep depression. To help cope and to try to escape the endless harassment and persecution, she changed schools yet again.

For a little while, it seemed like Amanda's situation was finally starting to turn around at the third school. She even met a boy who expressed an interest in her, which lifted her spirits and gave her a new sense of hope. Unfortunately, though, he took advantage of her while his girlfriend was away on vacation. This led to the girlfriend and her friends coming to school to find Amanda to exact revenge. She was mercilessly beaten by some while others stood around cheering, yelling vicious insults, and video recording the incident. In severe mental and emotional anguish, Amanda attempted suicide that afternoon by drinking bleach. Thankfully, though, she was rushed to the hospital where her stomach was pumped to save her in time.

In yet another effort to flee from the source of her pain and start over, Amanda moved to a new city. However, social media and smartphones made it easy for the harassment to follow her wherever she went. Her mom Carol has shared that “every time she moved schools [her stalker] would go undercover and become a Facebook friend. What the guy did was he went online to the kids who went to (the new school) and said that he was going to be a new student—that he was starting school the following week and that he wanted some friends and could they friend him on Facebook. He eventually gathered people's names and sent [the nude content] to her new

school” (which included students, teachers, and parents). Such extreme and unrelenting torment led to continued substance abuse and self-harm and ultimately contributed to a decision by Amanda to overdose on her antidepressants—resulting in another hospital stay.

All of this, of course, gave her peers even more reasons to bully, reject, and humiliate her. In response and perhaps as a last-ditch cry for help, Amanda created a nine-minute YouTube video in September 2012 to share her anguish with the world. In it, she candidly told her story through the use of flashcards which conveyed how alone she felt. Unfortunately, her situation did not improve, and any help or support she did receive was simply not enough as the bullying and cyberbullying continued. In fact, individuals left vicious and hateful comments on her video saying that she should have used a different kind of bleach, and tried harder to kill herself. About a month after creating the YouTube video, Amanda decided that there was just no escape for her from the incessant abuse and pain. On October 10, 2012, just weeks before her sixteenth birthday, she successfully took her own life in her bedroom.

This story might seem sensationalistic, but it is true. We remember the first time we saw Amanda Todd’s video and how our hearts started to race and our lungs started to tighten because we could empathize with her pain and struggle and yet we felt completely helpless to do anything about it. But in this story, we recognized how a perfect storm of elements came together: a teen desperate to find herself and feel accepted and loved; extensive social cruelty, exclusion, and bullying; and the widespread use of social media as a vehicle for communications and, in this case, a medium to harm instead of help. And so the incidents and outcome—extreme and tragic when compared to most cases of cyberbullying—can serve as both a cautionary tale and a case study depicting how teens can exploit their access to various devices, networks, and apps to hurt others if not educated and equipped with the knowledge they need to responsibly and wisely use them.

Amanda’s story raises a number of important questions. Obviously, we wonder what could have been done to prevent this tragedy. Why are some teens so cruel to initiate the hate and harassment but then continue even as Amanda tried to escape it? What could have been done by Amanda’s friends? How could the school have intervened and dealt with the problem and the aggressors? Would it have mattered? How could they have supported and protected Amanda? What could her family have done to help Amanda cope and outlast the harassment? What about at the neighborhood, community, and even societal level?

Amanda could have been our little sister, our daughter, or one of our kids’ best friends. She could have been someone whose parents are friends of ours, who we barbecue with during the summer. She could have been on

the same sports teams as other kids we know and love. It is devastating to think about the loss in this case—how a young, bright, beautiful girl will not be able to live up to her potential because of the way she was treated, and how the world was prematurely robbed of someone who could have contributed to it in amazing ways. But this is our reality. While the details of Amanda’s story are extreme, and the vast, vast majority of peer harassment situations do not lead to such horrific outcomes, it vividly illustrates what *can* happen. And every incident we see or hear about involving kids traumatized at the hands of others—regardless of the severity—motivates us in the same way to do all we can about this problem. Because it is not right, and no one deserves to be mistreated. Ever. We are sure you feel the same way.

The primary goal of this book is to illuminate the best ways you can help the students you care for in your school and the children you have in your household. More than providing important information to understand cyber-

No one deserves to be mistreated. Ever.

bullying, though, we want to give you the knowledge, skills, and tools necessary to address it. If you have previously faced some of these issues, you know how difficult it is to navigate this complex and challenging terrain. If you haven’t encountered

any instances of online aggression among the youth you serve, sooner or later you will. Regardless, we hope this book becomes your favorite resource when dealing with cyberbullying among youth.

Before we can dive into the details about what exactly cyberbullying looks like (and what you can do about it), first we need to take a step back and provide a basic foundation by reviewing what we know about traditional schoolyard bullying. This backdrop should help you fully appreciate the harm that often stems from bullying and clarify how cyberbullying can do the same. Perhaps you have a conception of bullying based on your personal experiences, news headlines or stories, television and movie scenes, or other sources. However, those are all largely anecdotal, high-profile, or isolated examples that may not represent the majority of bullying experiences. Over the last few decades, a number of scholars have actively researched bullying to identify trends and patterns across the personal experiences of thousands of youth. We now summarize what you need to know from this body of knowledge.

TRADITIONAL (SCHOOLYARD) BULLYING

The specific impact of bullying on young people has been studied at great length in the disciplines of counseling, education, sociology, psychology, psychiatry, and criminology. Most generally, the term *bullying* is equated to the concept of harassment, which is a form of unprovoked aggression often

directed repeatedly toward another individual or group of individuals.¹ However, bullying tends to become more insidious as it continues over time and may be better equated to *violence* rather than *harassment*. Accordingly, Erling Roland states that bullying is “longstanding violence, physical or psychological, conducted by an individual or a group directed against an individual who is not able to defend himself in the actual situation.”² Scandinavian researcher Dan Olweus, who is arguably most responsible for the current academic interest in the topic, defines bullying as “aggressive behavior that is intentional and that involves an imbalance of power. Most often, it is repeated over time.”³ Tonja Nansel, a senior investigator at the National Institutes of Health, and her colleagues define bullying as aggressive behavior or intentional “harm doing” by one person or a group, generally carried out repeatedly and over time and involving a power differential.⁴ Finally, the Minnesota Department of Education states that “definitions of bullying vary, but most agree that bullying includes the intent to harm, repetition, and a power imbalance between the student targeted and the student who bullies.”⁵

In January of 2014, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Department of Education, and the Health Resources and Services Administration, worked with a number of bullying experts across various fields to develop a uniform definition of bullying:

Bullying is any unwanted aggressive behavior(s) by another youth or group of youths who are not siblings or current dating partners that involves an observed or perceived power imbalance and is repeated multiple times or is highly likely to be repeated. Bullying may inflict harm or distress on the targeted youth including physical, psychological, social, or educational harm.⁶

This is as good a definition as is currently available yet still likely falls short. Despite the variation across different perspectives, certain dominant themes are pretty obvious. First, the behavior is intentional and purposed rather than accidental or inadvertent. Accidents happen all of the time on the playground, and some of these result in physical harm. Still, most people recognize that accidental or unintentional behaviors do not constitute bullying. Most state bullying laws explicitly include an element of intent. For example, Delaware law characterizes bullying as an “intentional written, electronic, verbal or physical act.”⁷ Louisiana defines cyberbullying as “the transmission of any electronic textual, visual, written, or oral communication with the malicious and willful intent to coerce, abuse, torment, or intimidate a person.”⁸ Indeed, intent is generally a fundamental component of criminal law. In order to hold someone criminally responsible, not only must we establish that the person engaged in a wrongful act, but that he or she did so with *mens rea*, that is, a guilty mind. When it comes to law there are always

6 ● Bullying Beyond the Schoolyard

exceptions, and we believe that the vast majority of bullying incidents can and should be handled outside of the formal law. The point is that most academic and legal definitions of bullying include intent.

Second, bullying necessarily involves maliciousness on the part of the aggressor, and that maliciousness is one type of *violence*. Researchers have attempted to categorize various types of bullying violence in multiple ways. Some have focused on differentiating between direct aggression and indirect aggression.⁹ Direct aggression involves physical violence (hitting, kicking, taking items by force) and verbal violence (taunting, teasing, threatening).¹⁰ Indirect aggression includes more subtle, manipulative acts such as ostracizing, intimidating, or controlling another person.¹¹ Others have focused on distinguishing between overt and covert (relational) forms of aggression. Overt aggression might involve name-calling, pushing, or hitting, while relational aggression includes gossip, rumor spreading, social sabotage, exclusion, and other behaviors destructive to interpersonal relationships.¹²

Third, one instance of aggression is not sufficient to qualify as bullying; to be considered bullying, behavior must occur, or present the threat of occurring, on a repetitive basis. This is one of the features that distinguishes bullying from other forms of peer harassment. We should clarify that just because a hurtful behavior only happens once doesn't mean that it should be ignored. It just means that it isn't accurate to refer to it as bullying. But part of the reason bullying can be so emotionally or psychologically damaging is *because* it is repetitive. The repetitive nature of bullying creates a dynamic where the victim continuously worries about what the bully will do next. Indeed, the target often alters his or her daily behaviors to avoid personal contact with the bully because it is assumed that something bad will happen if they interact. Do you personally remember choosing to go down different hallways or to show up to class right when it began instead of early to avoid spending unnecessary "quality time" with someone who always hassled you? We vividly recall instances from our middle school days that taught us the art of skillfully dodging any run-ins with the bullies in our respective lives.

I just want to end this problem. I don't want to fight anymore with anyone. I've been trying to mind my own business but nobody seems to leave me alone. They always ask for a fight. I always try to ignore it but it's just too impossible for me to just let it go. I never fought with anyone till this year. This has been the worst year yet. My life is falling apart and I just don't know what to do anymore.

—Scarlett, 15, Virginia

Fourth, inherent in any conception of bullying is the demonstration (or interpretation) of power by the offender over the target. If both parties were equal (socially, physically, or otherwise), one might think that neither has the proverbial upper hand. With differential levels of power, though, bullying can occur. Many characteristics can give a bully perceived or actual power over a victim, including popularity, physical strength or stature, social competence, quick wit, extroversion, confidence, intelligence, age, sex, race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status.¹³ And even more relevant to the primary topic of this text, technological proficiency can imbue a person with power over another. Youth who are able to skillfully navigate online environments or who know how to cover their virtual tracks have a leg up on a newbie who doesn't fully understand how to set up their accounts properly, or how to identify the authors of hurtful content.

To summarize, there appear to be four distinct components of bullying, which are listed in Box 1.1.

Box 1.1

Characteristics of Bullying

- Intentional behavior
- Repetition
- Violence or aggression
- Power differential

While the harassment associated with bullying can occur anywhere, the term *bullying* often concerns the behavior as it occurs between adolescent peers in some proximity to school. This includes at or around school bus stops, in school hallways and bathrooms, on the playground, or otherwise close to or inside the school setting. Bullies can also follow their targets to other venues, such as shopping malls, restaurants, or neighborhood hangouts, to continue the mistreatment.

Bullying often concerns the behavior as it occurs between adolescent peers in some proximity to school.

Nevertheless, because of the prominence of the school in the lives of youth, these behaviors and interactions often reveal themselves at or near that environment. Of course, this means that teachers, school counselors, and other school officials are among the most important when it comes to bullying prevention, identification, and response.

The Definitional Debate: What Exactly Is *Bullying*?

As is probably clear based on the discussion above, there's been much debate between and among researchers, legislators, policymakers, and school administrators about the best way to define bullying. Each seems to conceptualize it differently, largely due to the constraints placed on them by their constituents. For example, researchers need to define it in a way that is measureable; legislators need to state it unambiguously so that it can withstand legal scrutiny; policymakers need to convert laws into practical and understandable guidelines for educators; and school administrators see variations of the behaviors every day and probably best understand the varied nature of experiences.

For years, we deliberately remained on the sideline when it came to debates like this. For us, whether some behavior was bullying or not was really beside the point. We advocated for identifying and focusing on the *specific problematic behavior* and addressing it reasonably and appropriately for what it was. Unfortunately, this is no longer an option as some states have passed laws that mandate specific actions when it comes to behaviors defined as bullying. For example, New Jersey law requires principals to investigate every incident of bullying within one school day and complete a formal report within ten school days that must be submitted to the superintendent within two days of completion.¹⁴ Results of the investigation must be presented to the school board at the next regularly scheduled meeting. Students in Georgia who are found to have bullied others for a third time are sent to an alternative school.¹⁵ Furthermore, labeling a particular behavior as bullying can complicate and inflame a situation—especially if the label is being misapplied. So it has become imperative to clearly articulate what is meant by bullying.

Trudy Ludwig, author of *My Secret Bully*¹⁶ and many other outstanding children's books, also recognizes that not all hurtful peer-to-peer behavior can be accurately defined as bullying. She shares how one school she visited helped its community differentiate bullying from other forms of hurtful behavior:

- When someone says or does something unintentionally hurtful and they do it once, that's **RUDE**.
- When someone says or does something intentionally hurtful and they do it once, that's **MEAN**.
- When someone says or does something intentionally hurtful and they keep doing it—even when you tell them to stop or show them that you're upset—that's **BULLYING**.

And again, just because something doesn't necessarily qualify as bullying doesn't mean that it isn't hurtful or important to stop.

We don't expect to resolve this decades-long debate in this book, but we do hope to encourage researchers, policymakers, legislators, educators, and others who are charged with putting students in particular categories (e.g., the “bully”) to think carefully about the criteria they use to make these decisions. Defining a person's behavior as bullying or labeling someone a bully can set that person on a particular trajectory, and it is best not to do this capriciously or haphazardly.

Prevalence of Traditional Bullying

Now that we've outlined some of the foundational features and characteristics of bullying, we'd like to take some time to highlight what is known about the extent of the problem. In recent years, a number of rigorous research studies have clarified the proportion of youth who have had experiences with bullying. As an example, a notable international study involving 202,056 students found that an average 26 percent of adolescents were involved as a bully, a victim, or as both (with rates varying by country and other demographic variables).¹⁷ One nationally representative (US) study of 15,686 students in Grades 6 through 10 identified that approximately 11 percent of respondents were victims of bullying each year, while 13 percent were bullies and another 6 percent were both victims and bullies.⁴ Similarly, the US Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics reported that of those youth between the ages of twelve and eighteen, 8 percent had been victims of bullying in the previous six months.¹⁸ Other studies have suggested that the prevalence of bullying in American elementary schools is between 14 and 19 percent,¹⁹ while the secondary school rate is between 3 and 10 percent.²⁰ Overall, conservative estimates maintain that *at least* 5 percent of those in primary and secondary schools (ages 7–16) are victimized by bullies *each day*—but the percentage may well be much higher.²¹

In addition, the National Crime Victimization Survey in the United States has been tracking bullying experiences through its nationally representative School Crime Supplement since 1989.²² Surveys were administered in 1989, 1995, 1999, and biennially ever since. Researchers in this study changed how they measure bullying between 2003 and 2005, moving from a single question, “During the last 6 months, have you been bullied at school,” to a series of questions that focus on specific bullying experiences (e.g., being made fun of, rumors spread, threats, etc.). As a result, it is difficult to compare rates from earlier studies to more recent ones. In 2005, however, 28.5 percent of students ages twelve to eighteen said they were bullied. In 2011, the latest year available, 27.8 percent (over 6.8 million youth) reported that they had been bullied at school. So, essentially, the proportion of teens who have experienced bullying at school has remained largely unchanged over the last decade or so.

Emotional and Psychological Consequences of Bullying

Consequences of bullying victimization identified in previous research include psychological and psychosomatic distress and problematic emotional and social responses.²³ For example, eating disorders and chronic illnesses have affected many of those who have been tormented by bullies, while other victims have run away from home.²⁴ According to an Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention fact sheet on juvenile bullying, victims of bullying often felt lonely, humiliated, insecure, and fearful going to school; experienced poor relationships and had difficulty making friends; and struggled with emotional and social adjustments.²⁵

The proportion of teens who have experienced bullying at school has remained largely unchanged over the last decade.

It has also been discovered that victims also regularly experience feelings of vengefulness, anger, and self-pity.²⁶ Indeed, depression has been a frequently cited consequence of bullying and seems to continue into adulthood—demonstrating the potentially long-term implications of peer mistreatment during adolescence.²⁷ Bullying victims have generally demonstrated more

depression and distress than nonvictims.²⁸

Finally, research based in the United States has found that being a victim of traditional bullying frequently increases the likelihood of experiencing suicidal thoughts by 10 percent in boys and by more than 20 percent in girls.¹¹ Generally speaking, victims tend to consider suicide and attempt suicide more often than nonvictims.²⁹ We'll discuss this very important relationship more in Chapter 4.

Academic and Behavioral Consequences of Bullying

The relationship between bullying and academic difficulties is a complicated one. There is no question that youth who are being bullied have a tough time concentrating on learning and therefore may struggle in their studies.³⁰ But at least one study has also found that those who struggle at school make for good targets of bullying.³¹ So it is hard to know whether bad students make good targets or if being bullied contributes to bad school performance. We do know that some students who are bullied at school may attempt to avoid that environment as much as possible—which may worsen academic difficulties and lead to tardiness or truancy.³² While missing school may not seem too alarming, it has been identified as often leading to delinquency, dropping out, and other undesirable outcomes.³³ Research has also linked bullying victimization to behaviors such as vandalism, shoplifting, dropping out of school, drug use, fighting, and school violence.³⁴

As a final cautionary tale, consider the Columbine High School tragedy in Littleton, Colorado, in 1999. The educational system was challenged to address bullying because Eric Harris (age 18) and Dylan Klebold (age 17)—the two teenagers who carried out the massacre of twelve students and a teacher, while wounding twenty-four others, before committing suicide—were reported to have been ostracized and bullied by their classmates. Additional research of thirty-seven school shooting incidents involving forty-one attackers from 1974 through 2000 discovered that 71 percent of the attackers “felt bullied, persecuted, or injured by others prior to the attack.”³⁵ It was determined that being bullied played at least some role in their later violent outburst.

Research has linked bullying victimization to behaviors such as vandalism, shoplifting, dropping out of school, drug use, fighting, and school violence.

To review, the consequences of bullying victimization identified in previous research are both subtle (emotional and psychological) as well as tangible (physical and behavioral). We have felt it crucial to detail and group together these findings because traditional bullying has been studied for many years, while cyberbullying has only recently begun to be explored.

Though I know life has its challenges, it seems this new generation is faced with a whole new challenge brought about via cyberbullying and related technology-based assaults.

—Mother of a 14-year-old victim of cyberbullying, Hawaii

WHAT EXACTLY IS *CYBERBULLYING*?

In general, we define *cyberbullying* as “willful and repeated harm inflicted through the use of computers, cell phones, and other electronic devices” (see Box 1.2 for cyberbullying synonyms). We developed this definition because it is simple, concise, and reasonably comprehensive and it captures the most important elements. These elements include the following:

- **Willful:** The behavior has to be deliberate, not accidental.
- **Repeated:** Bullying reflects a pattern of behavior, not just one isolated incident.
- **Harm:** The target must perceive that harm was inflicted.
- **Computers, cell phones, and other electronic devices:** This, of course, is what differentiates cyberbullying from traditional bullying.

Box 1.2

Cyberbullying Synonyms

- cyber-bullying
- cyber bullying
- electronic bullying
- e-bullying
- cyber harassment
- text bullying
- SMS bullying
- mobile bullying
- digital bullying
- Internet bullying

Based on the research we have reviewed, the constructs of *malicious intent*, *violence*, and *repetition* are highly relevant when constructing a comprehensive definition of traditional bullying and are similarly appropriate when attempting to understand cyberbullying. To be sure, cyberbullies seek pleasure or perceived social benefits through the mistreatment of another. Violence is often associated with aggression and corresponds with actions intended to inflict injury or harm (of any type). Through electronic means, cyberbullies commonly convey direct threats of physical violence (“I am going to pound you at school tomorrow!!!”) and manifest indirect psychological, emotional, or relational aggression (“UR gay and smelly and nobody likes you.”). All of this is carried out with some measure of maliciousness, even if it is subtle and not patently visible.

Just like with traditional bullying, it is also important to remember that one instance of mistreatment cannot accurately be equated to bullying; it must involve harmful behavior of a repetitive nature. We believe that the nature of cyberbullying makes it very likely that repetitive harm will occur. For example, imagine someone posts a particularly embarrassing picture of another person online in such a way that others can see it, link to it, and leave public comments in reference to it. While the action of uploading the picture is a one-time behavior, others can view it or otherwise refer to it repeatedly, thereby resulting in recurring humiliation and shame to the target. One person might see it or millions of people might see it. And even if only one person actually saw the photo, the perception of the target is that everyone did.

Though not explicit in our definition, there is usually an imbalance of power in cyberbullying situations. We chose not to include it as a definitional

component because the type of power being exerted in cyberspace is somewhat amorphous and often shifting. While power in traditional bullying might be physical (stature) or social (wit or popularity), online power may simply stem from proficiency with or the knowledge or possession of some content (information, pictures, or video) that can be used to inflict harm. Anyone with any of these characteristics or possessions within a certain online context has power, which can be wielded through some form

Cyberbullying is defined as “willful and repeated harm inflicted through the use of computers, cell phones, and other electronic devices.”

of cyberbullying. Indeed, anyone who can utilize technology in a way that allows them to mistreat others is in a position of power—at least at that moment—relative to the target of the attack. In addition, it can be difficult to measure this differential. As researchers we want to focus on the characteristics that are at least somewhat quantifiable. Suffice it to say that if one is being targeted for harassment in a way that doesn’t allow him to capably respond, he lacks power in that dynamic and it is right to say that he is being bullied.

Also, we must mention that we tend to explicitly focus our attention on adolescents when we refer to cyberbullying. Many people use the term *bullying* to refer to a wide variety of behaviors between individuals of varying ages. We feel, though, that it is more appropriate to reserve the term *bullying*, and therefore also *cyberbullying*, for the kinds of behaviors we describe below as they occur between adolescent peers. While these behaviors often occur among adults as well, it is not usually proper to call the incidents bullying. We acknowledge that there is some debate about this distinction, but we want to be clear who and what *we are discussing* in this book.

One of the reasons why cyberbullying is sometimes not taken seriously is that there remains a subset of adults who continue to perceive traditional bullying as simply “a rite of passage among adolescents,” as “boys being boys,” or as an inevitable and even instructive element of growing up. If you experienced bullying during your formative years, perhaps you share those beliefs. We believe, however, that if emotional, psychological, and potentially even physical harm stemming from online aggression can be reduced or prevented, it is definitely worth the effort. Our conversations with bullied youth around the world corroborate that notion. This book represents our effort to educate school personnel and other adults about cyberbullying so that they are better equipped to address, prevent, and respond to electronic harassment in meaningful and productive ways.

Well I get bullied a lot. In school, girls and boys even stare at me and laugh. They talk about me as if I'm not there. They make me feel worthless. Just today I logged onto my Instagram and I saw a girl who wrote "ew" on one of my pictures and started saying a lot of negative things. I just hate this. I feel so suicidal I don't understand why people hate me so much. I hate myself too. I can't even cope with life anymore. It's all too much especially when it's been going on for 5 years but it's only recently getting worse.

—Corrinne, 16, England

Accidental Cyberbullying

Earlier in this chapter, we presented the fundamental characteristics of bullying (e.g., harm, repetition, power differential) and pointed out that to be accurately classified as bullying, a behavior needs to be intentional. Parenting advocate Sue Scheff wrote an article for the *Huffington Post* describing what she referred to as “accidental” bullying and cyberbullying. She pointed to examples of incidents where teens say things to others, usually online, that aren’t intended to be hurtful but are experienced as such. “Even though it wasn’t your objective,” Scheff writes, “your words can be taken out of context by others when they’re read and regurgitated, amplifying your digital footprint.”³⁶ This can happen offline as well, of course, but technology certainly does more easily obscure actual intent. Many know from experience that it often leads to more frequent misunderstandings as communication occurs without important facial expressions, vocal intonations, or other interpretive behavioral cues that provide color and context to what is conveyed.

Scheff credits digital safety expert Katie Greer for first alerting her to these types of behaviors. In Scheff’s article, Greer explains accidental bullying in this way: “Oftentimes, kids described trying to be nice or positive to one friend or cause via various social networking sites, and unintentionally hurting someone’s feelings, or leaving someone out in the process.”⁶⁸ It is true that it is common for teens to say things to classmates or even to their best friends, without malice or intent to cause harm, but yet the comments are misinterpreted or otherwise result in harm. But is this bullying?

The concept of an accidental bully is not new. Internet lawyer Parry Aftab has included the “inadvertent cyberbully” in her taxonomy for years (since at least 2006). “They do it for the fun of it. They may also do it to one of their friends, joking around. But their friend may not recognize that it is

another friend or may take it seriously.” According to Aftab, inadvertent cyberbullies “don’t lash out intentionally,” which is curious because she defines cyberbullying as “when a minor uses technology as a weapon to *intentionally* target and hurt another minor” [emphasis added].³⁷ Like Greer, Aftab describes a situation where teens do or say something to be funny or even helpful, but it is misinterpreted or, for one reason or another, results in hurt feelings.

Greer offers an example in which the friends of a teen girl set up an online profile on Instagram where people are asked to comment or vote for the prettiest girl among four shown. The idea is to show their friend that she is very pretty. The profile creators stuff the virtual ballot box so that their friend emerges victorious, not realizing that by doing so the other three girls involved in the vote have had their feelings hurt (because, after all, they aren’t the prettiest). Were the less pretty girls in this example bullied? If the teens who created the site genuinely and honestly did not do so to cause harm to the girls who did not win, then we do not believe it is accurate to classify the incident as bullying.

Of course, the key to this is determining intent. It is possible that the girls responsible in Greer’s example could have intended all along to take particular classmates down a notch by setting it up so they would emerge as losers. Or rig the vote in a way that one specific girl received significantly fewer votes than all of the rest, thereby securing her spot as the “least prettiest.” It would be correct to classify those cases as bullying, though definitely not accidental. But if the girls are sincere and authentic in stating that they really didn’t mean to cause harm to those who were not voted the prettiest, then it isn’t bullying. It should not be ignored, however, and the girls responsible should be informed about the unintended consequences of their actions so that they will refrain from similar behaviors in the future. Hopefully that will be the end of the issue. If not, then subsequent intervention would be necessary.

Because it is impossible to know for certain what was going on in the mind of a teen when she behaved in a particular way, it is important to gather as much information as possible with which to determine whether or not the behavior in question could have been intentional. For example, is this the first time the particular student has been accused of bullying? Have there been behavioral problems with the student in the past? Were the students involved previously friends? Was there a falling out? Did anyone else (other students or staff) notice previous problems between the students?

Of course, we need to keep in mind that just because a teen has never misbehaved in the past, doesn’t mean they didn’t do so deliberately this time. And former friends often mistreat each other, especially if there was a recent issue that led to the breakup. The problematic behavior itself is only one piece of the puzzle. The more information you are able to gather about the

nature of the relationships among all involved, the easier it will be to figure out what happened and why—and whether it is appropriate to categorize the incident as bullying.

SUMMARY

By now, we have set the stage by providing some background on traditional bullying and its newer variant: cyberbullying. Regardless of the form, bullying involves intentional and repeated harmful behaviors targeted at someone who cannot easily defend himself. There is so much yet to discuss: from the range of emotional, psychological, social, and behavioral consequences; to the legal issues that are implicated when considering if and when educators can discipline online behaviors of students; to exactly what we can do to prevent and respond to the problem. First, though, we must make sure we are all on the same page regarding the *cyber* aspect of cyberbullying. In Chapter 2, we dive deep into a discussion of the various mediums and venues that have gained widespread adoption and use among youth. Here, we cover and clarify the benefits of social media and associated smartphone apps, while also pointing out the ways in which these marvels of the modern world can be used to harm others.

QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTION

1. How does your school define *bullying*? Is it similar to the examples provided in this book? Does it include cyberbullying?
2. How do we define *cyberbullying*? Is this definition comprehensive enough?
3. How does cyberbullying differ from traditional schoolyard bullying? How are the two forms similar?
4. What are some of the consequences of experience with bullying or cyberbullying?
5. Do you think someone could be an “unintentional” or “accidental” bully or cyberbully?

NOTES

1. M. Manning, J. Heron, and T. Marshal. “Style of Hostility and Social Interactions at Nursery, at School, and at Home: An Extended Study of Children.” In *Aggression*

- and Antisocial Behavior in Childhood and Adolescence*, edited by Lionel A. Hersov, M. Berger, and David R. Shaffer, 29–58. Oxford: Pergamon, 1978.
2. Erling Roland. “Bullying: The Scandinavian Research Tradition.” In *Bullying in Schools*, edited by Delwyn P. Tattum and David A. Lane, 21–32. Stoke-on-Trent, UK: Trentham, 1989.
 3. Dan Olweus. *Bullying at School*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1993; Dan Olweus. “Bullying Among School Children.” In *Health Hazards in Adolescence*, 259–297. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1990; Dan Olweus. *Aggression in the Schools. Bullies and Whipping Boys*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere Press, 1978.
 4. Tonja R. Nansel, Mary Overpeck, Ramani S. Pilla, W. June Ruan, Bruce Simons-Morton, and Peter Scheidt. “Bullying Behaviors Among U.S. Youth: Prevalence and Association With Psychosocial Adjustment.” *Journal of the American Medical Association* 285, no. 16 (2001): 2094–2100.
 5. Minnesota Department of Education. “Bullying and Cyber-Bullying.” *Safe and Healthy Learners* (2014). <http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/StuSuc/SafeSch/BullyCyberBullyPrev/index.html>.
 6. Matthew R. Gladden, Alana M. Vivolo-Kantor, Merle E. Hamburger, and Corey D. Lumpkin. *Bullying Surveillance Among Youths: Uniform Definitions for Public Health and Recommended Data Elements, Version 1.0* (2014). <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/bullying-definitions-final-a.pdf>.
 7. Delaware State Code. Title 14: Education, Free Public Schools, § 4112D School Bullying Prevention (2014).
 8. Louisiana State Legislature. La. Rev. Stat. § 14:40.7 Cyberbullying (2014).
 9. Delwyn P. Tattum. “Violence and Aggression in Schools.” In *Bullying in Schools*, edited by Delwyn P. Tattum and David A. Lane, 17–19. Stoke-on-Trent, UK: Trentham, 1989; Dan Olweus. *Aggression in the Schools. Bullies and Whipping Boys*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere Press, 1978; Valerie E. Besag. *Bullies and Victims in Schools*. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press, 1989; Susan P. Limber and Maury N. Nation. “Bullying Among Children and Youth.” In *Combating Fear and Restoring Safety in Schools*, edited by June L. Arnette and Marjorie C. Walsleben. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (1998). <http://www.ojjdp.gov/jjbulletin/9804/bullying2.html>; Barbara Leckie. “Girls, Bully Behaviours and Peer Relationships: The Double Edged Sword of Exclusion and Rejection.” Presented at Annual Conference of Australian Association for Research in Education, Brisbane, Australia, 1997; Nels Ericson. “Addressing the Problem of Juvenile Bullying.” *OJJDP Fact Sheet*, 27. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2001.
 10. David S. J. Hawker and Michael J. Boulton. “Twenty Years’ Research on Peer Victimization and Psychosocial Maladjustment: A Meta-Analytic Review of Cross-Sectional Studies.” *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 41, no. 4 (2000): 441–445.
 11. Marcel F. van der Wal, Cees A. M. de Wit, and Remy A. Hirasing. “Psychosocial Health Among Young Victims and Offenders of Direct and Indirect Bullying.” *Pediatrics* 111 (2003): 1312–1317.

12. Mitchell J. Prinstein, Julie Boergers, and Eric M. Vernberg. "Overt and Relational Aggression in Adolescents: Social-Psychological Adjustment of Aggressors and Victims." *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 30 (2001): 479–491; Nicki R. Crick and Jennifer K. Grotpeter. "Relational Aggression, Gender, and Social-Psychological Adjustment." *Child Development* 66 (1995): 710–722; Nicki R. Crick. "The Role of Relational Aggression, Overt Aggression, and Prosocial Behavior in the Prediction of Children's Future Social Adjustment." *Child Development* 67 (1996): 2317–2327; S. Sharp. "How Much Does Bullying Hurt? The Effects of Bullying on the Personal Well-Being and Educational Progress of Secondary Aged Students." *Educational and Child Psychology* 12 (1995): 81–88; Dieter Wolke, Sarah Woods, Linda Bloomfield, and Lyn Karstadt. "The Association Between Direct and Relational Bullying and Behaviour Problems Among Primary School Children." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 41, no. 8 (2000): 989–1002.
13. Dan Olweus, Susan P. Limber, and Sharon Mihalic. "Bullying Prevention Program." In *Fight Crime: Invest in Kids. Blueprints for Violence Prevention: Book Nine*, edited by Delbert S. Elliott. Boulder, CO: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, 1999; Dan Olweus. *Aggression in the Schools. Bullies and Whipping Boys*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere Press, 1978; Ken Rigby and Phillip T. Slee. "Dimensions of Interpersonal Relating Among Australian School Children and Their Implications for Psychological Well-Being." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 133, no. 1 (1993): 33–42; Erling Roland, *Terror i skolen*. Stavanger, Norway: Rogaland Research Institute, 1980; Phillip T. Slee and Ken Rigby. "The Relationship of Eysenck's Personality Factors and Self-Esteem to Bully-Victim Behaviour in Australian School Boys." *Personality and Individual Differences* 14 (1993): 371–373.
14. New Jersey Legislature Anti-Bullying Bill of Rights Act. P.L. 2010, Chapter 122 (2011).
15. Georgia Department of Education. O.C.G.A. 20–2–751.4 (2014).
16. Trudy Ludwig. *My Secret Bully*. Berkeley, CA: Tricycle Press, 2005.
17. Wendy Craig, Yossi Harel-Fisch, Haya Fogel-Grinvald, Suzanne Dostaler, Jorn Hetland, Bruce Simons-Morton, Michal Molcho, Margarida Gaspar de Mato, Mary Overpeck, Pernille Due, William Pickett. "A Cross-National Profile of Bullying and Victimization Among Adolescents in 40 Countries." *International Journal of Public Health* 54 (2009): 216–224.
18. Jill F. DeVoe, Katharin Peter, Philip Kaufman, Sally A. Ruddy, Amanda K. Miller, Mike Planty, Thomas D. Snyder, Detis T. Duhart, and Michael R. Rand. *Indicators of School Crime and Safety 2002*. NCES 2003–009. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, and US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002.
19. Joseph A. Dake, James H. Price, and Susan K. Telljohann. "The Nature and Extent of Bullying at School." *Journal of School Health* 73, no. 5 (2003): 173–180.
20. Riittakerttu Kaltiala-Heino, Matti Rimpelä, Päivi Rantanen, and Arja Rimpelä. "Bullying at School—An Indicator of Adolescents at Risk for Mental Disorders." *Journal of Adolescence* 23 (2000): 661–674.

21. Dan Olweus. *Aggression in the Schools. Bullies and Whipping Boys*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere Press, 1978; Erling Roland, *Terror i skolen*. Stavanger, Norway: Rogaland Research Institute, 1980; Kirsti M. Lagerspetz, Kaj Björkqvist, Marianne Berts, and Elisabeth King. "Group Aggression Among School Children in Three Schools." *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology* 23 (1982): 45–52; Kaj Björkqvist, Kerstin Ekman, and Kirsti M. Lagerspetz. "Bullies and Victims: Their Ego Picture, Ideal Ego Picture, and Normative Ego Picture." *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology* 23 (1982): 307–313.
22. National Center for Educational Statistics. *Student Reports of Bullying and Cyber-Bullying: Results From the 2009 School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey* (2011). <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011336.pdf>.
23. Anat Brunstein Klomek, Frank Marracco, Marjorie Kleinman, Irvin S. Schonfeld, and Madelyn S. Gould. "Bullying, Depression, and Suicidality in Adolescents." *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 46 (2007): 40–49; Robin M. Kowalski and Susan P. Limber. "Psychological, Physical, and Academic Correlates of Cyberbullying and Traditional Bullying." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 53, no. 1 (2013): S13–S20. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2012.09.018; Sheri Bauman, Russell B. Toomey, and Jenny L. Walker. "Associations Among Bullying, Cyberbullying, and Suicide in High School Students." *Journal of Adolescence* 36, no. 2 (2013): 341–350. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.12.001; Dorothy Seals and Jerry Young. "Bullying and Victimization: Prevalence and Relationship to Gender, Grade Level, Ethnicity, Self-Esteem and Depression." *Adolescence* 38 (2003): 735–747; Helen Cowie and Lucia Berdondini. "The Expression of Emotion in Response to Bullying." *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* 7, no. 4 (2002): 207–214; Gerd Karin Natvig, Grethe Albrektsen, and Ulla Quarnström. "Psychosomatic Symptoms Among Victims of School Bullying." *Journal of Health Psychology* 6 (2001): 365–377; Ryu Takizawa, Barbara Maughan, and Louise Arseneault. "Adult Health Outcomes of Childhood Bullying Victimization: Evidence From a Five-Decade Longitudinal British Birth Cohort." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 171 (2014): 777–784. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2014.13101401.
24. Mark G. Borg. "The Emotional Reaction of School Bullies and Their Victims." *Educational Psychology* 18, no. 4 (1998): 433–444. doi: 10.1080/0144341980180405; Riittakerttu Kaltiala-Heino, Matti Rimpelä, Mauri Marttunen, Arja Rimpelä, and Päivi Rantanen. "Bullying, Depression, and Suicidal Ideation in Finnish Adolescents: School Survey." *British Medical Journal* 319, no. 7206 (1999): 348–351; Ruth H. Striegel-Moore, Faith-Anne Dohm, Kathleen M. Pike, Denise E. Wilfley, and Christopher G. Fairburn. "Abuse, Bullying, and Discrimination as Risk Factors for Binge Eating Disorder." *The American Journal of Psychiatry* 159, no. 11 (2002): 1902–1907.
25. Nels Ericson. "Addressing the Problem of Juvenile Bullying." *OJJDP Fact Sheet, 27*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2001.
26. Mark G. Borg. "The Emotional Reaction of School Bullies and Their Victims." *Educational Psychology* 18, no. 4 (1998): 433–444. doi: 10.1080/0144341980180405; Marina Camodeca and Frits A. Goossens. "Aggression, Social

- Cognitions, Anger and Sadness in Bullies and Their Victims.” *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 46 (2005): 186–197; Minne Fekkes, Frans I. M. Pijpers, and S. Pauline Verloove-Vanhorick. “Bullying Behavior and Associations With Psychosomatic Complaints and Depression in Victims.” *Journal of Pediatrics* 144, no. 1 (2004): 17–22. doi: 10.1016/j.jpeds.2003.09.025.
27. David S. J. Hawker and Michael J. Boulton. “Twenty Years’ Research on Peer Victimization and Psychosocial Maladjustment: A Meta-Analytic Review of Cross-Sectional Studies.” *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 41, no. 4 (2000): 441–445; Manuel Gámez-Guadix, Izaskun Orue, Peter K. Smith, and Esther Calvete. “Longitudinal and Reciprocal Relations of Cyberbullying With Depression, Substance Use, and Problematic Internet Use Among Adolescents.” *Journal of Adolescent Health* 53, no. 4 (2013): 446–452; Dan Olweus. “Bullying at School: Long-Term Outcomes for Victims and an Effective School-Based Intervention Program.” In *Aggressive Behavior: Current Perspectives*, edited by L. Rowell Huesmann. New York: Plenum Press, 1994.
28. David S. J. Hawker and Michael J. Boulton. “Twenty Years’ Research on Peer Victimization and Psychosocial Maladjustment: A Meta-Analytic Review of Cross-Sectional Studies.” *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 41, no. 4 (2000): 441–445; Marcel F. van der Wal, Cees A. M. de Wit, and Remy A. Hirasing. “Psychosocial Health Among Young Victims and Offenders of Direct and Indirect Bullying.” *Pediatrics* 111 (2003): 1312–1317; Ryu Takizawa, Barbara Maughan, and Louise Arseneault. “Adult Health Outcomes of Childhood Bullying Victimization: Evidence From a Five-Decade Longitudinal British Birth Cohort.” *American Journal of Psychiatry* 171 (2014): 777–784. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2014.13101401; Carla Mills, Suzanne Guerin, Fionnuala Lynch, Irene Daly, and Carol Fitzpatrick. “The Relationship Between Bullying, Depression and Suicidal Thoughts/Behavior in Irish Adolescents.” *Irish Journal of Psychological Medicine* 21, no. 4 (2004): 112–116; Kirsti Kumpulainen and Eila Räsänen. “Children Involved in Bullying at Elementary School Age: Their Psychiatric Symptoms and Deviance in Adolescence.” *Child Abuse and Neglect* 24 (2000): 1567–1577; Kirsti Kumpulainen, Eila Räsänen, Irmeli Henttonen, Fredrik Almqvist, Kaija Kresanov, Sirkka-Liisa Linna, Irma Moilanen, Jorma Piha, Kaija Puura, and Tuula Tamminen. “Bullying and Psychiatric Symptoms Among Elementary School-Age Children.” *Child Abuse & Neglect* 22, no. 7 (1998): 705–717; Katrina Williams, Mike Chambers, Stuart Logan, and Derek Robinson. “Association of Common Health Symptoms With Bullying in Primary School Children.” *British Medical Journal* 313, no. 7048 (1996): 17–19.
29. Anat Brunstein Klomek, Frank Marracco, Marjorie Kleinman, Irvin S. Schonfeld, and Madelyn S. Gould. “Bullying, Depression, and Suicidality in Adolescents.” *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 46 (2007): 40–49; Sheri Bauman, Russell B. Toomey, and Jenny L. Walker. “Associations Among Bullying, Cyberbullying, and Suicide in High School Students.” *Journal of Adolescence* 36, no. 2 (2013): 341–350. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.12.001; Manuel Gámez-Guadix, Izaskun Orue, Peter K.

- Smith, and Esther Calvete. “Longitudinal and Reciprocal Relations of Cyberbullying With Depression, Substance Use, and Problematic Internet Use Among Adolescents.” *Journal of Adolescent Health* 53, no. 4 (2013): 446–452; Carla Mills, Suzanne Guerin, Fionnuala Lynch, Irene Daly, and Carol Fitzpatrick. “The Relationship Between Bullying, Depression and Suicidal Thoughts/Behavior in Irish Adolescents.” *Irish Journal of Psychological Medicine* 21, no. 4 (2004): 112–116; Marla E. Eisenberg, Dianne Neumark-Sztainer, and Mary Story. “Association of Weight-Based Teasing and Emotional Well-Being Among Adolescents.” *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine* 157 (2003): 733–738; Sean D. Cleary. “Adolescent Victimization and Associated Suicidal and Violent Behaviors.” *Adolescence* 35 (2000): 671–682.
30. Jonathan Nakamoto and David Schwartz. “Is Peer Victimization Associated With Academic Achievement? A Meta-Analytic Review.” *Social Development* 19 (2009): 221–242.
 31. David Schwartz, JoAnn M. Farver, Lei Chang, and Yoolim Lee-Shin. “Victimization in South Korean Children’s Peer Groups.” *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 30 (2002): 113–125.
 32. Ken Rigby and Phillip T. Slee. “Dimensions of Interpersonal Relating Among Australian School Children and Their Implications for Psychological Well-Being.” *The Journal of Social Psychology* 133, no. 1 (1993): 33–42; BBC-News. “Girl Tormented by Phone Bullies.” <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/education/1120597.stm>.
 33. Tonja R. Nansel, Mary Overpeck, Ramani S. Pilla, W. June Ruan, Bruce Simons-Morton, and Peter Scheidt. “Bullying Behaviors Among U.S. Youth: Prevalence and Association With Psychosocial Adjustment.” *Journal of the American Medical Association* 285, no. 16 (2001): 2094–2100; David P. Farrington. “Truancy, Delinquency, the Home, and the School.” In *Out of School: Modern Perspectives in Truancy and School Refusal*, edited by Lionel A. Hersov and Ian Berg, 49–63. New York: Wiley, 1980; Eileen M. Garry. “Truancy: First Step to a Lifetime of Problems.” *Juvenile Justice Bulletin* (NCJ161958). Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1996; Tom Gavin. “Truancy: Not Just Kids’ Stuff Anymore.” In *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin* 66. Washington DC: US Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1997.
 34. Nels Ericson. “Addressing the Problem of Juvenile Bullying.” *OJJDP Fact Sheet*, 27. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2001; Marcel F. van der Wal, Cees A. M. de Wit, and Remy A. Hirasig. “Psychosocial Health Among Young Victims and Offenders of Direct and Indirect Bullying.” *Pediatrics* 111 (2003): 1312–1317; Manuel Gámez-Guadix, Izaskun Orue, Peter K. Smith, and Esther Calvete. “Longitudinal and Reciprocal Relations of Cyberbullying With Depression, Substance Use, and Problematic Internet Use Among Adolescents.” *Journal of Adolescent Health* 53, no. 4 (2013): 446–452; Ken Rigby. “Consequences of Bullying in Schools.” *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* 48 (2003): 583–590; Justin W. Patchin. “Bullied Youths Lash Out: Strain as an

- Explanation of Extreme School Violence.” *Caribbean Journal of Criminology and Social Psychology* 7, no. 1/2 (2002): 22–43; Michelle L. Ybarra, Marie Diener-West, and Philip J. Leaf. “Examining the Overlap in Internet Harassment and School Bullying: Implications for School Intervention.” *Journal of Adolescent Health* 41 (2007): S42–S50. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.09.004; Loraine Townsend, Alan J. Flisher, Perpetual Chikobvu, Carl Lombard, and Gary King. “The Relationship Between Bullying Behaviours and High School Dropout in Cape Town, South Africa.” *South African Journal of Psychology* 38, no. 1 (2008): 21–32.
35. Bryan Vossekuil, Robert A. Fein, Marisa Reddy, Randy Borum, and William Modzeleski. “The Final Report and Findings of the Safe School Initiative: Implications for the Prevention of School Attacks in the United States.” Washington, DC: US Secret Service and US Department of Education, 2002. http://www.secretservice.gov/ntac/ssi_final_report.pdf.
 36. Sue Scheff. “Accidental Bullying and Cyberbullying.” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sue-scheff/accidental-bullying-and-c_b_3843092.html.
 37. Parry Aftab. “How Do You Handle a Cyberbully?” <http://stopcyberbullying.org/educators/howdoyouhandleacyberbully.html>.