UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Cyberbullying 101:

A Student Affairs Perspective

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

Requirements for the degree of Doctorate in Education

By

Elizabeth D'Arcy McKillop

2014

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Cyberbullying 101:

A Student Affairs Perspective

By

Elizabeth D'Arcy McKillop

Doctor of Education

University of California, Los Angeles, 2014

Professor Robert Rhoads, Co-Chair

Professor Richard Wagoner, Co-Chair

Bullying and its negative effects within the K-12 educational sector are thoroughly researched problems. However, there is a relative lack of research on bullying and its most recent incarnation, cyberbullying, within United States higher education. The studies that do exist indicate that college-level cyberbullying is a problem on some

U.S. campuses. The goal of my study was to explore the experiences of student affairs administrators in implementing policies and practices used to address cyberbullying. I conducted a qualitative study at three research universities which consisted of document review of publications related to online harassment at each school as well as in-depth interviews with 35 university administrators who implement cyberbullying policy and practice in their work.

Based on my study, cyberbullying may be defined as digital interactions that the originator intends to emotionally and/or psychologically harm the recipient and/or that the recipient perceives as emotionally and/or psychologically harmful. Further, a hierarchy for cyberbullying incidents based on my study ranges in severity from "Formerly In-Person" incidents to "Cyber-Stalking" incidents. My study also found that student affairs administrators relied on collaboration with colleagues and on university-wide policies in order to address cyberbullying incidents. Finally, my study found that the unique possibilities that online technology provides, including anonymity for perpetrators, wide-spread and instant dissemination of negative actions, a minimization of and desensitization to online interactions, the uncertainty of "jurisdiction" for policing the Internet, and the at times impossibility to trace acts of cyberbullying presented challenges to student affairs administrators in addressing the phenomenon.

The dissertation of Elizabeth D'Arcy McKillop is approved.

Kevin McCardle

Robert Rhoads, Committee Co-Chair

Richard Wagoner, Committee Co-Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2014

Dedication

To Mom and Dad, the best parents anyone could ever hope for.

I'm so lucky that you're mine!

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Acknowledgements

I owe many, many thanks. To Linda Rose, Director of UCLA's Educational Leadership Program – thank you for admitting me into the program and for surrounding me with my fellow members of Cohort 19. To my dissertation co-chairs, Rick Wagoner and Rob Rhoades, and to my committee member Kevin McCardle – thank you for your guidance. To Liz Cheadle, my boss during the first half of this process, and to Susan Judkins, my boss during the second and most challenging half – thank you for your flexibility, understanding, and encouragement.

Though earning my doctorate isn't the most difficult thing I've ever *experienced*, it's certainly the most difficult thing I've ever *accomplished*. It would not have been possible without the love and support of my family and friends. To my dearest Cohort 19 - I'm so glad to have gone through this with you! A special thanks to Linsey and Andy - you're the greatest! To my brother Dan, his wife Stephanie, and my niece and nephew Neve and Spencer - hearing your perspective and seeing you on visits to New York helped me remember that there was life outside school, and that nothing about it was the end of the world! To my best friend and sister Michele, her husband Matt, and their children Xavier and Monica - it's a good thing you know how much you mean to me, because there aren't words to express it. Thank you for including me in your family. To Grandma and Grandpa - I'm so grateful for your support in achieving this goal. I really feel that I share it equally with you, Grandma! To Pop and Gram - I miss you in a way I would never have thought possible. I love you. I love you. And most importantly, to Mom and Dad - every day of my life, you've shown me what unconditional love is. Everything I am is because of you. I love you both so very, very much!

Vita

1999	B.A. English University of Notre Dame Notre Dame, Indiana
2005	M.Ed. Education Counseling in Student Affairs University of California at Los Angeles Los Angeles, California
2000-2007	Administrator and Teacher St. Monica Catholic High School Santa Monica, California
2007-2009	Extension Program Coordinator St. Thomas Aquinas College Sparkill, New York
2009-2013	Assistant Director of Student Affairs UCLA School of Law University of California at Los Angeles Los Angeles, California
2013-present	Associate Director of Student Services UCLA Anderson School of Management University of California at Los Angeles Los Angeles, California

Chapter 1: Statement of the Problem

Introduction

Bullying and its negative effects within the K-12 educational sector are a thoroughly researched problem (Aluede et al, 2008; Clark, 2004 Hale, 2002; Del Principio, 2012; Gathers, 2005; Lyons, 2006; Pondell, 2011; Rivers et al, 2009; Staubli & Killias, 2011; Weinhold, 2011; Zagorski, 2010). However, there is a relative lack of research on bullying and its most recent incarnation, cyberbullying, within United States higher education (Baldasare et al, 2012; Chapell, 2006; Duncan, 2010; MacDonald & Pittman, 2010; Walker, Sockman, & Koehn, 2011). Research conducted in the United Kingdom and Finland indicates that the lack of investigation into bullying at the university level may be a worldwide phenomenon (Coleyshaw, 2010; Sinkkonen, Puhakka & Matti Meriläinen, 2012).

The studies that do exist indicate that college-level cyberbullying, or online harassment, is a problem on some U.S. campuses. A 2004 study of 339 undergraduate students at the University of New Hampshire found that 10-15% of the students reported receiving online communications typically defined as cyberbullying while in college (Finn, 2004). A 2010 survey of 439 students at the University of Indiana examined the cyberbullying they had experienced, witnessed, or enacted while in college; the study found that 22% had been cyberbullied, 38% said they knew someone who had been cyberbullied, and 9% had cyberbullied someone else (MacDonald & Roberts-Pittman, 2010). A 2011 survey of 120 undergraduate students determined that 30% of the respondents had been the victims of cyberbullying and 54% said they knew someone who

had been cyberbullied while in college (Walker, Sockman, & Koehn, 2011). Further, the authors' state, "This study explores a little-examined area of the undergraduate experience. The dearth of literature in this area left the authors with only two similar studies to evaluate" (Walker, Sockman, & Koehn, 2011). Finally, a 2012 qualitative study of the experiences of cyberbullying among 30 undergraduate college students found that participants described, "A wide range of behaviors, experiences, and social situations in which online aggression is occurring" (Baldasare et al, 2012, p.148) at their campus, a large southwestern university. The authors also noted that, "Although concern about cyberbullying at the K-12 level has led to the development of a number of excellent guidelines and recommendations for schools, colleges and universities have no such models" (Baldasare et al, 2012). Ideally, such guidelines and recommendations would come from an in-depth examination of the experiences and best practices of student affairs administrators dealing with the issue "on the ground," as it manifests itself at their college or university. My study is a qualitative exploration of the experience of student affairs administrators in implementing policy and practice to address online harassment at three institutions; as such, its goal is to provide a researched-based portrait of the student affairs response to the issue in order to inform practice.

Background and Terminology

Bullying in educational settings has ceased to be viewed as a natural part of growing up that victims must simply endure. In 2012, South Dakota became the 49th state to pass anti-bullying legislation, a trend which began with Georgia's enactment of anti-bullying legislation in 1999. These state laws define what is considered to be bullying behavior, encourage, or mandate policy enactment, and provide for legal remedies for the

victims. Thus far, the vast majority of social awareness and legislative action regarding bullying in educational settings has focused on K-12 schools. One theory that seeks to explain this imbalance posits, “Historically colleges and universities have been largely immune from liability for their students’ actions” (Duncan, 2010, p.269), a protection which has given post-secondary institutions little incentive to address the problem. It may also be possible that college students underreport incidents of bullying, or that bullying behaviors are classified with other types of harassment. However, in part due to highly publicized cyberbullying tragedies such as the 2010 suicide of Rutgers undergraduate Tyler Clementi, society's awareness of online harassment and its consequences at all educational levels has led to sustained dialogue concerning the issue.

Online harassment is an amorphous phenomenon; incidents are comprised of a variety of subject matters, technological methods, locations, relative severities, actors, and perceptions. Definitions of bullying and cyberbullying vary from study to study, institution to institution, and state to state. For example, California, the state in which my study will be conducted, provides an extensive definition of both bullying and online bullying the Elementary and Secondary Education section of the Education Code (ed. Code); bullying is defined as

> Any severe or pervasive physical or verbal act or conduct, including communications made in writing or by means of an electronic act, and including one or more acts committed by a pupil or group of pupils…directed toward one or more pupils that has or can be reasonably predicted to have the effect of one or more of the following:

(A) Placing a reasonable pupil or pupils in fear of harm to that pupil's or those pupils' person or property.

(B) Causing a reasonable pupil to experience a substantially detrimental effect on his or her physical or mental health.

(C) Causing a reasonable pupil to experience substantial interference with his or her academic performance.

(D) Causing a reasonable pupil to experience substantial interference with his or her ability to participate in or benefit from the services, activities, or privileges provided by a school.

(2) "Electronic act" means the transmission of a communication, including, but not limited to, a message, text, sound, or image, or a post on a social network Internet Web site, by means of an electronic device, including, but not limited to, a telephone, wireless telephone or other wireless communication device, computer, or pager, of a communication, including, but not limited to, any of the following:

(i) A message, text, sound, or image.

(ii) A post on a social network Internet Web site, including, but not limited to:

(I) Posting to or creating a burn page. “Burn page” means an Internet Web site created for the purpose of having one or more of the effects listed in paragraph (1).

(II) Creating a credible impersonation of another actual pupil for the purpose of having one or more of the effects listed in paragraph (1). “Credible impersonation” means to knowingly and without consent impersonate a pupil for the purpose of bullying the pupil and such that another pupil would

reasonably believe, or has reasonably believed, that the pupil was or is the pupil who was impersonated.

(III) Creating a false profile for the purpose of having one or more of the effects listed in paragraph (1). “False profile” means a profile of a fictitious pupil or a profile using the likeness or attributes of an actual pupil other than the pupil who created the false profile.

Notwithstanding paragraph (1) and subparagraph (A), an electronic act shall not constitute pervasive conduct solely on the basis that it has been transmitted on the Internet or is currently posted on the Internet. (California Education Code 2 EDC § 48900, 2013)

The extensive definition of both physical and electronic bullying within the Elementary and Secondary Education section of the Ed. Code is in stark contrast to the direction provided for colleges and universities:

> The Trustees of the California State University, the Regents of the University of California, and the governing board of each community college district are requested to adopt and publish policies on harassment, intimidation, and bullying to be included within the rules and regulations governing student behavior within their respective segments of public postsecondary education. It is the intent of the Legislature that rules and regulations governing student conduct be published, at a minimum, on the Internet Web site of each public postsecondary educational campus and as part of any printed material covering those rules and regulations within the respective public postsecondary education systems. (California Education Code 3 EDC § 66302, 2012)

For California State Universities and the schools in the University of California system, the decision whether to meet the minimum standard of publication of harassment policies is left up to the institution, as is the definition of the terms harassment, intimidation, and bullying; the Ed. Code's Postsecondary Education section uses the terms somewhat synonymously. As I will show in Chapter 2, this irresolution is also reflected in the literature on the subject. The terms *cyberbullying*, *online harassment*, *cyber harassment*, *electronic bullying*, *internet harassment*, and *online bullying* (Abbott, 2011; Beran, 2005; Finn, 2004; Kowalski & Limber, 2007; Moreno & Hornbeck, 2011; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2007) are all used to describe a wide range of negative digital behaviors and experiences, though the term *cyberbullying* appears to be the preferred term in the most recent literature on the subject in the educational realm (Abbott, 2011; Baldasare et al, 2012; Burnham & Houser, 2011; Dilmac, 2009; Englander, Mills, & McCoy, 2009; Gutshall, 2012; Hay & Mann, 2010; Hinduja & Patchin, 2009; Hoff & Mitchell, 2009; Johnson, 2011; Konig & Steffgen, 2010; Macdonald & Roberts-Pittman, 2010; Schenk, 2011; Walker, Sockman, & Koehn, 2011). Li (2006) was one of the first researches on the subject to use the term *cyberbullying* in 2006; he remained consistent in his use of the term in further studies in 2007, 2008, and 2010, indicating that the term has some staying power. In order to reflect the legitimate possibility of multiple terminologies, I used the terms *cyberbullying* and *online harassment* interchangeably in this dissertation, with two exceptions. First, when referring to a specific piece of literature, I used the term employed by the author. Second, since the term *harassment* appears in the student conduct codes of my research sites and the word *bullying* does not, I used the term *online harassment* when interacting with site personnel.

Research Questions and Design

The goal of my study was to explore student affairs administrator's experiences in implementing policies and practices used to address cyberbullying, or online harassment, at three U.S. universities. My study was designed to answer the following questions:

RQ1. How do student affairs administrators define online harassment as it occurs at their institution?

RQ2. What policies and practices do student affairs administrators say they use to address online harassment?

RQ3. What challenges do student affairs administrators say they face in their implementation of policies and practices that address online harassment?

In order to address my research questions, I conducted a qualitative study which consisted of document review and in-depth interviews of student affairs administrators who are involved in the implementation of online harassment policy and practice at three institutions. The research sites for my study were three research universities within the University of California system. I conducted a document review of university policies and other literature related to online harassment. I also conducted interviews of student affairs administrators at each campus who work directly with matters relating to online harassment. I sought information about the definitions of online harassment that they employ; the policies and practices regarding online harassment they implement as part of their work; and the challenges they experience in doing so. To date, the research conducted on cyberbullying within higher education has been almost exclusively based on student experience; the definition of and methods with which student affairs administrators handle cyberbullying and their experiences in doing so is as yet

unexplored. In order to address this gap in the research, I used professional standards of student affairs administrators as a guiding framework within which to conduct a qualitative study of administrators at each institution.

The objective of this study was to generate an in-depth portrait of student affairs administrators' experiences in handling cyberbullying. The findings from my research may be used to inform the practice of administrators at both the institutions involved in my study as well as other higher education institutions in terms of campus policies and practices regarding online harassment. I plan to make my study available to the student affairs offices involved at my research sites and any other interested colleges and universities. In addition, I plan to explore the possibility of presenting my results at student affairs administration regional and national conferences in the future.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In September 2010, Rutgers University freshman Tyler Clementi committed suicide by jumping from the George Washington Bridge. Three days earlier, his roommate had surreptitiously videotaped him via web-camera in a sexual encounter with another man and subsequently broadcast the video via Twitter. While this tragedy was neither the first nor the last incident of its kind, the media attention that followed resulted in a much greater awareness of online harassment and its consequences in higher education. This increased awareness has, in turn, resulted in scrutiny of the extant knowledge on the subject. Since 2010, researchers have lamented the dearth of research into cyberbullying within higher education (Baldasare et al, 2012; Coleyshaw, 2010; Duncan, 2010; MacDonald & Pittman, 2010; Walker, Sockman, & Koehn, 2011). To provide a comprehensive review of cyberbullying and its implications for student affairs administrators, in this chapter I will first present a brief history of the student affairs profession and outline professional standards of student affairs related to online harassment. These standards provided a guiding framework within which to examine documents from my research sites and responses from my participants. Next, I will provide a foundation for an examination of online harassment by synthesizing the relevant literature in four key domains: traditional bullying in educational settings; the impact of online technology on traditional bullying; online harassment as it occurs outside of educational settings; and finally, online harassment within educational settings.

A Brief History of the Student Affairs Profession

The student affairs profession has evolved from the faculty role of *in loco parentis,* to the creation of specialized roles of deans of men and women, and ultimately

to the complex organizational structure seen today. The need for student support outside the classroom traces its roots to the colonial colleges; students were viewed as immature adolescents requiring both academic training and close supervision and counsel. "College life was designed as a system for controlling the often exuberant youth and for inculcating within them discipline, morals, and character" (Cohen, 1998, p. 23). At this time, faculty members were responsible for enforcing all disciplinary regulations; they acted in the place of parents, developing and enforcing strict authoritarian rules and regulations about student life as they saw fit.

By the middle of the 19th century, students began forming literary societies, debate clubs, campus publications, and the gymnasium was introduced; it is at this time that the notion of the development of the whole person emerged, a concept that would become a central tenant of the student affairs profession. The second half of the century saw growing demands on college presidents, changing faculty roles and expectations, and an increase in coeducation and women's colleges; the changes coincided with, or possibly brought about, the first appointments of designated personnel to handle student life outside the classroom. In 1870, Harvard University appointed the first dean in higher education, whose main task was to release the president from his responsibilities as a disciplinarian; in 1891, the role was expanded to include personal counseling of students. The University of Chicago included a dean of women as a member of their founding administration in 1892; by 1903, an association of deans of women had formed, followed in 1919 by a similar association comprised of deans of men (Cohen, 2003). Faculty increasingly moved towards intensive scholarship, research, and specialization, and leading academics began to advocate a broadly elective, individual course of study to

replace the prescribed classical curriculum. Eventually, this innovation required increased attention to academic advising programs, each of which required administrators.

The early 1900's saw the inception of professional preparation in what is now known as student affairs; the first diploma for an “Adviser of Women” was granted by Columbia University’s Teachers College in 1914. Following World War I, "the earliest personnel bureaus in educational institutions primarily provided vocational guidance, obtained accurate data on each student, codified the requirements of different professions, and supervised the use of ability and interest inventories" (Nuss, 2003, p.69). By 1925, a variety of professional titles described student personnel workers: director of personnel, dean of students, social director, and vocational counselor, among others. Professional associations such as the National Association of Deans of Women (NADW), the National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men (NADAM, which would eventually become NASPA – Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education), and the National Association of Appointment Secretaries (NAAS, which would eventually become ACPA – the American College Personnel Association) formed. By the 1940’s, additional professional organizations had developed to address specialized student affairs roles, including national associations for registrars, admissions officers, health services administrators, and orientation directors. The passage of the Serviceman’s Readjustment Act in 1944 significantly affected higher education and student affairs. Enrollment increased dramatically from the 1940’s through the 1970’s, and "Greater size led to complexity in management, as each institution added administrators in greater proportion than it did students and faculty" (Cohen, p. 245).

In the 1960's and 1970's, federal support of and involvement in higher education increased. Major federal legislation mandated the elimination of discrimination and required equal access and treatment for educational programs receiving federal financial assistance; as a result, specialized student affairs roles, particularly in the areas of financial aid and support services for previously underrepresented groups, increased. The nature of the relationship between the college student and the institution changed as the long-standing doctrine of *in loco parentis* was challenged and eventually abolished; college students were recognized legally as adults. In the decades that followed, the emphasis on a student affairs professionals' role shifted from that of authoritarian and disciplinarian to administrator, counselor, and educator. For a brief period, "there seemed to be confusion or ambivalence among parents, legislators, the media, and others about what should be the appropriate level or degree of institutional responsibility for student conduct expectations" (Nuss, p.78); college students at the time tended to experience great personal and social freedom. However, high profile incidents such as the death from drug overdose of University of Maryland student and NBA prospect Len Bias and the murder of Lehigh University student Jeanne Clery in 1986 brought increased public scrutiny of student life at colleges and universities. The 1980's and 1990's also saw the student population became more diverse in all aspects than at any other time in history. In 1990, the Americans with Disabilities Act emphasized equal access to higher education, offices in support of ethnic and racial minorities were established, and the needs and interests of gay, lesbian, and transgender students began to receive attention from school administration. Increasingly, "student affairs" and "student development" began to replace the term "student personnel" (Nuss, p.75).

The new millennium has seen further professionalization of student affairs, increased specialization within the field, and an emphasis on student learning outcomes and assessments which student affairs professionals are called upon to spearhead. In addition, the impact of technology on the profession has been significant. Communication about and the delivery methods of programs and services have become simpler and more convenient. As institutions consider the costs and benefits related to online courses, the very nature and existence of student affairs professionals on campus are called into question. In addition, technological advances and the widespread, if not universal, use of technology by college students also brings with it increasingly complex issues never before seen, such as cyberbullying.

Professional Standards for Student Affairs Administrators

In the 1970s, leading student affairs organizations recognized the lack of comprehensive standards for professional development, evaluation, self-study, and accreditation. A strong desire for an interassociation entity or consortium was expressed, and eventually the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) was formed in 1979. The organization now boasts 39 member institutions, including the ACPA: College Student Educators International, the American College Counseling Association (ACCA), NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education , the National Association for Campus Activities (NACA), the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA), and NODA: Association for Orientation, Transition, and Retention in Higher Education. The first *CAS Standards and Guidelines* were published in 1986 and addressed nineteen functional areas of higher education programs and services; the most recent set of standards, published in 2012,

provide guidelines for effective management and best practices, consistent with individual institutional missions, in thirty functional areas. Part 10 of the 2012 CAS General Standards provided a guiding framework for my study within which to explore the administrative response to online harassment. The relevant portion of the standard reads:

> When providing student access to technology, programs and services must:
>
> - have policies on the use of technology that are clear, easy to understand, and available to all students
> - inform students on the legal and ethical implications of misuse as it pertains to intellectual property, harassment, privacy, and social networks
>
> Student violations of technology policies must follow established institutional student disciplinary procedures. Students who experience negative emotional or psychological consequences from the use of technology must be referred to support services provided by the institution. (Council for the Advancement of Standards General Standards, 2012)

It is important to note that that the standard above covers only institutionally provided access to technology. In addition, neither academic institutions nor individual administrators are mandated to subscribe to the CAS Standards. However, by comparing the standard to the results of my document review and the responses of student affairs administrators, my study results not only in a rich description of the student affairs response to online harassment, but also an examination of that response seen through the lens of nationally recognized professional standards.

With this picture of the student affairs profession and guidelines within the profession relating to online harassment in mind, in the remainder of this chapter I will provide a foundation for an examination of online harassment within higher education. In order to do so, I synthesized the relevant literature in four key domains: traditional bullying in educational settings; the impact of online technology on traditional bullying; online harassment as it occurs outside of educational settings; and online harassment within educational settings.

Traditional Bullying in Educational Settings

"Sticks and stones may break my bones, but names will never hurt me." Reflecting the traditionally held attitude that bullying is simply a part of growing up, this childhood idiom provides what would now be considered an insufficient tool in dealing with the traumas associated with bullying. It was not until the 1970's in Scandinavia that research into aggressive schoolyard behavior began. In 1970, Dan Olweus embarked on what is regarded as the first scientific study of bullying and victimization, the results of which were published in the U.S. in 1978 under the title "*Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys*." His work led to the foundational definition of traditional, face-to-face bullying: "A student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more students" (Olweus, 1993, p.9). "Negative actions" are further defined as intentionally inflicting or attempting to inflict "injury or discomfort upon another," in the form of "teasing, name calling, threatening, and taunting" or physical actions such as hitting, pushing, or restraining others (Olweus, 1993). Additionally, Olweus includes non-physical actions without the use of words, such as "making faces or dirty gestures,

intentional exclusion from a group, or refusing to comply with another's wishes" (Olweus, 1993). Finally, Olweus contends that an imbalance of power, one in which one student does not have equal "physical or psychological" strength to another must be present to constitute bullying (Olweus, 1993).

Subsequent to Olweus seminal work, bullying research began in earnest throughout the world in the 1980s. While definitions vary, there is consensus regarding the major elements that define traditional bullying. These major elements fall into two historically accepted forms of bullying: "relational" or "indirect" bullying, which consists of non-physical actions such as teasing, social isolation, and intentional exclusion; and "direct" bullying, which consists of a physical or verbal attack (Olweus, 1993). Three features of both relational and direct bullying have become standard components of contemporary definitions: the infliction of harm or fear on the victim; repeated aggression against an individual who does not provoke the bullying behavior due to a real or perceived difference in power; and typical occurrence within familiar social circles (Burgess, Garbarino, & Carlson, 2006).

Many researchers of cyberbullying deem it sufficient to expand on Olweus' foundational definition of bullying to include technology when defining the term (Burnham, Wright, & Houser, 2011; Leenaars & Rinalid, 2010; Wright, Burnham, Inham, & Ogorchock, 2009). Slonje and Smith (2008) in particular build on Olweus' concept and define cyberbullying as aggression that utilizes modern technology, specifically the World Wide Web and cell phones. However, other scholars (Abbott, 2011; Barr & Lugus, 2011; Patchin & Hinduja, 2011; Speers, Slee, Owens, & Johnson, 2009; Vandebosch & Van Cleemput, 2008; Willard, 2007) contend that particular

characteristics of cyberbullying render the traditional definition of bullying inadequate. While the infliction of harm to the victim remains consistent, requisite physical harm resulting to the victim and/or physical strength of the perpetrator contained in the traditional definition of bullying may not apply to cyberbullying. Further, the necessity of a power imbalance - be it physical or psychological - between bully and victim may not apply. Though a widely accepted characteristic of conventional bullying, some researchers believe that the anonymous nature of cyberbullying renders the notion of power imbalance moot (Baldasare, 2012). Third, though convention defines traditional bullying as typically occurring in familiar social circles, the anonymity provided to online harassers turns convention on its head: "As [in] many of the instances of online abuse, the victim may not know his or her victimizer" (Barr & Lugus, 2011, p.6); in other words, the victim may not have the benefit of knowing whether they know the perpetrator or not. The fourth and final aspect of traditional bullying that may not apply to cyberbullying is the notion of repeated action. Though a standard and widely accepted component of the definition of traditional bullying, experts on cyberbullying differ on whether the sender of an offensive digital communication must repeat the negative action to meet a definition of cyberbullying, or whether this type of repetition does not apply to cyberbullying since digital communications may easily be visible to multiple witnesses, and/or can easily be forwarded, copied, and posted in multiple locations (Patchin & Hinduja, 2011; Speers, Slee, Owens, & Johnson, 2009). Given the above, my study investigated how online harassment is defined by the student affairs administrators I interviewed, both in their practice and institutionally.

Effects

The negative effects experienced by victims of traditional bullying have been researched extensively. Studies conducted of students at the K-12 level show these negative effects can include diminished academic performance; poor psychological adjustment and other mental health issues; stress-related physical issues; low self-esteem; poor school attendance; increased high-school dropout rates; the development of criminal proclivities; negative psychosocial effects; and the development of at-risk behavior (Aluede et al, 2008; Bauman & Del Rio, 2006; Bishop & Casida, 2011; Clark, 2004; Del Principio, 2012; Gathers, 2005; Pondell, 2011; Rivers et al, 2009; Staubli & Killias, 2011; Weinhold, 2011; Zagorski, 2010). Bullying has also been found to be a precursor to school violence (Hale, 2002). In their review of the responses of 15,686 students in grades 6 through 10 to the World Health Organization's Health Behaviours in School Children 1998, Nansel et al. (2003) found that bullying others and being bullied were consistently related to each of the four violence-related behaviors measured, which included self-report of weapon carrying, weapon carrying in school, physical fighting, and being injured in a physical fight. Leary, Kowalski, Smith, and Phillips (2003) found that school violence followed instances of bullying of the perpetrator in 10 out of 15 school shootings between 1995 and 2001. In a follow-up to this study, Weatherby, Strachila, and McMahon (2010) found bullying of the perpetrator to precede 6 out of 12 incidents of school shooting between 2001 (subsequent to the incidents of that same year studied by Leary et al) and 2008.

In 1999, seniors Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold murdered 12 fellow Columbine High School students and one teacher, and wounded 21 other students before committing

suicide. Witnesses report Harris and Klebold declaring, "This is for all the shit you've given us for the past four years!" after entering the school's library and opened fire on those inside. Later in the massacre, Klebold reportedly mocked a victim, saying, "You used to call me a fag. Who's a fag now?" The Columbine shootings shocked the nation and brought issues of school safety, gun control, and bullying to the fore. In response to the tragedy, an analysis released by U.S. Secret Service found that of 37 premeditated school shootings, bullying played the major role in more than two-thirds of the attacks (U.S. Secret Service, 2002). In addition to the link between bullying and school violence, the suicide of those victimized by bullying has become so prevalent that a new term, *bullycide*, has entered the lexicon. Unfortunately, the Tyler Clementi suicide is one of dozens of cases in which victims of bullying of all types have ended their own lives, either apparently or overtly in response to the bullying they endured. Klomek, Sourander, and Gould (2010) reviewed 31 empirical studies that evaluated both cross-sectional and longitudinal research articles, and found that bully-victims are repeatedly reported to exhibit high levels of suicidal ideation. Though the phenomenon has recently come into prominence due to highly publicized incidents, it has long been a problem: it was the 1982 suicide of three Norwegian boys due to bullying that prompted Dan Olweus to conduct his seminal research into bullying at what would be considered the U.S. K-12 level.

The Impact of Technology: Putting the "Cyber" in Cyberbullying

The evolution of computers and the Internet from once room-sized hardware and elite technology to handheld devices used 24 hours a day by younger and younger children has allowed for an evolution in bullying as well. Whereas bullying previously

took place in the schoolyard or on campus, cyberbullying has no physical boundaries. Formerly, victims were safe from harassment when at home; victims of online harassment have no such haven. In the past, victims knew their bullies; now attacks can come from anonymous strangers. Abbott (2011), Gross (2009), and Kowalski, Limber, and Agatson (2008) found that this "always on" aspect of technology has allowed cyberbullies to intensify attacks.

Additionally, a psychological phenomenon known as "the online disinhibition effect," in which people act with less restraint while online than they would in face-to-face interactions, may be a factor in cyberbullying. Of the six characteristics of the online disinhibition effect explored by Suler (2004), three are especially relevant to cyberbullying: dissociative anonymity; invisibility; and asynchronicity. While on the Internet, users are able to keep their identity hidden; people "have the opportunity to separate their [online] actions from their real world" and may feel that "when acting out hostile feelings, the person doesn't have to take responsibility for those actions. In fact, people might even convince themselves that those actions 'aren't me at all' "(Suler, 2004, p.321). This *dissociative anonymity* may factor in to the psychology of a cyberbully. Distinct from online anonymity is the online user's actual physical *invisibility*. In face-to-face interactions, important physical cues guide and influence behavior; with no such guide in online interactions, a cyberbully is immune to his or her victim's expressions of sadness, anger, humiliation or the like, that might curtail their bullying behavior. Finally, the *asynchronous nature* of online communication may facilitate online harassment. Since people do not interact in real time in many methods of online communication, it is possible for a cyberbully to post a hostile message or send a threatening email without

having to deal with the victim's immediate reaction. Suler (2004) quotes online psychotherapist Kali Munro as describing this occurrence as an "emotional hit and run" (p.321). The implications of the above for student affairs practice include potentially helpful insights for deans of students, counselors, residence life staff, and others into the experience of both victims and perpetrators of cyberbullying. For example, when dealing with a victim, recognition of the victim's possible feelings of helplessness due to their inability to physically escape from the online bullying would help student affairs administrators to be empathetic to the student's situation and would therefore improve their practice. Similarly, an understanding of the notion that a cyberbully may not initially accept full personal responsibility for their actions would be helpful to dean of students' offices in their remediation processes.

Online Harassment Outside of Educational Settings

Online harassment is also a problem outside of educational settings; recent literature has examined issues such as racism, stalking, sexual harassment, and workplace bullying and harassment via digital technology (Back, 2002; Spitzberg & Hoobler, 2002; Tavani & Grodzinsky, 2002; Geach & Haralambous, 2009; Pitcher, 2007; O'Connell, 2008; and Kuzma, 2013). The terminology used for the phenomenon varies, and includes *online harassment*, *internet abuse*, *cyberharassment*, *cyber-harassment*, *electronic harassment*, *e-harassment*, *online bullying*, and *cyber-bullying* (Bartow, 2009; Griffiths, 2003; Kim, 2008; Kuzma, 2013; Larson, 2010; O'Connell, 2008; and Pitcher, 2007). The majority of the literature about online harassment outside of educational settings focuses on issues in the workplace. A 2007 study of businesses in the UK found that one in ten employees felt that "cyber bullying is a problem in their workplace" (Pitcher, 2007); in

this case, a survey of 1,072 workers found that one in five had been bullied at work via e-mail, and one in 16 said they had been bullied by text message. The article concluded, "Workplace bullying is estimated to cost UK employers more than £2bn a year in sick pay, staff turnover, and lost production" (Pitcher, 2007). The definition used for bullying was not stated. More recently, a 2012 study conducted by the University of Sheffield and Nottingham University shows that 8 out of 10 employees of several UK universities experienced cyberbullying on at least one occasion in the previous six months; the results also showed that 14-20% experienced them on at least a weekly basis. Cyberbullying here is defined as including, but not limited to "malicious or threatening emails, text messages, and tweets; electronic communications that contain jokes about ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any other topic that would make an individual feel uncomfortable; public shaming via mass email; sharing embarrassing, offensive, or manipulated images or videos of an individual; and spreading lies and gossip" (Sprigg et al, 2012).

In one of the first empirical studies of its kind, Kuzma (2013) examined 60 worldwide online social networking sites (OSNs) in order to determine the "level of cyber-harassment protection" (Kuzma, p.53) each site provides. This study may be illustrative of the most current terminology and definitions used for online harassment. Though Kuzma uses the terms *cyber-harassment, online bullying, online harassment, internet abuse,* and *cyber-bullying* interchangeably and without differentiation in terms of definition throughout the study, two terms, *cyber-harassment* and *online bullying*, are defined as "broad terms encompassing a range of activities. These include sending abusive, threatening or obscene emails through mediums such as OSN (Online Social

Networking) sites; stalking users on sites, impersonating another person by creating a fake profile; spamming a specific user repeatedly", as well as "online activities such as stalking, threats, harassment, impersonation, humiliation, trickery and exclusion" (Kuzma, 2013, p. 54).

Online Harassment within Educational Settings

The majority of the research into cyberbullying at the K-12 level has identified and explored aspects of harassment unique to cyberbullying, and have concluded that characteristics particular to online harassment can result in greater distress for victims than traditional bullying (Agatston, Kowalski, & Limber, 2007; Burnham et al, 2011; Gross, 2009; Klomek et al, 2010; Patchin and Hindura, 2006; Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007). Several studies of cyberbullying at the K-12 level found the "time and place" differences between traditional bullying and cyberbullying to be of note. The time and place of online harassment is anytime and anywhere; the notion that the cyberbullying victim cannot escape their harassers once they leave school grounds recurs throughout much of the literature (Agatston, Kowalski, & Limber, 2007; Burnham et al, 2011; Gross, 2009; Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007). Patchin and Hindura (2006) and Kowalski and Limber (2007) found that the anonymity enjoyed by cyberbullies can result in increased emotional distress for the victim. Unlike traditional bullying, a victim of online harassment cannot be certain if there are one or several bullies tormenting them (Klomek et al, 2010; Kowalski & Limber, 2007; Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2005). Vandenbosch and Cleemput (2008) found that the ability to remain anonymous empowered some bullies that may not have harassed others in a face-to-face environment. The ability to cause pain without personal contact was found to shield the bully from concern about their actions

(Kowalski & Limber, 2007; Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2005; Vandenbosch & Cleemput, 2008). Further, the inability to witness a victim's emotional response may result in a continuation of behaviors that may have been intended by the perpetrator as a joke, but which has a true negative impact on the victim (Kowalski & Limber, 2007; Raskauskas, 2007). As these same uniquely *cyber*-bullying attributes would exist in instances of cyberbullying at the college level, the practice of student affairs administrators such as counselors, residence life staff, dean of students' staff, and others, can be informed and improved by a recognition that victims of online harassment may experience greater distress than victims of traditional, face-to-face bullying.

Relative to the research conducted at the K-12 level, there is a recognized lack of research on bullying and cyberbullying within higher education (Baldasare et al, 2012; Chapell, 2006; Duncan, 2010; MacDonald & Pittman, 2010; Walker, Sockman, & Koehn, 2011). One commonality between the two educational levels in the research that has been conducted is the need for cyberbullying to be defined. As late as 2012, a qualitative study of the experiences of cyberbullying among of 30 undergraduate college students found that participants defined cyberbullying as "a wide range of behaviors, experiences, and social situations in which online aggression is occurring" (Baldasare, Bauman, Goldman, & Robie, 2012, p.148). "Many participants" (p. 136; no *N* provided) noted that harm may be unintentionally caused in online communications, and therefore, intent and repetition must be present to indicate online harassment. However, "more participants" (p.137) asserted that the receiver's interpretation of the communication was the defining factor. Once again, the foundational issue of definition of, or a single term

for, the phenomenon is shown to be both vital and elusive in any research conducted on the subject.

Prevalence

Studies differ in findings of the prevalence of cyberbullying among adolescents. In their survey of 1,454 twelve to seventeen-year-olds, Juvonen and Gross (2008) found that 72% of those surveyed had been cyberbullied at least once in the past year, and that 19% of respondents had been cyberbullied seven or more times in the same time period. Their study also found that those students who are bullied in school were much more likely to be cyberbullied, a finding contradicted by the prior research Ybarra, Diener-West, and Leaf (2007). Their study of 1,500 students between the ages of 10 and 17 found that 64% of those harassed online were not, in fact, being harassed in school. Sengupta and Chaudhuri (2011) examined online harassment through the lens of social networking sites (SNS). Through an analysis of the Pew Internet American Life Online Teen Survey data (gathered in 2006), they found that only 25% of respondents had been harassed online. The differing definitions of cyberbullying employed by each researcher may have influenced the resulting rates of cyberbullying reported. For example, in order to minimize self-selection bias, Juvonen and Gross (2008) referred to "things that happen online that are mean or rude" (p. 498) - by the respondent's own definition - in their survey; Sengupta and Chaudhuri (2010) looked at data that included teenager's positive responses to having experienced "rumor spreading, receiving threats, embarrassing information posted about them, and forwarding of private messages" (p.285) online. Again, in terms of implications for higher education student affairs, precise knowledge of

an institution's definition of online harassment will be a necessary starting point for any examination.

The majority of studies about cyberbullying at the college level seek to provide a foundation of research into the extent to which online harassment occurs among college students. The results of these studies differ widely, ranging from extremes of 8% (Englander, Mills, & McCoy, 2009) to as many as 61% (Gutshall, 2012) of survey respondents reporting having been the victim of cyberbullying or online harassment (Akbulut, Sahin, & Eristi, 2010; Aricak, 2009; Baldasare et al, 2012; Englander, Mills, & McCoy, 2009; Finn, 2004; Gutshall, 2012; MacDonald & Pittman, 2010; Schenk, 2011; Smith, Grimm, Lombard, & Wolfe, 2012; and Walker, Sockman, & Koehn, 2011). (It should be noted that the disparity between these two rates may have to do with the way each study defined cyberbullying for its respondents. Englander et al. limit the inquiry to students who have been cyberbullied - by the respondents definition - via Instant Message only, while in Gutshall's study, the number includes those who responded positively to having experienced any of nine forms of cyberbullying, including being "unfriended" on Facebook - an action that may be reasonably construed as somewhat benign.) These studies often solicited information about the cyberbullying behaviors of respondents, with results ranging from 3% to 51% of respondents reporting that they had cyberbullied someone else (Aricak, 2009; Englander, Mills, & McCoy, 2009; Gutshall, 2012; MacDonald & Pittman, 2010; Smith, Grimm, Lombard, & Wolfe, 2012). In fewer studies, but still of note, researchers asked students if they knew of someone else having been cyberbullied (though it was not specified whether this person was a fellow college student, nor when the incident occurred); results range from 37%-54% of respondents

answering positively (MacDonald & Pittman, 2010; Smith, Grimm, Lombard, & Wolfe, 2012; Walker, Sockman, & Koehn, 2011). Four studies (Akbulut, Sahin, & Eristi, 2010; Gutshall, 2012; MacDonald & Pittman, 2010; Walker, Sockman, & Koehn, 2011) do not specify whether their results reflect incidents that occurred solely during a respondent's college years. Taken as a whole, though the rates of prevalence are inconsistent, the studies show that online harassment is occurring on some college campuses. As this is the case, and as the potential negative ramifications for institutions from even one incident are severe (see the Tyler Clementi case and the associated negativity surrounding Rutgers University), student affairs administrators are obliged to craft and exercise policy and practice that not only addresses online harassment when it occurs, but also seeks to prevent it from occurring.

Demographics

The literature provides some insight into differences in age and gender in terms of the cyberbullying experienced by adolescents, indicating that cyberbullying tends to decrease as students grow older, and that cyberbullying is more of an issue for females than males. Raskauskas (2007) and Williams and Guerra (2007) found that the occurrence of electronic and internet bullying is greater in middle school than in high school. Several studies found that the type of cyberbullying conducted by girls is most often covert (i.e., female cyberbullies tend to rely on the anonymity online interactions can provide), and that a majority of girls view online harassment as problematic and are more likely than boys to report occurrences (Agatston, Kowalski, & Limber, 2007; Dilmac, 2009; Li, 2005; Li, 2006; Wolak, Mitchell, & Finkelhor, 2007); boys are more likely to be involved in more overt, direct cyberbullying behaviors and are less likely

than girls to view the behavior as a problem (Agatston, Kowalski, & Limber, 2007; Dilmac, 2009; Li, 2005; Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2007). In their study involving first a survey of 92 eleven to sixteen-year-olds followed by focus groups, then a survey of 533 students of the same age range, Smith et al. (2008) found that girls were more likely to be cyberbullied than boys. One participant credited this to a perceived difference in how females and males address conflict, stating "Girls hold grudges for longer, boys deal with it there and then and get it over with" (p. 380). Finally, Sengupta and Chaudhuri (2011) examined online harassment through the lens of social networking sites (SNS). Through an analysis of the Pew Internet American Life Online Teen Survey data (gathered in 2006), they found that teenage girls were 63% more likely to create a SNS, which led to girls being 250% more likely than boys to be harassed online. Research showing that females are more likely than males to report cyberbullying occurrences (with the caveat that this research stems from students at the K-12 level) may be an important factor for a student affairs information and research office to consider when examining rates of prevalence of cyberbullying among their students.

In the only extant study at the K-12 level to include a cross-cultural comparison, Li (2008) found that only 25% of the Canadian students surveyed (N = 157 twelve to fifteen-year-olds) reported being cyberbullied, while the experience of cyberbullying was reported by 60% of the Chinese students surveyed (N = 202 eleven to fourteen-year-olds). It would be unsound to extrapolate possible implications for student affairs administrators regarding international or minority population students from this single study, though certainly these populations are of special note in student affairs practice already.

Similar to the research conducted at the K-12 level, only one study (Abbott, 2011) has specifically examined the cyberbullying experienced by ethnic minorities at the college level. The mean age of survey respondents was 20.4, though because participants were recruited both online and on the campus, only 73% of the 113 respondents had completed "some college" (p.69). Four ethnicities were identified among the respondents: 64% Latino/Hispanic, 25% Asian/Asian American, 9% African American, and 3% Native American; 7% of participants identified themselves as biracial. Similar to Akbulut and Eristi's 2011 higher education study, Abbot's survey questioned students about "flaming [hostile and insulting interactions between Internet users, sometimes as a result of a discussion topic, sometimes intended to incite hostility for its own sake], harassment, griefing [intentionally disrupting an online game player, for example], cyberstalking, denigration, impersonation, outing/trickery, and exclusion" (p.71). Results showed that 27% of respondents knew someone who had been a victim of these types of cyberbullying; 19% had been a victim; 18% knew someone who had cyberbullied others; and 7% were themselves cyberbullies. It is difficult to compare these results to any known prevalence of online harassment among ethnic majorities for two reasons: first, both the ranges of prevalence discussed earlier vary greatly, and second, no ethnic breakdown was conducted within the studies. As studies of online harassment in higher education increase, it is highly likely that greater emphasis will be placed on an examination of the experiences of ethnic and other minorities, since institutions are generally cognizant of the importance of recognizing these groups.

Content and Type of Communication

The studies that examine the types of technology available to cyberbullies at the K-12 level indicate that negative communications containing images, rather than text, are the most disturbing to victims of cyberbullying. In Kowalski and Limber's (2007) study of nearly 4,000 sixth, seventh, and eighth-graders in the Southeastern and Northwestern United States, the use of camera phones to take pictures in personal settings and spread them quickly via the Internet or picture messaging led to increased concerns for victims. Slonje and Smith (2008) studied 360 Swedish adolescents between the ages of 12 to 20, and found that an image disseminated on the Internet had the highest emotional impact on its victims. Finally, Juvonen and Gross' 2008 study of adolescents found webcams to present the highest risk for potential use by cyberbullies among the eight technological tools they considered (the others being e-mail, Instant Messaging, profile sites, blogs, text messages, chat rooms, and message boards). Given the above, I investigated the ways in which my research sites communicate with their students about the uses of technology, and what if any, distinctions are made between the methods of online harassment by student affairs practitioners in terms of the ramifications for perpetrators and victims.

In research into incidents of cyberbullying within higher education, the subject matter and type of the negative communication takes many forms. In the research conducted in Turkey by Akbulut, Sahin, and Eristi (2010), cursing in instant messages was the most frequently reported incident of cybervictimization (56%), followed by individuals online masquerading as someone else (53%), and harassing e-mails or instant messages (52%). In this case, survey participants were recruited from a popular online social media site; the highest proportions of educational levels represented were high

school students (44%) and college students (40%). In 2011, Akbulut and Eristi extended their research into cyberbullying, focusing only on college students. They surveyed 254 Turkish college students between the ages of 18 and 23 about their experiences with online "flaming, harassment, cyberstalking, denigration, masquerade, exclusion, outing, and trickery" (p. 1160). Results indicated that social exclusion (in the form of instant messages being blocked) was the most form of cyberbullying most widely experienced by respondents (at 42.8%), followed by gossiping or inappropriate chats at 34.7%. Exclusion from online groups (25%) and concealing identities (21.6%) were the least reported form of cyberbullying experienced. Walker, Sockman, and Koehn (2011) examined the subject matter of the cyberbullying experienced by victims in their study; results ranged from 3% of respondents received threatening pictures or images to 34% of respondents had received communications from an individual pretending to be someone else. Schenk's (2011) results show that the most common subject of attack was on a victim's self-worth; the second most common for females was regarding sexual activity, and for males was sexual orientation. The third most prevalent subject for both genders was attacks on the victim's appearance. While it is difficult to synthesize these results into a single conclusion, it is important for student affairs administrators involved in handling cyberbullying to be aware of the variety of incarnations that online harassment can take.

Effects

Ybarra, Diener-West, and Leaf (2007) conducted a national survey of 1,588 youths between the ages of 10 and 15 years old and found that when internet harassment occurred twelve or more times in a school year, increased behavioral problems in victims resulted. One in five respondents stated that they brought a weapon to school within the

month prior to the study due to the cyberbullying they were experiencing. Though it would not be sensible to create policy based on one piece of research, student affairs administrators are obliged to address any possible origins of campus violence in the current climate of campus safety and its priority.

A number of studies produced results indicating a variety of factors that could be associated with cyberbullying. Dilmac (2009) conducted research in Turkey, gathering data from 666 students at Selcuk University. The researcher sought to identify personality traits correlated with cyber bullying. Findings indicated that aggression and "succorance" ("soliciting sympathy, affection, and emotional support from others") positively predicted cyber bullying, while endurance and affiliation ("seeking and sustaining numerous personal friendships") were negatively correlated with cyber bullying (p.1313). Dilmac, however, did not limit respondents to the online harassment they had experienced while in college. Schenk's 2011 study of West Virginia University undergraduates who reported having experienced cyberbullying included a questionnaire focused on the symptoms of psychopathology, a Likert-type scale to determine suicidal ideation, and a Likert Scale to determine five personality traits (neuroticism, extraversion, openness to new experiences, agreeableness, and conscientiousness). Results showed that cyberbullying victims scored high in depression, anxiety, phobic anxiety, and paranoia; 5.7% of victims reported attempting suicide, and 10.1% had frequent suicidal ideations. Johnson (2011) conducted a survey of 577 undergraduate students enrolled in communication classes at two mid-western universities whose ages ranged from 17 to 55. Students were asked such questions as, "In the past, I have been cyberbullied a lot"; a Likert Scale was also constructed regarding the respondents emotional responses to the incidents. Johnson

found a positive relationship between being a target of cyberbullying and loneliness and peer rejection. Results also showed that the effects of cyberbullying resonate deeply with victims and are easily recalled. The above includes potentially helpful insights for deans of students, counselors, residence life staff, campus police, and others into the experience of cyberbullying victims; for example, it would be beneficial for residence life staff to be aware that the effects of cyberbullying experienced by their residents during high school may still resonate while in college.

Studies show that cyberbullying may produce cyclical effects. A number of researchers studied the perpetrators of cyberbullying, finding that these perpetrators often act out of distressed feelings of their own. Konig, Gollwitzer, and Steffgen (2010) investigated the motivations of cyberbullies. 79% of the 473 teenaged respondents to their online survey were classified as cyberbullies; of those, 31% reported being the victims of traditional bullying within the past six months. Indeed, revenge is cited as a motivation for online harassment elsewhere in the literature (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004). However, Crothers and Kolbert (2008) and Dilmac (2009) found that children raised in abusive or neglectful homes were more likely to cyberbully others. Additional research found that a child's need to feel dominant may have led to their online bullying behavior (Beran & Li, 2005; Dilmac, 2009; Patchin & Hinduja, 2006; Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007). These findings may have implications for student affairs professionals in better understanding and counseling cyberbullies, in addition to enacting the institutional disciplinary procedures called for.

Summary

The terminology used for and definitions of cyberbullying vary in the extant literature, as does the range of behaviors considered to exemplify the phenomenon. Examples include an adolescent's response to a survey question inquiring about "things that happen online that are mean or rude" (Juvonen & Gross, 2008, p.498); rumor spreading, threats, the publicity of embarrassing information, and the forwarding of private messages (Sengupta & Chaudhyri, 2010); repetitive offensive and/or threatening electronic messages sent to a target, the posting of derogatory and/or untrue information about another online, and online impersonation, outing, trickery, and exclusion/ostracism (Kowalski et al., 2008). Examples of cyberbullying range, even within one study, from "unfriending" someone on Facebook to a man impersonating a woman online who had romantically rejected him; posing as the woman, he posted her address and telephone number on various internet chat room sites and online message boards, along with messages stating that she fantasized about being raped; on at least six occasions, men visited her home attempting to comply (Gutshall, 2012).

The professionalization of student affairs throughout its history has led to more and more specialized roles and departments; learning the perspectives of the variety of administrators who handle issues of cyberbullying at their institution would be a valuable tool in furthering our understanding of the issue. This increased professionalization has led to the formation of national student affairs organizations, and a consortium of these organizations has published standards relating to online harassment policy; it is unknown to what extent these standards are subscribed to or followed in practice. Finally, the studies analyzed above indicate that online harassment is occurring on college campuses,

and that the implications for student affairs administrators of the research conducted thus far would be informed by further research into their particular experience of the phenomenon. In the only extant study to include student affairs administrators, Gutshall (2012) surveyed an unstated number of staff members of either the judicial or student conduct offices of six institutions within the Southeastern Conference. The study found that each of the participating institutions deals with between 5 and 20 cases of cyberbullying each year. Additionally, while the term "cyberbullying" did not appear in the code of conduct at any of the schools, administrators pointed to anti-harassment policies under which they adjudicate incidents of behaviors typically referred to as cyberbullying. This lone study involving higher education administrators serves to generate, rather than to answer, questions regarding the experiences and practice of student affairs administrators when it comes to cyberbullying; for example: how does existing harassment policy function when used to address *online* harassment? What are the challenges faced by administrators in their work with cyberbullying? What would staff members of other departments (counseling departments, housing offices, etc) have reported about the nature of the online harassment they encounter and how they handle it? And finally, what would a layered, hierarchical definition of cyberbullying look like, as seen "on the ground" by university administrators? In order to address the gap in existing higher education cyberbullying research, a rich, descriptive examination the experiences of university administrators in implementing cyberbullying policy and practice is called for. Chapter Three presents the methods I used to provide this missing element of online harassment research.

Chapter 3: Methodology

There is a lack of research into the problem of online harassment in higher education (Chapell, 2006; Duncan, 2010; MacDonald & Pittman, 2010; Walker, Sockman, & Koehn, 2011; Baldasare et al, 2012). The studies that have been conducted have focused almost exclusively on the student perspective and experience; only one study, a doctoral dissertation (Gutshall, 2012), included the participation of student affairs administrators, and that via survey response. Due to this scarcity of research into the subject, student affairs administrators may respond to online harassment based on a variety of factors: their own student affairs experience; established policies at their institutions that address behaviors typically categorized as cyberbullying; established policies at their institution specific to cyberbullying; discussions with other student affairs administrators; or a combination of these. The goal of my study was to examine the experiences of student affairs administrators in implementing policies and practices related to online harassment at three universities. This chapter presents my research design, including details about the research sites; the participants; the data collection methods; the plan for data analysis; issues involving credibility and transferability; and finally, ethical considerations. My study was designed to answer the following research questions:

RQ1. How do student affairs administrators define online harassment as it occurs at their institution?

RQ2. What policies and practices do student affairs administrators say they use to address online harassment?

RQ3. What challenges do student affairs administrators say they face in their implementation of policies and practices that address online harassment?

Research Design

In order to provide a thorough foundation of research from which larger-scale quantitative studies may follow, I conducted a qualitative examination of student affairs administrators' work related to online harassment at three large public research universities. A qualitative approach was most appropriate for my study because cyberbullying in higher education and the administrative response to the problem have not yet led to a substantial body of research; a qualitative approach, which seeks to "establish the meaning of a phenomenon from the views of the participants" (p.16), was therefore optimal. In addition, the problem required "a means for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem," as opposed to quantitative research, which is "a means for testing objective theories by examining the relationship between variables" (Creswell, 2009, p.4). Personal interviews with student affairs administrators about cyberbullying policy and practice provided rich, descriptive data that spoke to "interpretation in context" (Tellis, 1997). In addition, these in-depth interviews functioned as a method to understand the experiences of the administrators and the sense making they attribute to those experiences (Seidman, 2006).

Using the 2012 CAS standard pertaining to institutionally provided student access to technology (henceforth referred to as the CAS guideline) as a guiding framework, my study involved a document review of materials related to online harassment at each

institution as well as in-depth interviews with student affairs administrators who are involved in responding to online harassment at their campus.

Research Sites

To gain diverse perspectives from university administrators in multiple departments, it was desirable to select universities of at least 10,000 degree-seeking students. A second criterion for selecting appropriate research sites was that the institutions provide extensive wired and wireless Internet access throughout campus to their students, so that my research into the administrative response to cyberbullying - an online and Internet-based phenomenon - would not be rendered moot from the outset based on limited technological infrastructure. Additionally, I sought institutions that do not specifically address cyberbullying in their student codes of conduct, yet whose student affairs administrators are called to combat issues of online harassment nonetheless (similar to the staff members of the judicial and student conduct offices surveyed in Gutshall's work) in order to examine how existing policy is used to address a novel and fast-moving phenomenon. Finally, it was desirable that my research sites be as similar as possible in every respect: size; sources of funding; co-educational status; degree-granting level; setting (residential vs. nonresidential); governance; and in terms of the institutions' current discernible cyberbullying policy. With a baseline of commonality established, confounding issues having to do with the dissimilarities between institutions is less likely to be relevant. In addition, variations in institutional policy and practice among similar institutions that do exist become more meaningful, making a richer comparison of their responses to online harassment possible.

Consistent with these criteria, I selected three universities within the University of California system as my research sites; for the purposes of this study, the sites will be referred to as University Red, University White, and University Blue. Each university is classified as a large institution according to the Carnegie Classification standard of at least 10,000 degree seeking students. Each university provides extensive wired and wireless Internet access and capabilities throughout their campuses to their students. While nearly identical harassment policies exist among the universities, none currently have a specific policy regarding cyberbullying within their student code of conduct. Finally, the universities are identical in a number of important classification categories. Each is a large, public, co-ed, four-year, primarily residential university. At least 80 percent of bachelor's degree majors at each university are in the arts and sciences, and graduate degrees are offered in at least half of the fields corresponding to undergraduate majors at each university. Each is a doctoral-granting research university with a very high level of research activity. In addition, as each university is a member campus of the University of California system and each campus is governed by the University of California Office of the President, student affairs administrators' roles and functions are somewhat consistent.

Participants

I interviewed a total of 35 administrators - 10 administrators from University Red, 13 administrators from University White, and 12 administrators from University Blue - who work directly with issues related to online harassment. Through email correspondence with a member of the student discipline staff at University Red (personal communication, December 19, 2013), I learned that the three main student affairs offices

that deal with cyberbullying at University Red are the student discipline office, the legal affairs office, and the student housing office. Ideally, I hoped to interview two-to-three student affairs administrators from each of these three offices. An initial interview pool of at least 17 administrators was possible from these three offices.

In a discussion with a student discipline administrator at University White, (personal communication, December 6, 2013), I learned that the four main departments that handle online harassment at University White are the student discipline office, the counseling office, the housing office, and campus security. Ideally, I hoped to interview two-to-three student affairs administrators from each of these four offices. An initial interview pool of at least 50 student affairs administrators was possible from these four offices.

Through email correspondence with two student discipline administrators (personal communications, both December 18, 2013) at University Blue, I learned that the three offices that handle the bulk of cyberbullying reports at University Blue are the student discipline office, the housing office, and the legal affairs office. Ideally, I will interview two-to-three student affairs administrators from each of these three offices. An initial interview pool of at least 21 student affairs administrators was possible from these three offices.

Data Collection

Document review. I reviewed university policy and other documents related to online harassment made available to the public, such as the universities' student conduct codes, student housing codes, computer use policies, and counseling policies found on the universities websites, as well as media articles in the universities' online student

newspapers. The search topics in my review of media articles included *cyberbullying, cyber bullying, online harassment, cyber harassment, electronic bullying, internet harassment, electronic harassment, digital harassment,* and *online bullying*. My document review generated a greater knowledge of the administrative structures on each campus, led to additional potential interviewees, and also informed my interview protocol.

Interviews. I interviewed 35 administrators at the three campuses who work directly with online harassment policy and practice. My interview protocol *(Appendix C: Student Affairs Administrator Interview Protocol)* was informed by information collected in my document review as well as by my preliminary list of codes *(Appendix B: Preliminary List of Codes Derived from Chapter 2: Literature Review and the 2012 CAS Technology Guideline)*, and sought to answer my research questions directly *(Appendix D: Relevance of Interview Questions to Research Questions).* The goal of these interviews was to delve in-depth into the administrators' experiences in implementing policies and practice that address and seek to prevent online harassment.

Based on the number and type of questions in my interview protocol, interviews were between 30 and 60 minutes long, and were semi-structured to allow for deep probing. All interviews were held in the interviewee's office or in a similar private space on campus of their choosing; in the event that an in-person interview was impossible to schedule (9 out of 35 interviews), I conducted a phone interview. I received consent from the interviewees to audio-recorded the interview on both an iPhone voice recorder and a secondary digital recording device. The names and titles of participants are not used in my study, but the names of all participating offices are listed in the aggregate. Since even

the proper names of these departments and offices might be identifiable to a specific university, I intentionally use generic descriptors (for example, student discipline office; counseling office; housing office) and use the lower case for these descriptors in this dissertation so as to preserve confidentiality of participants (who are identified as student discipline administrators, counseling office administrators, housing office administrators, etc). In addition, I asked each participant for the names of other potential interviewees whom I may not be aware of, again with the criteria of being a staff member who works directly with online harassment at the campus. This "snowball" technique identified study participants of whom I was unaware, and furthered my goal of painting an in-depth portrait of the administrative response to and prevention of cyberbullying at each institution.

Data Analysis

Document analysis. Using Document Summary Forms (*Appendix A*), I compared the findings of my document analysis for each institution to the CAS guideline in order to identify commonalities and dissimilarities. I also analyzed document data for campus policies and practices related to online harassment and information that address my research questions.

Interviews. I employed a professional transcription service to transcribe the audio recording of each interview within hours of it being conducted. After the first five to seven interviews from each university were transcribed, I began to code the transcripts by identifying themes related to the research questions and by matching the themes to my preliminary list of codes (*Appendix B: Preliminary List of Codes Derived from Chapter 2: Literature Review and the 2012 CAS Technology Standard*). I also compared the

responses of student affairs administrators to the CAS guideline in order to identify commonalities and dissimilarities. The results of both my document analysis and interviews are therefore a rich description of the student affairs response to online harassment at the institutions, and also an examination of that response seen through the lens of nationally recognized professional standards. This final coding process involved sorting the data into segments, and giving those segments a category or theme name (Creswell, 2009); the names of the categories or themes emerged from what I identified in the data as the most apt description for the shared characteristics of the data (Merriam, 2009). As additional interviews were transcribed and analyzed, I continually reassessed my coding as new themes emerged, comparing the results to my research questions. I constantly compared data during the coding process to help ensure that there was no drift in the definition or meaning of codes (Creswell, 2009). When all interviews were transcribed and coded, I was able to identify the themes that emerged and was be able to quantify like responses and outliers. I divided each set of coded transcripts by university and grouped themes as relevant to my research questions, as well as by relevance to the CAS guideline. I ultimately analyzed and discussed as findings the most prevalent themes for each university, the standard being that at least half of the interviewees made statements exemplifying the theme. Findings from the interviews were bolstered throughout with relevant information that emerged from the document review.

Credibility and Transferability

"To have any effect on either the practice or the theory of a field, research studies must be rigorously conducted; they need to present insights and conclusions that ring true to readers, practitioners, and other researchers" (Merriam, 2009, p. 210). In order to meet

this standard of rigor, I implemented strategies intended to shore up my study's credibility and transferability.

The internal validity, or *credibility*, of a study is a measure of how closely the study's findings are linked to reality (Merriam, 2009). In order to help to make my study credible, I needed to reflect critically on my own biases, dispositions, and assumptions about cyberbullying. I combated the influence of any preconceptions I brought to the issue by piloting my interview questions with a university student discipline administrator who does not work at my research sites. In addition, each of my interviews included a request for the names of other campus administrators who deal with online harassment so that I could interview them as well. This deliberate “snowball” technique helped to minimize researcher bias, since I did not know of these additional interviewees from the outset. As mentioned previously, participant’s names and titles are not used in my study. In this way, the participants felt comfortable expressing their true feelings and opinions. In addition, I gave each participant the opportunity to review the transcript of our interview soon after it was created but prior to my coding, and asked them to make known to me any concerns they had with the transcription. Lastly, not only did my doctoral committee co-chairs conduct reviews of my research and findings throughout the process, but in addition, an independent objective source reviewed my interview data and assessed whether my findings appeared plausible.

The external validity, or generalizability, of a study is measured by the extent to which its findings can be applied to other situations. This traditional sense of generalizability does not suit a qualitative study, in which "a single case or small, nonrandom, purposeful sample is selected precisely because the researcher wishes to

understand the particular in depth, not to find out what is generally true of many" (Merriam, p.224). Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest crossover terminology, proposing the notion of *transferability* as proper for use in qualitative studies. They suggest that the onus of applicability is on the reader or consumer of the study, rather than the researcher. It is the researcher's duty to provide rich, thick description in the form of highly detailed presentation of my findings, along with "evidence presented in the form of quotes from participant interviews, field notes, and documents" (Merriam, 2009). It is my hope that I have accomplished this.

Ethical Considerations

My role as a mid-level student affairs administrator at one of the professional schools at one of my research sites presented ethical issues that needed to be considered and addressed. Since I did not seek the participation of any employees of the professional school where I am employed, and since I do not routinely professionally interact with the offices that I focused on in my study, I did not and do not foresee any complications or conflicts of interest arising. It was, however, important for me to clearly disclose my professional role to the administrators at the site who participated in my study.

All notes taken by hand during interviews were locked in a file cabinet at my home and were only removed if and when needed for review. Upon completion of my doctoral program, all paper documents containing interview notes or notes of any kind related to my study will be shredded and destroyed. Digital files, recordings, and notes were saved in a password protected cloud-based application that was accessible only by me. Upon completion of my research, all digital files will be deleted from both my personal computer and cloud backup. Digital audio recordings were relayed to the

independent transcription service through encrypted file-sharing software and were accessible only by the independent transcription service and me.

Summary

To develop a rich, thick description and analysis of higher education administrative policy and practice related to online harassment, I conducted a qualitative study at three universities. My study consisted of document review of publications related to online harassment at each school and interviews with 35 university administrators who implement online harassment policy and practice in their work. Chapter Four examines the findings from the data collected.

Chapter 4: Findings

This study investigated university student affairs policy and practice regarding online harassment, or cyberbullying, among its students. The investigation sought to address the following research questions:

RQ1. How do student affairs administrators define online harassment as it occurs at their institution?

RQ2. What policies and practices do student affairs administrators say they use to address online harassment?

RQ3. What challenges do student affairs administrators say they face in their implementation of policies and practices that address online harassment?

To answer these questions, I reviewed documents relevant to online harassment from three research universities that are available to the public (such as the universities' student codes of conduct, student housing policies, and media articles in the universities' online newspapers), and conducted in-depth interviews with a total of 35 student affairs and other university personnel who work with the issue of online harassment at the three schools. The findings from this study are presented in four sections: the first three sections present the findings from both the document review and the interviews at each university. The 2012 CAS standard for institutionally provided technology acts as a guiding framework for analysis throughout. The fourth section presents a comparison of the findings from each university to the other two.

Case One: University Red

University Red is a large research university of more than 29,000 undergraduate and graduate students, over 1,100 faculty and nearly 10,000 staff members. The University was founded in 1965, and its campus covers 1,500 suburban acres. In 2013, over half of the students in University Red's freshmen class were the first in their families to pursue a college degree. In 2012-2013, tuition at University Red was approximately $15,000 for California resident undergraduates and approximately $38,000 for nonresidents. The school received over 60,000 applications for the freshmen class in 2013, and enrolled just over 5,000 students that fall. Over 12,000 students live on campus each year, with roughly 80% of all freshmen choosing to live on-campus. Though the university has no overarching university-wide mission statement, it affirms the values of "respect, intellectual curiosity, integrity, commitment, empathy, appreciation, and fun" (University Red website). At the conclusion of the 2012-2013 school year, University Red awarded over 6,000 Bachelor's degrees, over 1,200 Master's degrees, over 400 Ph.D./EdDs, over 100 M.D.s, and over 80 J.D.s. University Red's academic structure is comprised of the School of Arts, Biological Sciences, Education, Engineering, Humanities, Information and Computer Sciences, Nursing Sciences, Pharmaceutical Sciences, Physical Sciences, Social Ecology, Social Science (the largest academic unit, consisting of almost 7,000 undergraduate and graduate students), and professional schools of Business, Law, and Medicine.

As suggested by my initial campus contact, I contacted via email administrators in the student discipline, legal affairs, and student housing offices, due to the offices' familiarity with online harassment among students. From these three offices, I was able

to interview two staff members of the student discipline office, one staff member of the legal affairs office, and one staff member of the student housing office. At the conclusion of each interview, I asked each of these administrators to recommend additional personnel on campus whose work involves online harassment among students. I subsequently emailed the recommended staff members. Through this "snowball" technique, I was able to interview two staff members of the counseling office, three staff members of a large academic department that had experienced recent incidents of online harassment, and one staff member of campus security. In total, I interviewed ten University Red staff members. For the sake of clarity, I assigned each interviewee a gender-neutral pseudonym (see TABLE 1 below).

Table 1

Gender-neutral Pseudonyms for University Red Interviewees

Gender-neutral Pseudonym for Interviewee	University Red Department
Jaylin	Campus Security
Emory	Counseling
Jessie	Counseling
Milan	Large Academic Department
Justice	Large Academic Department
Armani	Large Academic Department
Dakota	Legal Affairs
Lennon	Student Discipline
Sidney	Student Discipline
Oakley	Housing/Residence Life

The findings gleaned from these interviews, along with the relevant information obtained from my University Red document review, follow. My findings are grouped according to the Research Question to which they pertain.

Research Question 1: How do student affairs administrators define online harassment as it occurs at their institution?

Administrator's Roles on Campus

When asked to define online harassment, responses from all ten University Red administrators reflected the role that the administrator plays on campus. Those in student discipline or legal affairs departments (three out of ten interviewees) adhered to the definition of harassment found in the university's Code of Student Conduct: "conduct that is so severe and/or pervasive, and objectively offensive, and that so substantially impairs a person's access to University programs or activities that the person is effectively denied equal access to the University's resources and opportunities." (University Red Student Code of Conduct; see Appendix E). These departments are responsible for categorizing student behavior, matching it to the conduct code, and adjudicating the matter; hence, their familiarity with the definitions and standards found within the code. In cases involving online harassment, the online nature of the behavior acted as a descriptor for the administrators in terms of the method of harassment. For example, Lennon, a student discipline administrator, said "I don't think there is a standard campus definition of online harassment; I think the student conduct policies have traditionally defined just harassment. Being online or being virtual has been one of the components of the form of communication." With regard to terminology for the phenomenon, all three interview subjects in student discipline or legal affairs roles relied on the student code of conduct in their determination of what to call the incidents they are faced with. "It might be online harassment, it might be cyberbullying. It might be whatever the terminology that may work best depending on what describes the manner in which it's being executed", said Sidney. Dakota, an administrator in the legal affairs office, stated, "We use [the term] electronic harassment more than anything else. Online

doesn't capture it fully, because we have so many instances of harassing text messages, and I don't consider that to be online. I don't think cyberbullying would be a term we would use, because my office has a more specific focus than everything that could be considered bullying."

The seven interviewees at University Red who do not work in either the student discipline or legal affairs offices also based their conception of online harassment on their work experience with the phenomenon. For example, Oakley, a housing/residence life administrator, described the phenomenon as incidents in which "people have posted others' private information, or have made threats or slanderous comments on the Internet or on Twitter or the like, that would possibly hit our harassment level". Oakley described an incident in which one student resident repeatedly tweeted private information and gossip about his/her roommate and other residence hall members over a period of months. On-campus residents at University Red are held not only to the overarching student code of conduct, but also to housing/residence life policies which include a prohibition of "both direct and indirect forms of verbal and written abuse, threats, physical harassment, intimidation, and violence against another person" (University Red On-Campus Housing Policy; see Appendix F). In this case, housing staff addressed the matter by applying the existing housing harassment policy, and by meeting with both the perpetrator in a series of one-on-one counseling sessions in order to end the behavior.

Jaylin, a member of the university's security staff, also stated that the definition of and terminology for online harassment is dictated by the policies that guide his or her work: "Generally we're sticking with the terminology that we find in the criminal code, so harassing, annoying behaviors; words we can find in the criminal code itself". The

California Penal Code lists obscene language used “with intent to annoy,” and threats to a person, their family members, or their property as misdemeanors (see Appendix G for the portions of California Penal Code relevant to online harassment). Jaylin described dealing with cases in which "the party that didn't want the relationship to break up starts texting very mean, derogatory, sometimes threatening statements or emailing or posting on Facebook, and basically is almost trying to bully the other party back into the relationship.”

Emory, a staff member in the counseling office, defined online harassment as "the use of social media or text messages and how students can use that to control and manipulate each other, especially within the context of intimate partner relationships." Emory then described an incident in which a student received over 40 emails and text messages a day over a period of two to three weeks from another student who believed the relationship to be a close one. Emory also mentioned using the term "cyberstalking" rather than online harassment when dealing with the issue, since he or she feels that the term "stalking" more appropriately describes the behavior he or she has encountered, and is a term frequently used in the counseling field. Similar to Lennon, Emory matches behavior to a previously established standard, and subsequently incorporates the internet-related term to distinguish where or how the behavior is being conducted.

The incidents University Red administrators use to describe online harassment are consistent with the types of behavior described as online harassment or cyberbullying in the literature on the subject, defined most recently by Kuzma as activities that include “sending abusive, threatening, or obscene emails through mediums such as OSN (online social networking) sites; stalking users on sites, impersonating another person by creating

a fake profile; spamming a specific user repeatedly" and "online activities such as stalking, threats, harassment, impersonation, humiliation, trickery and exclusion" (Kuzma, 2013, p. 54). Further, incidents of what the interviewees considered online harassment are consistent with the distinctions made in the literature between traditional, face-to-face bullying, and cyberbullying. At no time did the student affairs administrators interviewed refer to physical harm resulting to the victim as a component for their defining the incident as online harassment, nor did interviewees mention the physical strength of the online harasser. Interviewees did not mention either a physical or psychological power imbalance between the online harasser and the victim in the incidents they described as online harassment. In some incidents described by interviewees as online harassment, the victim did not know the perpetrator, as opposed to traditional acquaintance bullying. Finally, though some interviewees mentioned incidents of online harassment that included repetition of the behavior in question, repetition itself was not thought of by the administrators as definitional criteria, but rather spoke to the severity and urgency of the case.

The lack of a universally recognized and utilized definition for online harassment at University Red is also consistent with the literature on the subject, in which, as previously stated, definitions vary from study to study. As a result, student affairs administrators rely on either previously established policies under which online harassment behaviors fall, and/or on their professional experience to describe the nature, scope, and meaning of the phenomenon. In the case of the student discipline, legal affairs, and campus security administrators interviewed, a relevant policy used routinely in their work exists and is able to be applied to online harassment. In the case of the housing

administrators interviewed, both an adherence to housing policies as well as a more counseling-like approach to their residents determined their course of action when addressing online harassment. In the case of the counseling administrators, there is no existing counseling policy to consult regarding online harassment; their jobs are not to specifically nail down the parameters and boundaries of the phenomenon, but rather, to listen to and advise perpetrators and victims. A second member of the counseling department, Jessie, captured this when he or she indicated that work with the online harassment on the ground trumps the need to pin down an exact definition for the phenomenon, saying "I would describe the behaviors in what I'm looking at and deal with it on a case-by-case basis; I don't need to define it to work with it."

For comparison with that of my other research sites, further analysis of University Red's definition of online harassment is found on page 93.

Online Harassment Tools

All ten University Red administrators named Facebook as a social media tool they have seen used in cases of online harassment among students. This use of the social media network to describe online harassment and provide its meaning - in essence, to define the phenomenon - was universal among the University Red administrators I interviewed. Nine out of ten administrators cited text messaging as a commonly used method of online harassment; only one of these administrators (Lennon) described dealing with cases of cyberbullying in which the perpetrators used "services where you can't trace the origin of who sent the text." Nine out of ten administrators named e-mail as a widely used method of harassment. Six of the ten University Red administrators cited websites such as juicycampus.com, hotornot.com, or "anonymous message boards

or websites where you have a user name and you submit your opinion; we see a lot of cases come out of the comments sections of these sites", said Dakota. See the table below for all methods used for online harassment according to University Red administrators:

Table 2

Method or Tool Used for Online Harassment as Cited by University Red Administrators

Method/Tool Used for Online Harassment	Number of Administrators Citing (out of 10)
Facebook	10
Texting	9
Email	9
Misc. Websites, Message Boards, or Blogs (JuicyCampus, HotOrNot, etc)	6
Instant Messaging/GChat	4
Twitter	3
Snapchat	2
Craigslist	2
University Classroom Management System	2
YouTube	1
Tinder	1
WebCam/Videotaping	1
Teaching Evaluation	1
Instagram	1
GroupMeet	1
Yelp	1

According to the literature, Facebook's history of addressing online harassment concerns is somewhat inconsistent. Kuzma (2013) reports that in 2008, Facebook joined with 13 other "online giants" (including MySpace and Google) in launching an industry initiative to combat online harassment and abuse "in response to the European governmental pressure to fight growing concerns over cyber-bullying" (p.55). However, in 2010, Facebook rejected the use of a panic button, developed by Microsoft and the UK's Child Exploitation and Online Protection Center, which would allow users to press one button, integrated into Internet Explorer 8, to report a range of online abuse (Kuzma,

2013). That said, in naming methods used for online harassment, Lennon responded, "Facebook. That tends to be the preferred method by our students these days. Everybody's on it," indicating that Facebook's prominence on the above list may speak more to the prevalent use of the online social network among students rather than any specific features or failings of Facebook itself. The pervasive use of Facebook in particular and online technology in general expressed by University Red administrators recalls Abbott (2011), Gross (2009), and Kowalski, Limber, and Agatson's (2008) finding that the "always on" aspect of online technology facilitates the aggressions of cyberbullies.

Increasing Prevalence of Online Harassment

A fundamental component of defining an issue is not only determining its meaning, but also its boundaries; with this in mind, I sought to learn from my interviewees their perception of the prevalence of online harassment among students at their university. Seven of the ten administrators interviewed at University Red describe the existence online components in the cases they deal with as increasing over time. Of these seven administrators, the prevalence of the online harassment issues they dealt with varied by department. Those in student discipline and legal affairs roles expressed that the cases involving some type of online component have increased as the use of technology has become ubiquitous among students; said Sidney, "I wouldn't consider it the majority [of cases], but it has gone up and up. It's increased from what it was 7, or 5, or even 3 years ago. It's an every minute part of their [students'] lives now." Emory stated that within the counseling office, "it's very prevalent in the majority of cases we're seeing now, especially within the context of stalking". However, Oakley, a housing/residence

life administrator, stated, "It's definitely on the rise, but I don't think by any means it's the predominance of what we deal with [in the residence halls]. That would be alcohol [-related incidents]".

University Red administrators were unable to share statistics on the precise number of online harassment cases that occur at the university for two reasons. First, the complete internal records of the offices with which I spoke – the student discipline, counseling, housing, and campus security offices – are not available to the public for reasons of confidentiality. Second, since the working definition of what constitutes online harassment varies from department to department, and at times, within a department, precise data on the subject would be impossible to gather. This is not to say that student affairs departments at University Red are not addressing the issue; it is a more a matter of differing categorizations. Inconsistency among reported rates of prevalence of online harassment by University Red administrators is consistent with the literature on the subject. Just as what "counts" as cyberbullying may vary from office to office and administrator to administrator, the definition of cyberbullying varies in study to study; since rates of prevalence reported in a particular study are based on that study's definition of the phenomenon, rates of prevalence vary widely (see pages 22-24). In addition, rates of prevalence of online harassment at a university will not only be based on the university's definition of the issue; the definition and meaning the victim him or herself attaches to the experience will determine whether they report the experience, and therefore whether it comes to the attention of university administrators at all.

Research Question 2: What policies and practices do student affairs administrators say they use to address online harassment?

Inter-Departmental Collaboration and Consultation

Nine out of the ten administrators interviewed from University Red described collaboration and consultation with other departments on campus as standard practice when handling incidents of online harassment. Lennon described the intention of this collaboration: "Basically, we use all the resources available to us to best manage the situation and maximize the opportunity for the student to get the most out of the situation." Both counseling office administrators interviewed reported working closely with the student discipline, campus security, housing/residence life offices, and academic departments in terms of receiving referrals of students who experienced "negative emotional or psychological consequences from the use of technology" (CAS guidelines). This collaboration among University Red administrators is not incidental; Jaylin (campus security), Sidney (student discipline), and Jessie (counseling) each mentioned a standing body of administrators comprised of the legal affairs, campus security, counseling, social work, the student discipline offices that meets weekly to discuss ongoing cases relevant to the offices represented.

Use of Student Discipline and Legal Affairs Policies and Practices

Seven of the ten University Red administrators interviewed cited the policies and practice of the student discipline or legal affairs office when describing methods used to address online harassment of and by students. Of these seven, five administrators are not professionally responsible for applying the regulations found in the student conduct code, but are aware that those regulations are enforced by other offices on campus in dealing with cases of harassment, whether online or otherwise. Dakota said, "we send our results to [the dean of students office] for them to take appropriate student conduct or judicial

action as necessary...Some of our student code of conduct policies specifically on harassment will apply" to incidents of cyberbullying. Jessie noted that while his or her work in the counseling office is guided by professional ethics, "After that, it's university conduct policy...that we need to abide by." Two of the seven administrators are themselves members of the student discipline or legal affairs offices whose professional roles call them to refer to and apply the code frequently. Lennon said, "In order for the university to impose any kind of administration action or discipline, those students will have to be in violation of university [student conduct] policy."

The student discipline and legal affairs offices work together to adjudicate not only violations of the University's student conduct code, but also the school's Computer and Network Use Policy. This policy covers the Federal Electronic Communication and Privacy Act of 1986, the University of California Electronic Communication Policy, and University-specific computing and information systems guidelines and policies of use, including guidelines for sexual harassment complaint resolutions, guidelines for the UC electronic communications policy, a world wide web policy, and security guidelines for computers and devices connected to the university's network. For example, one section of the policy reads in part:

"University users may use electronic communications resources for incidental personal purposes provided that such use does not directly or indirectly:

- Involve sending regular or voluminous personal messages via lengthy email lists
- Create a hostile working environment (including sexual or other forms of harassment)

- Violate any University policy or law, including obscenity laws." (Computer and Network Use Policy of University Red)

According to Milan, an information technology administrator in an academic department that had experienced recent incidents of online harassment, "[The Computer and Network Use] policy is something that every student has to read and accept in order to get their online Student ID." In this way, University Red informs each of its students about the implications of the misuse of institutionally provided technology. In addition, if an incident of online harassment meets the standard of harassing behavior found in the Code of Student Conduct and/or the Computer and Network Use Policy, established institutional student disciplinary procedures (CAS guidelines) would be followed, which is consistent with nationally recognized professional standards for student affairs administrators when addressing online abuse. All ten University Red administrators interviewed mentioned either disciplinary consequences for perpetrators of online harassment (such as a no-contact order, suspension, or expulsion) and/or the resources on campus for victims of the behavior (such as the university counseling centers, student health center, LGBT resource office, and legal affairs offices).

An Online Harassment Hierarchy

Administrators at University Red said that the cases of online harassment they deal with varied by degree relative to a number of factors. Six of the ten administrators interviewed cited severity of the language used in the communication as determinative in prioritizing the case; these administrators also cited repetition of the communication, perceived urgency of the situation, and perception of overt or covert threat to the victim or others. Dakota said incidents handled by the legal affairs office have included

"everything from just repeated email requests or annoyances to folks who might choose to post graphic messages online, whether it's on Facebook or some other social media site, to people who are harassing another student by setting up a dummy Craigslist ad for sexual favors." Jaylin expressed the range of incidents dealt with by campus security:

> We've had a number of cases in this realm, starting out from simply a couple in a relationship that are breaking up or not getting along; one will start harassing the other online whether it be on Facebook, email, text message and so forth, continued to a far extreme where we've had people who don't like another person's lifestyle and will focus in on them, again on Facebook or email, just a number of methods for transmitting that hate-filled language, to than another far extreme where we have people being stalked on the Internet; we had one of our female students being stalked through Yelp; that's how he knew where she was.

The hierarchy of online harassment expressed by University Red administrators is consistent with the way in which they define the phenomenon; that is, the hierarchy expressed generally reflects the role the administrator plays on campus. For example, Jessie, an administrator in the counseling office, describes "the minor ones" as "where there's not really anything clearly stated; it's a bit more ambiguous. Like, it might be a student crying out for help" rather than presenting an overt threat to another student on an online platform. Jessie continued, "I can say with certainty that anybody who is threatening to hurt themselves or someone in the campus community, we take those very, very seriously." Lennon, a student discipline administrator, echoed student conduct code policy when describing the relative degrees of severity he or she places on cases of online harassment, saying a case is considered severe "if it is a credible threat that is actionable

by the university. If it's conduct that happens multiple times, really serves no purpose and there is a sense in which the person fears for their safety". Dakota, a legal affairs administrator, made a distinction of degree using legal terminology: "If it was behavior directed towards somebody who's ion a protected group, that would classify as harassment. Anything other than that, I would call it lower level bullying". For comparison with that of my other research sites, further analysis of University Red's hierarchy of online harassment is found on page 95.

Research Question 3: What challenges do student affairs administrators say they face in their implementation of policies and practices that address online harassment?

Anonymity of Online Interactions

Six of the ten University Red administrators interviewed described the anonymity the Internet provides as a challenge in their work with online harassment. For example, Armani described the unique difficulty online anonymity presents to the victims of cyberbullying, saying

> The hard thing with online stuff is you can come up with a fake e-mail address, fake Facebook account, and say whatever the heck you want and never really have to face any consequences…when it's not traceable it's especially frustrating for the student that's receiving the harassment. They don't know if they're sitting next to that person in class.

Lennon described the technological difficulty that exists in determining the original location of the harassment: "In years past, e-mail headers contained a lot of information about where the email originated from...but services today, so that people can protect

their information in terms of privacy, they're not as revealing. In years past, an IP address could lead us directly to the computer it's sending from." Advances in technology, however, make it possible for users to "mask their IP address," according to Jaylin. "It takes a lot more investigation on those to actually backtrack and try to figure out where it's coming from." Secondly, if this "backtracking" is accomplished, it may not be possible to prove who exactly created the offending content. Milan explained, "The hard part is, technologically, you could make the claim that 'I left my computer logged on, I didn't write that, I gave my friends my login and password"; you could say anything. Or you could even say, 'My account was hacked', and you might never know the truth." Sidney described how problematic this aspect of online harassment can be in practice:

> When you have anonymous comments, it's hard. You do the best you can and narrow down, ok, who might this be?...Usually, the student that's receiving the messages has a good idea of who it is, so that helps in terms of maybe brining in some folks and investigating it, but it's a challenge because you may be bringing in people who have no idea. Now all of a sudden they've been accused wrongly of doing something.

Research into practical aspects of the anonymity that online technology provides to cyberbullies is yet unexplored. Though Suler's (2004) concept of online disinhibition delves into the possible psychological effects of anonymous online interactions on the aggressor, thus far the literature on cyberbullying does not extend to an examination of the practical ways in which universities, businesses, and the like might or might not access accurate user information as a component of tracing acts of online aggression.

Minimization of and Desensitization to Online Interactions

Five University Red administrators described students' tendency to minimize the substance of online interactions as challenging to deal with, in terms of interactions with both perpetrators and victims of online harassment. Dakota stated, "I think the biggest challenge I've seen develop in this whole area of harassment is that people are willing to be much more mean spirited, graphic, really awful online or in writing than they might in person. People will say things they would never say face to face online...I think people don't recognize the longevity of their online words or their online posts." This insight reflects two characteristics of Suler's (2004) theory of online disinhibition: dissociative anonymity (a cyberbully separating his or her online actions from the way they would behave in the real world) and invisibility (with no physical cues from their victims as a guide for their behavior, a cyberbully is immune to expressions of sadness, anger, humiliation and the like that might curtail their bullying behavior). Administrators at University Red also noted a how this minimization of online interactions leads to a desensitization among victims of online harassment. Oakley believes that students are "desensitized...to negativity online. I think it's out there, so prevalent...they're so, unfortunately, used to seeing derogatory status updates, or people blasting each other for this or that, for them they're just like, 'Yup, there's another one'". Emory described the issue manifesting itself slightly differently in his or her counseling work, stating,

> I think a lot of it is the unawareness of the power of your own phone. You'll want to check in and you'll want people to know where you are and what you're doing...it ends up doing a lot of damage because people have lost all sense of privacy...what's so hard about online harassment is, people don't always realize how accessible we all are to reach others with social media, it doesn't allow

people to make that separation of what is normal and what is not. I think it's difficult for people to realize what is stalking; it's become so minimized.

This concept of tacit acceptance of negative online behavior is as yet unresearched within the current literature on cyberbullying.

Summary of University Red Findings

University Red administrators define online harassment based on their on-campus roles and work experience, and there is a perception among administrators that the prevalence of online harassment among students is increasing. Facebook is tool most widely cited by administrators for the online harassment they have dealt with professionally. University Red administrators rely on collaboration and consultation among colleagues of their own and other departments on campus when addressing online harassment, and tend to refer to policies and practices related to the student discipline and legal affairs offices in doing so. Administrators cited severity of the language used in the communication, repetition of the communication, perceived urgency of the situation, and perceived overt or covert threat to the victim or others in their determination of the priority or seriousness of the incident. Finally, University Red administrators find the anonymity the internet provides and a desensitization to and minimization of online interactions as most challenging when it comes to the implementation of university policy and practice in addressing online harassment, which corresponds to both Abbott (2011), Gross (2009), Kowalsii, Limber, and Agatson's (2008), and Patchin and Hindura's (2006) finding that the lack of a safe haven from online harassment has allowed cyberbullies to intensify attacks, as well as to aspects of Sulers (2004) Online disinhibition Theory. From a student affairs perspective, the policies and practices implemented by University Red

administrators meet the nationally recognized guidelines set forth by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in 2012 regarding institutionally provided student access to technology; policies are clearly stated in the university's student code of conduct, and these policies are readily referred to by University Red administrators when counseling and/or disciplining perpetrators and victims of online harassment.

Case Two: University White

University White is a large research university of over 40,000 undergraduate and graduate students, over 3,500 faculty, and over 23,000 staff members. Its undergraduate student body (over 26,000 students) is 55% female; its racial/ethnic make-up is 3% African American/Black, <1% American Indian/Alaskan Native, 34% Asian/Pacific Islander, 17% Hispanic, 32% White, 3% Domestic, Race/Ethnicity Unknown, and 7% International. 89% of University White's undergraduates are California residents, 5% are out-of-state students, and 7% are from other countries. The average age of an undergraduate is 20, with 6% of undergraduates age 25 years or older. University White's urban campus is comprised of just over 400 acres. In 2013-2014, tuition at University White was approximately $13,000 for California resident undergraduates and $36,000 for nonresidents. University White received over 80,000 applications for the freshmen class in 2013, and enrolled approximately 5,500 of those applicants that fall. 55% of University White undergraduates receive some sort of financial assistance. At the conclusion of the 2012-2013 school year, University White awarded over 7,500 Bachelor's degrees, over 2,700 academic and professional Master's degrees, over 700 PhD/EdDs, and over 600 DDS, J.D., and MDs. 38% of all undergraduates, and 94% of freshmen, live in university

housing. University White summarizes its purpose as that of education of its students, research which advances knowledge, and service within the local community and globally. University White is comprised of 5 divisions of undergraduate education (social science, humanities, physical sciences, life sciences, and undergraduate education), 4 schools of both undergraduate and graduate learning (arts and architecture, engineering and applied science, theatre, film, and television, and nursing), and 8 graduate and professional schools (education & information studies, law, business, public affairs, medicine, dentistry, public health, and neuroscience & human behavior).

I contacted via email administrators in the student discipline office, counseling office, student housing and campus security, as suggested by my initial campus contact, due to the offices' familiarity with online harassment among students. From these four offices, I was able to interview four staff members of the student discipline office, two staff members of the counseling office, three staff members of the student housing office, and two staff members of campus security. At the conclusion of each interview, I asked each of these administrators to recommend additional personnel on campus who work with online harassment among students. I subsequently emailed the staff members recommended. Through this "snowball" technique, I was able to interview one staff member of the legal affairs office and one staff member of the student life office. In total, I interviewed thirteen University White staff members. For the sake of clarity, I assigned each interviewee a gender-neutral pseudonym (see TABLE 3 below).

Table 3

Gender-neutral Pseudonyms for University White Interviewees

Gender-neutral Pseudonym for Interviewee	University White Department

Peyton	Campus Security
Jamie	Campus Security
Tatum	Counseling
Rory	Counseling
Dallas	Legal Affairs
Amari	Student Discipline
Rowan	Student Discipline
River	Student Discipline
Hayden	Student Discipline
Quinn	Student Life
Finley	Student Housing/Residence Life
Parker	Student Housing/ Residence Life
Reese	Student Housing/Residence Life

The findings gleaned from these interviews, along with the relevant information obtained from my University White document review, follow. My findings are grouped according to the Research Question to which they pertain.

Research Question 1: How do student affairs administrators define online harassment as it occurs at their institution?

Definition Based on University Policies

Administrators across campus departments at University White refer to university policies in order to define online harassment and to guide them in the use of terminology associated with the phenomenon. Nine out of the thirteen administrators interviewed (representing the offices of student discipline, counseling, housing/residence life, legal affairs, and student life) referred either to the university student conduct code or to university housing policies for on-campus residents when defining online harassment. Amari, a student discipline administrator, defined online harassment succinctly as, "Anything that violates our harassment policy that happens to have occurred on an online platform." (See Appendix H for the portions of University White's Student Conduct Code that pertain to online harassment.) Parker, a housing/residence life administrator, said

that, "the definition [for online harassment] would be similar to what we have for in-person harassment." (See Appendix I for the portions of University White's on-campus housing policies that pertain to online harassment.)

Eleven of the thirteen University White administrators interviewed preferred the term "harassment" for negative online behavior, though the qualifier used to precede and describe harassment varied. Dallas, a legal affairs administrator said, "I'd use electronic harassment. But it doesn't really matter to me, because all I care about is the behavior that violates our harassment policy." Hayden, a student discipline administrator concurred, stating, "I'd call it digital harassment, because not everything is online...digital captures the fact that it has the capacity to move exponentially." In explaining his or her preference not to use the term cyberbullying, River, another student discipline administrator, said, "I find it easier in my work to use the language in our Student Conduct Code." Reese, a housing administrator, summarized his or her use of the blanket term harassment by saying,

> I think the rules we have in our conduct code and our rules for residents are about descriptors. They don't have the term cyberbullying in them; cyberbullying is a form of harassment. We're not in the world of having a cyberbullying policy, and a playground bullying policy, and all the different types; otherwise, we would have to have a huge APA manual [of terms].

University White administrators across departments tend to refer to either university student conduct or student housing policies when defining online harassment, and the uniformity also extends to a consistently preferred term for the behavior. This knowledge of and adherence to university-wide guidelines and terminology is also

reflected in the policies and practices used by University White administrators in addressing online harassment (see page 65). For comparison with that of my other research sites, further analysis of University White's definition of online harassment is found on page 93.

Variability of Perceived Prevalence

Assessments of the prevalence of incidents of cyberbullying vary widely among administrators at University White, and appear to vary based on campus role. The three student discipline administrators interviewed estimate that they deal with five to seven cases of online harassment each year, though one administrator (Rowan) believes that incidents may be underreported. The student discipline administrators' perceptions about the prevalence of online harassment on campus differ widely from that of administrators in both the counseling and student housing/residence life offices. Rory, a counseling office administrator stated, "I would say the majority of cases involve some [online component], especially if there is a stalking aspect". When asked to describe the prevalence of online harassment incidents he or she handles within the housing/residence life office, Finley stated, "I would say we hear about it several times a month. It's not rare. I would say it *happens* daily, frequently, all the time. I don't think they bring it to us." A colleague in the housing/residence life office, Parker, estimated that he or she is aware of a dozen or more incidents per year involving online harassment.

As was the case at University Red, University White administrators were unable to share statistics on the precise number of online harassment cases that occur at the university for two reasons: first, the complete internal records of the offices with which I spoke – the student discipline, counseling, housing, and campus security offices – are not

available to the public for reasons of confidentiality. Second, though administrators at University White were largely consistent in their use of university-wide definitions (either within the student conduct or student housing codes) for online harassment, it is clear based on the above inconsistency in reported rates of prevalence that, for example, a counseling department administrator may consider an incident to be online harassment which may not in fact be adjudicated by the student discipline office. University White administrators, therefore, exhibit a sort of fluidity in terms of their attitude towards online harassment, and are comfortable moving between policy definitions and personal definitions of the phenomenon.

Online Harassment Tools

According to Hayden, "If there is a way to deliver information or communicate electronically, it has been used [as a method for digital harassment]. The most common are texting and email and then for online, emphatically, Facebook." In fact, twelve out of thirteen University White administrators named Facebook as a platform used in online harassment cases they have handled. The other most cited methods of or tools for online harassment were: texting (10), miscellaneous websites, message boards, or blogs such as juicycampus.com and hotornot.com (10), email (7), and twitter (6). Table 4 below lists all methods for online harassment cited by University White administrators.

Table 4

Method or Tool Used for Online Harassment as Cited by University White Administrators

Method Used for Online Harassment	Number of Administrators Citing (out of 13)
Facebook	12
Texting	10

Misc. Websites, Message Boards, or Blogs (JuicyCampus, HotOrNot, etc)	10
Email	7
Twitter	6
Instagram	4
Snapchat	4
Instant Messaging/GChat	4
Craigslist	3
YouTube	2
Fax	1
Pinterest	1
LinkedIn	1
Reddit	1

Research Question 2: What policies and practices do student affairs administrators say they use to address online harassment?

Consistent Adherence to Policy and Collaboration

Administrators at University White were quite consistent in the policies and practices they say they use to address online harassment. Twelve out of thirteen administrators cited federal and state laws as some of the policies that come into play when dealing with the issue. These included Title IX of the Higher Education Act, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA), the Family Educational Right and Privacy Act (FERPA), the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPPA), the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), the Jeanne Cleary Act and its amendment, the Campus SAVE Act, the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Federal Communications Commission (FCC) policies, and the California Penal Code. Nine out of the thirteen administrators referred to the university's student code of conduct or on-campus housing policies. Eight of the thirteen administrators mentioned university-specific statements of broad preference concerning appropriate ideal behavior among

students and concepts of fellowship that are not codified, but that the university actively encourages its students to follow; these statements and concepts include measures of integrity, accountability, respect, tolerance, inclusiveness, and civility.

Nine out of thirteen administrators said they routinely collaborate and consult with other departments on campus when addressing incidents of online harassment. The offices cited were the student discipline office, the housing office, the counseling office, the legal affairs office, and campus security. Four of these nine administrators also referred to a multi-department standing group that meets weekly to address critical incidents on campus, which at times has included discussions of online harassment cases. Peyton, a member of campus security, described how “jurisdiction” issues would be discussed in a typical meeting: "We recognize that there are violations of the student code of conduct...the interplay between the case a dean may have, a conduct case, and whether it's a criminal case. We try to get first crack at it [if a violation of the California Penal Code may have occurred], and this is what we'll talk about with all the different areas."

A further example of the uniformity with which University White administrators exists in their knowledge of both the consequences for perpetrators and the resources for victims of online harassment. Ten of the thirteen University White administrators interviewed mentioned either disciplinary consequences for perpetrators of online harassment, such as a no-contact order, suspension, or expulsion, and/or the resources on campus for victims of the behavior, such as the university counseling centers, student health center, legal affairs offices, the LGBT resource center, and partnerships with resources within the larger off-campus community like the local rape treatment center.

University White also has a detailed computer, network, and information resource acceptable use policy, some components of which pertains incidents of online harassment; in an exception to the general depth of policy familiarity among administrators at University White, this policy was referred to by only two of the thirteen administrators interviewed (Amari and Hayden). The policy covers the University of California Electronic Communication Policy, University-specific email policies, and guidelines, and acceptable use policies (see Appendix J). According to Hayden, all University White students must read and accept the policy in order to obtain their University login ID, a practice that mirrors University Red's method for publicizing technology policies and the consequences for violations of the policies to all students. This practice is in line with the CAS nationally recognized professional guidelines for universal promulgation of technology use policies.

The consistency of University White administrators in their knowledge and application of university policies and practices and state and federal laws is noteworthy. Organizationally, such consistency at an institution the size of University White (over 40,000 students and over 23,000 staff members) is impressive when compared to the relative lack of consistency found at Universities Red and Blue (over 29,000 students and fewer than 10,000 staff members and over 18,000 students and over 4,500 staff members, respectively).

An Online Harassment Hierarchy

According to Finley, a housing/residence life administrator, the severities of online harassment incidents dealt with at University White range from "fairly benign name calling all the way to bias-related racial slurs and direct threats such as, 'I'm going

to do X to you'". Another housing office administrator, Hayden, described the range of incidents by saying, "Extreme cases have included death threats and anti-Semitic harassment of a [student] staff member online, and with graphic pictures, and unknown [source]...to text messages to roommates, and just more inappropriate than probably policy violation...being a jerk, but less threatening." Six administrators cited threats to physical safety, either overt or covert, as characteristic of cases needing urgent attention. River, a student discipline administrator, recounted an incident in which a dummy Craigslist ad included pictures and contact information for a student along with requests for contact regarding sexual favors, saying

> That was on the extreme scale for me. It wasn't just about someone's face and information being online, it was about the impact, and what could have happened. The phone number was posted; they have reverse lookup [through which a home address might be found]...I was very worried for the student's safety, as were the police, as was this particular student.

River expressed intentionality in the terminology he or she uses to scale incidents of online harassment. "I hate to use the word minor, because it's not minor in the mind of someone who is dealing with it. It's not minor when you're getting [repeated emails] saying 'I want to come see you, I want to come see you'...when you're dealing with it for weeks and months...and you're finally mustering up the strength to tell someone to make it stop. There are more manageable [cases], I'll say it that way." Four other administrators also referred to incidents in a similar fashion, calling incidents “simpler to address” or “clear-cut” rather than using qualifiers of scale like “minor.” For comparison with that of

my other research sites, further analysis of University White's hierarchy of online harassment is found on page 95.

Research Question 3: What challenges do student affairs administrators say they face in their implementation of policies and practices that address online harassment?

Combating "The World Wide Bathroom Wall"

The challenges in handling online harassment most often cited by University White administrators reflect particular characteristics that digital technology provides; nine out of thirteen administrators specified one or more technological features that make incidents of online harassment especially difficult to deal with. The anonymity provided by the internet was cited by six administrators as especially frustrating; Payton lamented,

> One of the biggest challenges is the anonymity [online] and what it allows folks to get away with. We've had cases going on for years really, where we can't necessarily determine where the person is. If it's on the boarder of criminal behavior and we can't get a search warrant, we can't get a subpoena for the records at the provider, this case is going nowhere.

Three administrators cited their experience with perpetrators of online harassment who seemed to feel that there would be no consequences for their online actions because they weren't "real" communications. Hayden stated,

> The other aspect that we know emphatically is that the distance of online communication allows us to not think of it as real communication...you believe that it doesn't have the same impact, but it's quite the contrary. The impact is

significantly greater digitally, because it has a life unto itself. We have the capacity to take one picture and share it with 5,000 people. And then it goes viral.

In other cases, administrators expressed that technological advances heightened or exaggerated harassing interactions that occur online. Three administrators stated their belief that some perpetrators of online harassment present or express themselves differently and more aggressively online than they would in person. Four administrators cited the ability of harassing postings to "go viral" as especially problematic; Reese said, "Once it gets out there, people can copy and paste it, and it continues to live versus going away. You can never guarantee that it's gone." Peyton said, "People will write anything anywhere, but it goes from the time they used to write it on the bathroom wall, to now it's posted on the Internet, available for anybody to take a look; it's a world-wide bathroom wall."

Three of the challenges cited by University White administrators above - the anonymity of harassers, the "unreality" harassers attach to their actions, and the disassociation of harassers from their actions - reflect previously mentioned characteristics of Suler's (2004) online disinhibition theory. The fourth challenge expressed - the ability for harassment to "go viral" - speaks to the notion of repeated action found within widely accepted definitions of traditional bullying. As stated in Chapter 2, experts on cyberbullying differ on whether the sender of an offensive digital communication must repeat the negative action to meet a definition of cyberbullying, or whether this type of repetition does not apply to cyberbullying since digital communications may easily be visible to multiple witnesses, and/or can easily be forwarded, copied, and posted in multiple locations (Patchin & Hinduja, 2011; Speers,

Slee, Owens, & Johnson, 2009). Clearly, the University White administrators mentioned above believe the latter.

Summary of University White Findings

The definition of and terminology used for online harassment is largely consistent among University White administrators, and is based on university policy. Though the perception of the prevalence of online harassment varies among administrators, and appears to be based on the role the administrator plays on campus, Facebook is overwhelmingly cited by administrators as the tool used in incidents of online harassment they have dealt with professionally. University White administrators are not only consistent in terms of the way they define online harassment; they also express consistent adherence to university and collaboration in addressing incidents that occur. Administrators cited racist language and covert or overt threats to physical safety as characteristic of cases of online harassment requiring urgent attention. Finally, University White administrators named one or more technological features that make incidents of online harassment especially challenging, including the anonymity the Internet provides to perpetrators, the disinhibition exhibited by perpetrators, and the viral nature of online postings. Both the concept of anonymity and disinhibition are found in the literature on the subject; Suler's (2004) Theory of Online Disinhibition is apt, and the notion that the cyberbullying victim cannot escape their harassers recurs throughout much of the literature (Agatston, Kowalski, & Limber, 2007; Burnham et al, 2011; Gross, 2009; Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007). In addition, Patchin and Hindura (2006) and Kowalski and Limber (2007) found that the anonymity enjoyed by cyberbullies can result in increased emotional distress for the victim. From a student affairs perspective, the policies and

practices implemented by University White administrators meet the nationally recognized guidelines set forth by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in 2012 regarding institutionally provided student access to technology; policies are clearly stated in the university's student code of conduct, and these policies are readily referred to by University White administrators when counseling and/or disciplining perpetrators and victims of online harassment.

Case Three: University Blue

University Blue is a large research university consisting of over 18,000 undergraduate and nearly 3,000 graduate students in the Fall of 2013. The University employed over 600 faculty members in 2011, and over 4,500 staff members in 2012. Its racial/ethnic make-up is 6% African American/Black, 35% Asian/Asian American, 32% Chicano and Latino, 1% Native American, 17% White/Caucasian, 2% Race/Ethnicity Unknown, and 7% International. 89% of University White's undergraduates are California residents, 5% are out-of-state students, and 7% are from other countries. University Blue's suburban campus is comprised of nearly 1,200 acres. In 2013-2014, tuition at University Blue was approximately $15,000 for California resident undergraduates and $38,000 for nonresidents. University Blue received over 34,000 applications for the freshmen class in 2014, and enrolled over 19,000 of those applicants that fall. At the conclusion of the 2012 school year, University White awarded over 7,500 Bachelor's degrees, over 2,700 academic and professional Master's degrees, over 700 PhD/EdDs, and over 600 D.D.S., J.D., and M.D.s. 30% of University Blue students live on-campus, with 75% of freshmen living on-campus. University Blue's mission statement

focuses on service to the people of California through the contributions of its students and graduates in addressing societal problems. University Blue offers 101 bachelor degree programs, 52 master's degree programs, 42 Ph.D. programs, and 13 state teaching credentials, and is comprised of three academic divisions (the colleges of engineering, humanities, arts, & social sciences, and natural & agricultural sciences) and four graduate/professional schools (business, education, medicine, and public policy).

I contacted via email administrators in the student discipline office, student-housing office, and legal affairs office, as suggested by my initial campus contacts, due to the offices' familiarity with online harassment among students. From these three offices, I was able to interview five staff members of the student discipline office, four staff members of the student housing office, and one staff member of the legal affairs office. At the conclusion of each interview, I asked each of these administrators to recommend additional personnel on campus who work with online harassment among students. I subsequently emailed the staff members recommended. Through this "snowball" technique, I was able to interview one staff member of the counseling office and one staff member of the campus security. In total, I interviewed 12 University Blue staff members. For the sake of clarity, I assigned each interviewee a gender-neutral pseudonym (see Table 5).

Table 5

Gender-neutral Pseudonyms for University Blue Interviewees

Gender-neutral Pseudonym for Interviewee	University Blue Department
Kendall	Campus Security
Harley	Counseling
Avery	Legal Affairs
Taylor	Student Discipline

Kai	Student Discipline
Dylan	Student Discipline
Zion	Student Discipline
Sawyer	Student Discipline
Jordan	Student Housing/Residence Life
Morgan	Student Housing/Residence Life
Cameron	Student Housing/ Residence Life
Sage	Student Housing/Residence Life

The findings gleaned from these interviews, along with the relevant information obtained from my University Blue document review, follow. My findings are grouped according to the Research Question to which they pertain.

Research Question 1: How do student affairs administrators define online harassment as it occurs at their institution?

Definition Through Incident Anecdotes

Ten of the twelve administrators interviewed at University Blue used incident anecdotes to describe the nature, scope, and meaning of online harassment rather than citing the definitions of harassment found in the University's student code of conduct or housing policies (see Appendix K and L for University Blue student conduct code and housing policies that pertain to online harassment). The incidents cited included email and text disputes over housing situations that contained abusive language, dummy Craigslist ads that resulted in unwanted contact from strangers, abusive and repeated text messages targeting a former sorority sister from various members of the sorority, vulgar and abusive comments regarding sexuality, gender, or race of fellow classmates on the University classroom management system's class webpage, and even more extreme outcomes of what the administrator considered online harassment, including the rape of a

student by her ex-boyfriend following months of her ignoring approximately 50 text messages from him per day.

The majority of administrators interviewed at University Blue may feel that they "don't need to define it to work with it." For comparison with that of my other research sites, further analysis of University Blue's definition of online harassment is found on page 93.

Terminology Varies

Seven of the twelve administrators interviewed expressed irresolution regarding the terminology used for online harassment. Sage, a housing/ residence life administrator, stated, "Terminology is less important; we're going to focus on describing the behavior. You can say social media, you can say online, you can say electronic, you can say cyber. They can have slightly different meanings for the individual, so it's easier to just talk about the actual behavior." Taylor, a student discipline administrator, stated his or her reasoning behind their indifference towards one term over another:

> We don't have an official glossary that we use. I've heard a number of different phrases used when talking about this: cyberbullying, online harassment, cyberstalking...We're trying to problem solve rather than set the tone or the paradigm, necessarily. It's just, 'How can we work on this?' We don't want anybody to feel like their situation doesn't apply because it's not exactly like what we're talking about, or...maybe they're not going to call it cyberbullying, so they're not going to come to us for help.

Avery, a legal affairs administrator who deals with specific terminology found within the University Blue student code of conduct, expressed his or her intentionality in

not using the term harassment when discussing the subject in general, saying "Everything we've been talking about is *harassment-question-mark*. The recipient may consider it harassment. Often it isn't intended that way by the originator or producer of it. Objectively, it may not be clear whether it was [harassment] legally or according to University policy." Though the motivations behind the disparate terms used by University Blue administrators varies, the resulting irresolution regarding one universally used term for online harassment is reflected in the literature. As previously stated, the terms *cyberbullying, online harassment, cyber harassment, electronic bullying, internet harassment, electronic harassment, e-harassment, and online bullying* (Abbott, 2011; Beran, 2005; Finn, 2004; Kowalski & Limber, 2007; Moreno & Hornbeck, 2011; Kuzma, 2013; Larson, 2010; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2007) are terms used to describe a wide range of negative digital behaviors and experiences, though the term *cyberbullying* appears to be the preferred term in the most recent literature on the subject in the educational realm (Abbott, 2011; Baldasare et al, 2012; Burnham & Houser, 2011; Dilmac, 2009; Englander, Mills, & McCoy, 2009; Gutshall, 2012; Hay & Mann, 2010; Hinduja & Patchin, 2009; Hoff & Mitchell, 2009; Johnson, 2011; Konig & Steffgen, 2010; Macdonald & Roberts-Pittman, 2010; Schenk, 2011; Walker, Sockman, & Koehn, 2011).

Variability of Perceived Prevalence

The perceived prevalence of online harassment issues that University Blue administrators handle varied by department. Members of the student discipline office expressed that the prevalence of online harassment incidents was somewhat low; "I guess it's increasing, but it's not overwhelming," said Sawyer. Both student discipline administrators interviewed also said, that they believe the phenomenon to be

underreported. Two housing administrators perceived higher rates of occurrence; Jordan estimated that an online component is present in about one-quarter of the roommate conflicts he or she deals with: "It's a little trend we're seeing. I think the more that we see social media advancing, the more outlets there are, the more incidents of this that we're seeing." The greatest rate of prevalence was reported by a member of the counseling department; Harley stated, "just about all of them [cases he or she handles in the counseling department] have some kind of [online or digital] component. In these times, that's how students communicate."

Online Harassment Tools

Eleven of the twelve University Blue administrators cited Facebook as a tool used by students to harass others online; three of these eleven specifically cited it as the most often used tool. "My experience is that Facebook is usually what's connected. The students always seem to kinda treat Facebook as the basic platform [for online harassment]", said Taylor. The other most cited methods of or tools for online harassment were: texting (8), email (8), and miscellaneous websites, message boards, or blogs such as juicycampus.com and hotornot.com (6). Table 6 lists all methods cited by University blue administrators.

Table 6

Method or Tool Used for Online Harassment as Cited by University Blue Administrators

Method Used for Online Harassment	Number of Administrators Citing (out of 12)
Facebook	11
Texting	8
Email	8
Misc. Websites, Message Boards, Blogs (JuicyCampus, HotOrNot, etc)	6
University Classroom Management	5

System	
Instagram	3
Twitter	3
Instant Messaging/GChat	1
Craigslist	2
Webcam	1
Tumbler	1
Tinder	1
Grinder	1
GPS	1
Phone	1
SnapChat	1

The top four platforms for online harassment cited by University Blue administrators were Facebook (the most often cited, by 11 of 12 administrators); texting; email; and miscellaneous websites, message boards, or blogs (such as JuicyCampus, HotOrNot, etc).

Research Question 2: What policies and practices do student affairs administrators say they use to address online harassment?

Use of Student Discipline and Legal Affairs Policies and Practices

Seven of the twelve University Blue administrators interviewed cited the University's student conduct code as the overarching policy used to address incidents of online harassment. Jordan called the policy "first and foremost" in terms of importance when dealing with the cases (see Appendix K). In addition, six of these seven administrators described the UC mandated policy of referring any incidents involving harassment of a sexual nature to the Title IX office on campus. On-campus residents of University Blue are also held to housing policies in addition to the overarching student code of conduct; these policies were cited by the four housing administrators interviewed (see Appendix L).

Only one University Blue administrator (Sawyer) mentioned the University's electronic use policy when discussing online harassment, saying "[The Information Technology] office has some agreements that you have when you sign on; you accept the policies as part of your network ID." This method of informing all students of network policies and the consequences of misuse (see Appendix M) is similar to the methods used by both University Red and White. Nine of the twelve University Blue administrators interviewed mentioned either disciplinary consequences for perpetrators of online harassment (such as educational sanctions, a no-contact order, suspension, or expulsion) and/or the resources on campus for victims of the behavior (such as the university counseling centers, student health center, legal affairs offices, the LGBT resource center, and partnerships with resources within the larger off-campus community like the local rape crisis center), which is in line with the CAS nationally recognized professional guidelines for violations of technology policy being subject to established institutional disciplinary procedures, as well as those students who "experience negative emotional or psychological consequences from the use of technology" (CAS General Standards 2012) being referred to university support services.

Emphasis on an Educational Approach

Six of the twelve administrators interviewed at University Blue cited their use of an instructive, educational approach in terms of their attitude toward perpetrators of online harassment. These administrators represented varying departments, including the student discipline, housing/residence life, and legal affairs offices. Jordan said that in the housing/residence life office, "We're dealing with it from a very, 'we care about you as a student, think about how this can reflect on your larger career...what it means to your

reputation as a student and a scholar, and how does it affect your overall well-being and your relationship with others. How do you want to be seen?' " Taylor, a student discipline administrator, related his or her response to an incident of increasingly negative text messages and emails between former housemates, saying "What I did with each student was remind them, if this behavior escalates or includes threats to the other's safety, then that's not appropriate and would be a policy violation. Trying to help both of them realize what they were doing and talk them down." Three of these six administrators used the term "coaching" to describe their educational approach to interactions with students enacting bullying behavior online.

University Blue administrators are distinct from both University Red and University White administrators in the articulation of their "coaching," educational attitude towards student interactions. While this same philosophy and approach may be used by administrators at all three universities, it was only specifically expressed by administrators at University Blue, and then in noteworthy numbers (50% of interviewees). Though University Blue's mission statement reads in part, "University Blue serves the needs and enhances the quality of life of the diverse people of California, the nation and the world through knowledge – its communication, discovery, translation, application, and preservation", this is not in itself sufficient to explain the singular emphasis on a developmental approach by student affairs staff; the mission statements of both Universities Red and White contain similar messaging about the importance of the dissemination of knowledge (as one might expect).

An Online Harassment Hierarchy

Administrators at University Blue described the hierarchy applied to incidents of online harassment with a wide variety of terms, including "manageable," "inactionable," "lower-level", "lower-end of the spectrum", "in between", "deeper side", "more severe", "high level", and "egregious". While four administrators did refer to the student conduct code as part of their explanation of relative degree of severity ("Maybe we don't think this should have happened, but it doesn't violate a specific policy", said Dylan, a student discipline administrator, when referring to less severe incidents of online harassment), eleven of the twelve administrators readily used incident anecdotes to relate the hierarchy they apply to online harassment. Jordan said,

> Lower-level, I've had students that are back-to-back in their room and really, on their computers, having an argument with each other. When I say lower-level, though, those things can escalate into much larger situations pretty quickly. I would say the deeper side is when we have folks that are either harassing or stalking via social media in some way, taking video...that's a really egregious one we had. We had two male roommates, one would direct their webcam towards the other person's bed and videotape him having sex, or videotape him coming out of the shower, and post the video online.

For comparison with that of my other research sites, further analysis of University Blue's hierarchy of online harassment is found on page 95.

Research Question 3: What challenges do student affairs administrators say they face in their implementation of policies and practices that address online harassment?

Variability of Challenges

The challenges expressed by University Blue administrators in their implementation of policies and practices that address online harassment vary widely, and appear to be largely unconnected to the role the administrator plays on campus. For example, both Jordan, a housing/residence life administrator, and Avery, a legal affairs administrator, expressed the difficulty of assigning "jurisdiction" to the internet; Jordan said, "If things happen within the Residence Hall areas, it's my jurisdiction. If it happened one inch across on the larger campus, then it is the campus issue. Even if it's a residential student, they deal with it and then they hand me the report. Us being location-based and cyberspace being this intangible space, then what policies, how do we deal with that?" Cameron (housing/residence life), Kendall (campus security), and Sawyer (student discipline) cited as challenging the technological possibilities of digital communications, such as the volume of harassing interactions, the ability to Photoshop and alter images, and the difficulty in tracing Internet Provider addresses. Taylor and Kai, both student discipline administrators, and Avery, a legal affairs administrator, cited characteristics of the user of online technology as contributing to the challenge of dealing with online harassment, including the possibility to instantly act or react in online interactions, without thinking through the consequences; students feeling that the cyber world is "the Wild, Wild West" and that no restrictions apply; and a perpetrator's inability to accept that cyberbullying has an impact psychologically and emotionally on fellow students. According to Avery, "there's a certain kind of politeness and respectfulness and thoughtfulness about what you're doing...that when you go to e-communications somehow it dissolves." Finally, Zion, a student discipline administrator, and Sage, a

housing administrator, cited the impact that viral communication have on the victim of online harassment as challenging; Sage said, "...it also means that the person who feels like they're the victim feels like everybody knows about it because it's been made public."

While two of the three of the psychological effects on the user of online technology expressed by Taylor, Kai, and Avery are consistent with the dissociative anonymity characteristic of Suler's (2004) online disinhibition theory, one challenge expressed by the administrators is a departure from Suler's theory. The asynchronicity characteristic of online disinhibition posits that because people do not necessarily interact in real time in many methods of online communication (e.g., Facebook, email), it is possible for a cyberbully to post or send a negative message without having to deal with the victim's immediate reaction. In contrast, University Blue administrators cited their experience that online technologies provide the opportunity to act instantly, without forethought, which often results in negative behaviors that would not have occurred in a more judicious frame of mind. Said Taylor, "You can react instantly and see it instantly. There's no, 'You know what, I'm going to write a strongly worded letter and if I still feel the same way tomorrow, it'll be mailed off.' Now, 'I'm just going to say what I'm feeling right now, with no filters.'" This aspect of online technology's impact on cyberbullying is as yet unexplored in the literature.

Summary of University Blue Findings

Administrators at University Blue use incident anecdotes and a variety of terms to describe and define online harassment. The administrators perception of the prevalence of online harassment among students varied according to department, though all administrators interviewed believe the number of incidents to be increasing. Facebook

was the most widely cited tool for online harassment. Administrators at University Blue cited policies and practices related to the student discipline and legal affairs offices most often in addressing online harassment, and an emphasis on an educational approach in both counseling and disciplining students involved in incidents of online harassment was expressed. Administrators used incident anecdotes to describe a range in severity of online harassment, as well as qualifying terms such as "lower-level" and "more severe". The challenges in addressing online harassment vary widely among University Blue administrators, and do not conform to a pattern associated with the department the administrator represents. The challenges expressed relate mainly to Suler's (2004) Theory of Online Disinhibition, including the feeling that University Red students feel that there are no consequences to their online actions. From a student affairs perspective, the policies and practices implemented by University Blue administrators meet the nationally recognized guidelines set forth by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in 2012 regarding institutionally provided student access to technology; policies are clearly stated in the university's student code of conduct, and these policies are readily referred to by University Blue administrators when counseling and/or disciplining perpetrators and victims of online harassment.

Red, White, and Blue: Comparisons Across the Three Universities

An Overarching Definition of Online Harassment

All ten University Red administrators defined online harassment based on the role they play on campus. Student discipline, legal affairs, and campus security administrators rely on the student conduct and criminal codes; housing administrators rely on both

university housing policies and a more counseling-like approach to their residents; and counseling administrators listen to and advise perpetrators and victims of cyberbullying independent of specifically articulated boundaries and parameters regarding the definition of online harassment. Administrators across campus departments at University White refer to university policies in order to define online harassment; nine out of the thirteen administrators interviewed (representing the offices of student discipline, counseling, housing/residence life, legal affairs, and student life) referred either to the university student conduct code or to university housing policies for on-campus residents when defining online harassment. Ten of the twelve administrators interviewed at University Blue used incident anecdotes to describe the nature, scope, and meaning of online harassment rather than citing the definitions of harassment found in the University's student code of conduct or housing policies.

While the above variations exist, administrators at all three universities readily recounted actual work experiences they have had with cyberbullying in order to help them to define the phenomenon. While some administrators also specifically cited university policy, this citation was in addition to the recounting of incidents or events that the administrator deemed appropriate to exemplify their conception of the phenomenon. Definitions vary, but all 35 administrators "know it when they see it.” An overarching definition for cyberbullying at my research sites produced by my study would seek to merge these practical "on the ground" experiences into a concise description that would encompass them all. Based on my study, cyberbullying at my research sites may therefore be defined as digital interactions that the originator intends to emotionally

and/or psychologically harm the recipient and/or that the recipient perceives as emotionally and/or psychologically harmful.

In something of a departure from administrators at University Red, who tend to define online harassment based on their particular work experiences with the phenomenon, University White administrators across departments tend to refer to either university student conduct or student housing policies when defining online harassment, and the uniformity also extends to a consistently preferred term for the behavior.

In that the incidents mentioned by University Blue administrators to define online harassment reflect their work experiences, their responses more closely mirror those of University Red administrators than University White administrators. Similar to Jessie, a counseling department administrator at University Red, the majority of administrators interviewed at University Blue may feel that they "don't need to define it to work with it."

Terminology Used for the Phenomenon

There is no one term consistently used for the behaviors associated with online harassment, or cyberbullying, among the 35 administrators interviewed. Use of specific terminology ranged from adherence to the term *harassment* and its definition as found in the university's code of conduct along with a qualifier such as *online*, *electronic*, or *digital* expressing the type or kind of harassment occurring, to Tatum, a University White counseling administrator's statement, "I knew what you're talking about, but I would never have said *online harassment*. But I knew what you were talking about. I would have known if you have said 'cyber- whatever' as well, but probably not have used that

terminology myself." This lack of a single term for cyberbullying among university administrators is consistent with the literature on the subject.

A review of each university's online student newspapers may give some insight into the terminology students "on the ground" use for the phenomenon. University Red's archives include a 2009 article that includes a reference to "online bullying"; a 2011 article that includes the term "cyberbullies" in the title; a 2012 article that refers to "technology-facilitated harassment"; and a 2013 article that includes a reference to "cyber bullying." University White's archives include a 2011 article detailing "e-personation", "online mistreatment," and "online harassment." University Blue's archives include a 2013 article that refers to "cyber-bullying." Therefore, the literature on the subject, university policies, university administrators, and university students are comfortable using a variety of terms for cyberbullying; in doing so, however, it is important for the term used to be clearly defined in its particular context.

Prevalence of Online Harassment

Among administrators at University Red, the general perception is that the prevalence of online harassment incidents is increasing over time. Further, though the belief that the overall number of cases is increasing is consistent across departments, the actual number of cases cited varies. Administrators in student discipline, legal affairs, and counseling roles noted a high rate of cases involving an online component; housing administrators perceive a lower rate. Similar to the perception among University Red administrators, the perceived prevalence of online harassment issues that University Blue administrators handle varied by department, though the pattern did not match that of University Red. Those in the student discipline department perceived low rates of

prevalence; those in housing perceived higher rates; and the highest prevalence was expressed by a member of the counseling department. Among administrators at University White, perceived prevalence of online harassment again appears to be related to department, though the perceptions differ slightly from that of both University Red and University Blue administrators; administrators in student discipline reported the lowest rates of prevalence, while those in the counseling and housing departments reported a more frequent and roughly equivalent rate of occurrence. These differences make sense within a larger student affairs context; for example, not every incident which presents itself to a housing administrator or counselor would, in fact, violate a university's student code of conduct, and would therefore not rise to the level of the student discipline office.

Online Harassment Tools

Facebook was the tool most widely cited for online harassment by administrators at all three universities; 33 of the 35 administrators interviewed stated they have dealt with incidents of online harassment that occurred on the social media site. Texting, email, and postings on miscellaneous websites, message boards, or blogs follow closely behind, after which there is a sizeable drop-off in terms of the number of administrators citing any one particular method or tool used for online harassment among students. Table 7 lists the methods cited by administrators at all three universities.

Table 7

Methods or Tools Used for Online Harassment as Cited by Administrators at All Three Universities

Method Used for Online Harassment	Number of Administrators Citing (out of 35)
Facebook	33

Texting	27
Email	24
Misc. Websites, Message Boards, or Blogs (JuicyCampus, HotOrNot, etc)	22
Twitter	12
Instant Messaging/GChat	9
Instagram	8
University Classroom Management System	7
SnapChat	7
Craigslist	7
YouTube	3
Tinder	2
Webcam/Videotaping	2
GPS	1
Phone	1
Tumbler	1
GroupMeet	1
Yelp	1
Teaching Evaluation	1
Fax	1
Pinterest	1
LinkedIn	1
Reddit	1

The top four platforms for online harassment cited by University White administrators mirror those mentioned by University Red administrators, with Facebook remaining as the tool most often cited (by 12 out of 13 University White administrators). Texting; miscellaneous websites, message boards, or blogs (such as JuicyCampus, HotOrNot, etc); and email were the other tools most often cited by administrators at both universities. In the case of three of these platforms (Facebook, texting, and email), one method of potentially curtailing the harassing messages a victim received would be to no longer use Facebook, change their phone number, and change their email address, giving access to same only to trusted individuals. Peyton, a member of the campus security department, described how this solution plays out when proposed to victims of

cyberbullying he or she has interacted with: "Sometimes it's really quite amusing to say [to the student], 'You need to change your phone number.' They say, 'But I *can't* change my phone number!'" This minimization of the significance of negative online interactions - important enough to bring to the attention of campus security, but not important enough to alter one's phone number - is reminiscent of the concerns University Red administrators have about students' apparent desensitization to negativity online.

As was the case with both University Red and University White, the top four platforms for online harassment cited by University Blue administrators were Facebook (the most often cited, by 11 of 12 administrators); texting; email; and miscellaneous websites, message boards, or blogs (such as JuicyCampus, HotOrNot, etc).

Facebook's prominence in the minds of student affairs administrators when it comes to online harassment renders the online social network worthy of an in-depth examination. In his 2013 dissertation entitled "Social Media Selves: College Students' Curation of Self and Others through Facebook", David Kasch delves into college students' use of Facebook to create and express their identities through in-depth analysis of the user habits of 35 undergraduate students. Kasch identifies the "spectacle curation,"

> An intentional self that participants created explicitly for others to view. In the parlance of my participants, this is the curated self for others to 'stalk' or 'creep on'...In this context, students used the terms creeping and stalking as metaphorical, rather than literal, descriptions of others viewing their profiles anonymously to learn more about them, not *necessarily* harassing or invasive violations of privacy (p. 115, emphasis added).

Kasch goes on to state that

> A close correlate of presenting ones' self as a commodity for consumption is perceiving others as commodities to consume... the appeal of Facebook invariably turned to the ability to "creep on," or "stalk" others—to look at the pages of others. In some cases this was a light-hearted look at a photo or two, and in the extreme, it was an invasive search through all of the personal content available from others' pages and through the pages of their Friends. (p. 173)

His findings about students' recognition that they both create identities on Facebook to be "stalked" on and that they themselves view Facebook as a preferred platform to "stalk" others led Kasch to construct a "Scale of Facebook Creeping" in order to better interpret student behavior. The scale moves from "looking" (the least intrusive form of viewing another's profile) through "exploring" (a more intensive curiosity) and "creeping" (occasional intensive exploration of another's profile, the "boundary area between acceptable and problematic examination;" Kasch, p. 175) to "stalking" (intensive, repeated, unwanted, and unexpected searching of person's profile which makes the person uncomfortable).

It is telling that the students Kasch interviewed recognize the inherent possibility for Facebook to be used for negative and harassing purposes, so much so that a term a mocking this possibility is standard vocabulary when discussing the online social network. In his analysis that the students aren't *necessarily* using the term "stalking" literally, Kasch is acknowledging that though not the focal point of his study, Facebook has been used for harassing purposes, rendering the term both metaphorical and literal. It is fortunate that, in the case of Kasch's 35 interviewees, the most "extreme" form of negative online behavior experienced was the "invasive search through all of the personal

content available from others' pages and through the pages of their Friends" (p.173); in the case of the student affairs administrators I interviewed, an extreme case of negative online behavior occurring on Facebook included the posting of racially-motivated death threats on a student's Facebook page.

Kasch's study also examined "Facebook Citizenship", "the larger social context of Facebook use, both in how individual users are connected to a larger whole as well as the potential for Facebook usage to have an impact on forms of broader social engagement typically associated with the term citizenship" (p. 193). For Kasch's interviewees, examples of bad Facebook Citizenship included the posting of racist, sexist, or demeaning comments and status updates that either directly or indirectly harmed others (pp. 193-199). Viewed through the lens of some of the student affairs administrators I interviewed and taking into account the student codes of conduct of my research sites, this type of "bad Facebook Citizenship" could be considered online harassment, possibly warranting disciplinary procedures. Kasch's study also found that participants believed that conflicts were easy to instigate on Facebook and social media of all types, but difficult to resolve through social media because "various media formats lack strong non-verbal cues" (p. 200), a sentiment that is consistent with those expressed by some of the student affairs administrators I interviewed, as well as Suler's (2004) online disinhibition theory. I will discuss practical implications of Facebook's apparent dominance in terms of online harassment in Chapter 5.

Collaboration

Administrators at University Red described collaboration and consultation with colleagues in and outside of their own department as key in addressing online

harassment. In the case of University Red, a standing body of administrators from across university departments meets weekly to discuss issues and incidents of overarching concern. Administrators at University White also cited intradepartmental collaboration, as well as a weekly, multi-departmental meeting at which incidents of online harassment may be discussed. A majority of administrators at University Blue did not mention cross-departmental collaboration, though a knowledge of university-wide policies is implied by the citation of University Blue administrators across departments of policies related to the student discipline and legal affairs office in dealing with online harassment.

Student Discipline and Legal Affairs Office Policy and Practice

Administrators across departments at all three universities reported relying mainly on policies and practices related to the student discipline and legal affairs offices when dealing with online harassment. This reliance is reasonable from a student affairs perspective, as the student discipline office is generally the department on campus that produces the university's student code of conduct, in conjunction with the legal affairs office.

Emphasis on Educational Approach Unique to University Blue

University Blue administrators are distinct from both University Red and University White administrators in the articulation of their "coaching," educational attitude towards student interactions. While this same philosophy and approach may be used by administrators at all three universities, it was only specifically expressed by administrators at University Blue, and then in noteworthy numbers (50% of interviewees). Though University Blue's mission statement reads in part, "University

Blue serves the needs and enhances the quality of life of the diverse people of California, the nation and the world through knowledge – its communication, discovery, translation, application, and preservation", this is not in itself sufficient to explain the singular emphasis on a developmental approach by student affairs staff; the mission statements of both Universities Red and White contain similar messaging about the importance of the dissemination of knowledge (as one might expect).

An Overarching Hierarchy of Online Harassment

Six of the ten University Red student affairs administrators I interviewed cited severity of the language used in the communication as determinative in prioritizing the cases of online harassment they deal with; these administrators also cited repetition of the communication, perceived urgency of the situation, and perception of overt or covert threat to the victim or others. Six of the thirteen University White student affairs administrators I interviewed cited threats to physical safety, either overt or covert, as characteristic of extreme cases of online harassment. University White administrators also expressed intentionality in the vocabulary they use to express range of severity, preferring terms like "manageable", "simpler to address", clear-cut" to qualifiers of scale such as "minor". University Blue administrators also use a variety of terms to describe the levels of severity they attribute to incidents of online harassment, including "inactionable", "in-between", more severe", "high level", and "egregious". Eleven of the twelve University Blue administrators I interviewed used incident anecdotes to describe the hierarchy they apply to online harassment, indicating that "lower-level" incidents include arguments between students via instant message, while "deeper" incidents student

conduct code violations such as secretly videotaping a roommate while they are having sex and subsequently posting the video online.

Administrators at all three universities cite the relative degree or severity of either the language used or threat implied or stated in the electronic communication at issue as determinative in the hierarchy they assign to incident of online harassment. Specific terminology and exemplifying incidents used for these levels varies widely, indicating that as institutions, each university examines and treats each case individually. Beyond clear violations of the student conduct, housing, or criminal codes, the hierarchy of severity that administrators place on incidents of cyberbullying is subjective. However, a working hierarchy of cyberbullying incidents as handled by the student affairs administrators I interviewed would seek to encompass the incidents they recounted into overarching categories that could apply to the varying degrees of severity they placed on the incidents. Therefore, at my research sites, a hierarchy for cyberbullying produced by my study appears on the continuum below, ranging from less to more severe:

Figure 1. Hierarchy of Cyberbullying at my Research Sites

"Formerly In-Person" incidents (low-level insults exchanged among students that have always occurred on college campuses, but which now occur via digital technology,

that do not include language referring to a protected class; e.g., name-calling between students via Facebook) → "Come See Me" incidents (e.g., negative digital communications among students which rise to a level at which university administration deems it necessary to actively intervene and require an in-person meeting with then originator; e.g., one member of a resident hall repeatedly posting insulting or demeaning information about fellow residents, again, without reference to a protected class, on social media) → "No Contact Order" incidents (negative digital communications among students that may not rise to the strict standard of harassment found in the student code of conduct, but which university administration deem appropriate to official require a physical separation of the two parties, either due to repetition of action or the nature of the communication itself; e.g., repeated and unceasing text messages from one student to another, after the receiver has requested the sender end communications) → "Digital Harassment" incidents (electronic communications that meet the definitional standard of harassment found in the university's student code of conduct and/or the California criminal code, often though not always containing an overt or covert threat, often though not always containing remarks targeted at protected classes, often though not always reflecting repetition of action; e.g., the creation of a fake Craigslist ad listing a student's name, address, and phone number, and falsely soliciting sexual advances,) → "Cyber-Stalking" incidents (electronic communications that meet and exceed the definitional standard of harassment found in the university's student code of conduct and/or the California criminal code, often though not always containing an overt or covert threat, often though not always containing remarks targeted at protected classes, often though not always reflecting repetition of action; e.g., a student using digital technology to

repeatedly and unceasingly trace the whereabouts of another student without their consent and making their presence known to the student, either physically or electronically).

Challenges in Addressing Online Harassment

The challenges in addressing online harassment expressed by administrators at all three universities can be categorized in two ways: technological and psychological. Administrators across departments at all three universities cited a variety of challenges specific to online technology that make dealing with online harassment uniquely difficult; for example, the anonymity provided to perpetrators, the increasing difficulty to trace the source of online postings, and the ability for a negative post or message to "go viral"; these challenges are supported by the literature (Patchin & Hinduja, 2011; Speers, Slee, Owens, & Johnson, 2009). In addition, administrators across departments at all three universities reported unique psychological phenomena having to do with both perpetrators and victims of online harassment. While the anonymity of harassers, the "unreality" harassers attach to their actions, and the disassociation of harassers from their online actions expressed by administrators at all three universities are supported by Suler's (2004) theory of online disinhibition, the concept of tacit acceptance of negative online behavior expressed by University Red administrators has not yet been researched.

Chapter 5: Discussion

My study explored the ways in which student affairs administrators define cyberbullying, or online harassment; the policies and practices that student affairs administrators say they use to address online harassment; and the challenges they say they face in doing so. In order to address my research questions, I conducted a qualitative study which consisted of document review and in-depth interviews of student affairs administrators who are involved in the implementation of online harassment policy and practice at three institutions. The research sites for my study were three research universities within the University of California system. I conducted a document review of university policies and other literature related to online harassment. I also conducted interviews of student affairs administrators at each campus who work directly with matters relating to online harassment. I sought information about the definitions of online harassment that they employ; the policies and practices regarding online harassment they implement as part of their work; and the challenges they experience. The objective of my study was to generate an in-depth portrait of student affairs administrators' experiences in handling cyberbullying. The findings from my research may be used to inform both the universities and administrators involved in my study as well as other higher education institutions in terms of campus policies and practices regarding online harassment.

My study found that, consistent with the literature on the subject, the definition of online harassment, or cyberbullying, among student affairs administrators at my research sites vary. Definitions employed by some participants reflected existing policies, such as the university student conduct code, on-campus housing policies, or the California criminal code, but the consensus among all participants was that the most convenient way

to define cyberbullying was to describe it through the recounting of cases they have dealt with in their profession. Kai's statement serves as an exemplar:

> For me it's probably just describing case-by-case what's going on, and not labeling it. There are so many different ways a student can be harassed or threatened or have a negative experience...it can come though so many different means when you're on the ground dealing with it. It's more like, 'Well, what's happening and where?' If this behavior is happening via text or on Facebook or something like that, there's not necessarily a need to define it per se.

My study also found that student affairs administrators at each of my research sites rely on collaboration with fellow administrators in their own department and other departments on campus, and on university-wide policies in order to address online harassment when it occurs. As Tatum put it,

> The campus is a nice place because we have a very tight connection with one another within department or across departments within the campus community. Much closer working relationships than you would typically find outside campus. Like, I don't think twice about calling campus police to consult on something here; I don't even know who the police are where I live. But here it's really true, they really are our community.

Finally, my study found that the unique possibilities that online technology provides, including anonymity for perpetrators, wide-spread and instant dissemination of negative actions, a minimization of and desensitization to online interactions, the uncertainty of "jurisdiction" for policing the Internet, and the at times impossibility to trace acts of cyberbullying present challenges to student affairs administrators in

addressing the phenomenon. In discussing the challenges the digital world presents, Amari expressed that,

> In many respects, we're in new territory, and how do we look at it differently? We don't know. We're still sorting it out, trying to figure out the best way to deal with it. It may be time for us to really rethink.

In this chapter, I will discuss the practical implications and recommendations for student affairs administrators and universities produced from my study, as well as the implications my study has for further research into higher education online harassment; next, I will discuss the limitations of my study; and finally, the chapter concludes with my reflections.

Implications and Recommendations for Student Affairs Administrators and Universities

RQ1. How do student affairs administrators define online harassment as it occurs at their institution?

My study found that the definition of online harassment among student affairs administrators at my research sites varied, at times reflecting a technological qualification to existing university policy, but always reflecting a practical experience the administrator has had with the issue in their professional capacity. It would be beneficial to the work of student affairs administrators for the student conduct code of each university to add a component to their existing harassment policy and definition, specifically using the term "online" or "technology-based", and providing some guidance on the university's meaning and boundaries for the phenomenon. Though apparently effective thus far, student discipline administrators would then no longer need to take the

common sense step of referring to and implementing existing harassment policy and add the online component as the "place" the harassment occurred. Housing administrators would be able to refer to the unambiguous and more precisely termed student conduct code when creating their own policies. Not only would these improved university policies provide direction to administrators in their work, they would provide clarity to students in terms of behaviors expected of them. Counseling administrators would continue to be able to address the ramifications of negative online behavior beyond the strict definitions of online harassment provided in the improved policies, but said policies would again provide a benchmark or standard for referral and edification.

Student affairs administrators at my research sites overwhelmingly cited Facebook as a method used for online harassment among students, so much so that use of the social network for cyberbullying felt almost definitional; 33 of my 35 participants referred to the online social network as a method they have experienced being used for online harassment, a rate of 94%. Programming crafted to inform students about the possible negative ramifications of its use and workshops outlining "best practices" for Facebook and other forms of online technology should be conducted at university orientation events and within residence halls. For example, Kasch (2013) found that when students thoughtfully and judiciously crafted their self-presentations on Facebook, they reported fewer instances of unsolicited access to their profiles or personal information. Quinn, a student life administrator, described a new student orientation session at University White that could be the genesis of such programming:

> On the very first day, the Dean of Students office has a presentation about both academic and student conduct, so just making sure that our environment is safe

> for everyone, both online and in-person. It's a very general presentation, but it does reference their online records, so the degree audit report, but also anything in the UCLA directory and also how to keep your online persona and social online community confidential to avoid things like identity theft, stalking, and harassment.

Such "general" programming about online safety should be made more specific and more widespread at all three campuses.

RQ2. What policies and practices do student affairs administrators say they use to address online harassment?

My study also found that student affairs administrators at each of my research sites relied on collaboration with fellow administrators within their office or department, colleagues in other offices or departments on campus, and on university-wide policies in order to address cyberbullying when it occurs. Though participants at each of my research sites acknowledged this collaboration, it exists to varying degrees, in varying terms of regularity, and without specific focus on the issue of technology-based negative interactions among students. I am in a unique position; of all 35 administrators I interviewed, I alone have listened to and processed the stories of administrators from across each department on campus concerning cyberbullying. It would assist universities in addressing incidents of online harassment to have one staff member at each site dedicated to the issue. The staff member should be based out of the dean of students office so that he or she would have the most overarching access possible to confidential files, but he or she would "float" among all relevant departments - student discipline, housing, counseling, university police, student life, LGBT offices, etc. According to

Hayden, a student discipline administrator at University White, "So what is Student Affairs doing about it [cyberbullying]? I think Student Affairs is reactive as many parts of institutions are. Of late, right now there is lots of discussions about campus climate. So there are discussions about allocation of resources, specifically related to the campus climate. But ultimately, what does it take?" A staff member dedicated to the problem of online harassment would be the repository for all negative online incidents among students, and his or her existence would facilitate and enhance the already existing collaboration among departments in not only addressing incidents when they occur, but proactively creating programming to prevent incidents from occurring.

The consistency of University White administrators is remarkable for an organization of its size. Thanks to the consistency at University White in the definition used for online harassment and in the terminology used for the phenomenon, the policies and practices used to address it also show great consistency; the match between the foundational understanding of the phenomenon and the practical outcome of that understanding as seen in policy and practice is more evident at University White than at my other two research sites. Because this analysis arose organically from my study subsequent to data collection, and because it is beyond the purview of my study, I did not explore the methods through which University White administrators achieved this consistency.

RQ3. What challenges do student affairs administrators say they face in their implementation of policies and practices that address online harassment?

My study found that the unique possibilities that online technology provides, including anonymity for perpetrators, wide-spread and instant dissemination of negative

actions, a minimization of and desensitization to online interactions, the uncertainty of "jurisdiction" for policing the Internet, and the at times impossibility to trace acts of cyberbullying presented challenges to student affairs administrators in addressing the phenomenon. Universities should not only work with internet service providers, software companies, and online social networks in providing non-confidential data and expertise that would inform improvements and curtail the misuse of technology that student affairs administrators observe; they should be the vanguard of institutions pushing for such improvements.

Two administrators - Lennon, a student discipline administrator at University Red, and Quinn, a student life administrator at University White, mentioned "bystander intervention programs" as a method through which the schools are attempting to combat online harassment. Such programs seek to re-educate students regarding online behavior by addressing their fundamental attitudes towards the issue. As Quinn put it, "We're looking at ways to integrate more bystander intervention into our educational piece; like, if you see something wrong, don't just sit there and videotape it, do something about it". According to Lennon, such programs affirm campus values and "create a culture where students look out for one another". The challenge of combating the technical aspects of the Internet that facilitate cyberbullying were universally and readily acknowledged by the student affairs administrators I interviewed. It may be that cyberbullying can best be diminished by addressing and eliminating the culture of tacit acceptance behind negative online behaviors.

Implications for Further Research

As I stated in Chapter 4, scholarly research into practical aspects of the anonymity that online technology provides to cyberbullies is as yet unexplored. Though Suler's (2004) theory of online disinhibition delves into the possible psychological effects of anonymous online interactions on the aggressor, thus far the literature on cyberbullying does not extend to an examination of the practical ways in which universities, businesses, and the like might or might not access accurate user information as a component of tracing acts of online aggression. Participants in my study regularly cited this aspect of the cyber-world as challenging and problematic, so a targeted investigation that probes more deeply into how the problem manifests itself may lead to improvements.

A second aspect of online harassment that is as yet unresearched is the notion presented by University Red administrators that some students seem to tacitly accept negative online behavior as routine. In-depth qualitative research into the experiences and attitudes of users of online technology would be beneficial in educating and counseling both current and future users, and informing our understanding of shifting cultural mores.

Finally, the possibility that the Internet provides for instantaneous action and the impact of this possibility on cyberbullying has not yet been examined in the current literature. Suler's (2004) theory of online disinhibition does address the timing of online interactions in some sense with its exploration of the "asynchronous" nature of online communications. Suler posits that since people do not interact in real time in many methods of online communication, it is possible for a cyberbully to post a hostile message or send a threatening email without having to deal with the victim's immediate reaction. However, neither this theory nor any others presented in current cyberbullying

literature focus on the psychology behind and ramifications of a person's ability to act instantly, with little to no forethought, and in such a permanent and extraordinarily widespread way.

Limitations

Ideally, the participant pool at each of my research sites would have been identical in terms of both departments represented and number of interviewees within each department. However, due to the availability or unavailability of participants, departments are unequally represented. As seen in the chart below, while the departments representing each university in my study matched almost perfectly, the number of participants per office tended to be more unequal, possibly resulting in my study being "student discipline" or "student housing" heavy.

Table 8

Distribution of Interviewees

Office Represented	University Red	University White	University Blue	Total
Student Discipline	2	4	5	11
Student Housing/ Residence Life	1	3	4	8
Counseling	2	2	1	5
Campus Security	1	2	1	4
Academic Department	3	0	0	3
Legal Affairs	1	1	1	3
Student Life	0	1	0	1

In addition, it is my belief that, in terms of a study on administrative action regarding cyberbullying on campus, a unique in-depth study of one institution would be of optimal benefit to that institution.

Reflections

It was my privilege to speak with fellow student affairs administrators across three universities about their work with cyberbullying among students, how they interact with other departments on campus in doing so, and how they implement policies and practices to address the issue. Some of the knowledge I gained did not rise to the level of a "finding," but is noteworthy nonetheless. For example, surprisingly, some administrators mentioned the *benefits* of the online nature of cyberbullying when handling the incidents, while at the same time recounting the unique challenges it presents. For example, Dallas, a legal affairs administrator at University White, stated,

> Sometimes the evidence you can collect is really good. That device, your smartphone, has done more to make collecting evidence easy than anything else. People come in with documented evidence, it's electronically documented. Texts, Facebook posts, Facebook photos of the actual harassments. You can't deny that you said those things, there it is, in writing.

Sidney, a student discipline administrator at University Red, concurred, stating

> In some cases, having it on the Internet means there's a flip side; at least we have verifiable proof. Someone wrote this. Someone posted this, and we have names, and we have dates, and we have who it was addressed to. In that sense. there can be some good evidence that comes through that allows the conduct officer to come in with good information, versus when someone just said something.

Representing all three campuses and a variety of offices at each campus, twelve of the thirty-five administrators I interviewed remarked in one form or another about the

benefits and conveniences the digital format of cyberbullying provides to the performance of their role.

Six administrators representing a variety of offices at each of the three campuses (Oakley, student housing at University Red; Dallas, legal affairs at University White; Parker, student housing at University White; Jordan, housing at University Blue, Hayden, student discipline at University White; Taylor, student discipline at University Blue) specifically named, unprompted, the Tyler Clementi cyberbullying case as having been the impetus for the addition of a policy banning video recording in the case of a reasonable expectation of privacy within the harassment section of all three university's student conduct codes (see Appendices E, H, & K). As a student affairs administrator myself, I recognize that a large percentage of what we do is reactive - to trends in education, ever-changing student needs, the ever-expanding possibilities that technology provides, and, unfortunately, to nationally publicized tragedies such as Clementi's suicide. However, once a problematic issue is known, our roles must ideally consist of an equal percentage of proactivity in creating and implementing policies and programs that seek to prevent the problem from occurring. As Jordan, a residence life administrator at University Blue, put it,

> Once it comes to us, it's no longer cyberbullying; it's real life for these students. It's here and now. You have a student coming in, crying their eyes out or scared out of their mind because of what someone put online; it's no longer cyberspace, it's now in the real world.

Appendix A: Document Summary Form

Name or Description of Document: _____
Document Date:_____
Research Site: _____
Date Retrieved:_____

Significance of the document:

Brief Summary of Contents:

Relevance to 2012 CAS Guideline:

Relevant Preliminary Codes:

Relevance to Research Questions:

Reflections (questions, thoughts, implications for research):

Event or contact, if any, with which the document is associated:

Appendix B: Preliminary List of Codes

1. ONLINE HARASSMENT/CYBERBULLYING DEFINITIONS
   (e.g., How cyberbullying is defined by student affairs administrators, both in their practice and institutionally, especially with regards to the notion of repetition of the negative action)

2. ONLINE HARASSMENT/CYBERBULLYING CONSEQUENCES
   (e.g., A recognition that victims of cyberbullying may experience greater distress than victims of traditional, face-to-face bullying)

3. ONLINE HARASSMENT/CYBERBULLYING INCARNATIONS
   (e.g., Student affairs administrators' awareness of the variety of incarnations that cyberbullying can take)

4. EXISTING POLICY
   (e.g., How existing policies function when used to address online harassment/cyberbullying)

5. CHALLENGES
   (e.g., Challenges faced by administrators in their work with online harassment/cyberbullying)

6. DEMOGRAPHIC DISTINCTIONS?
   (e.g., Distinctions present regarding minority population students)

7. CAMPUS SAFTEY CONSIDERATIONS

8. COMMUNICATION FROM UNIVERSITY ABOUT TECHNOLOGY (CAS GUIDELINE)
   (e.g., The ways in which my research sites communicate with their students about the uses of technology, and what if any distinctions are made due to the method of online harassment/cyberbullying by student affairs practitioners in terms of the ramifications for perpetrators; Policies on the use of institutionally provided student access to technology that are clear, easy to understand, and available to all students; Information provided to students on the legal and ethical implications of misuse as it pertains to intellectual property, harassment, privacy, and social networks)

9. DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES (CAS GUIDELINE)
   (e.g., Violations of technology policy following established institutional disciplinary procedures)

10. REFERRAL TO SUPPORT SERVICES (CAS GUIDELINE)

(e.g., Referral to institutionally provided support services for students who experience negative emotional or psychological consequences from the use of technology)

Appendix C: Student Affairs Administrator Interview Protocol

Interviewee:
School:
Date:

This is an interview with _____. Thank you very much for agreeing to be interviewed regarding your work with online harassment among students at _____! As you read in my study information sheet, you name and title will not be used in my study, but the names of all the offices at University Red, University White, and University Blue that participate in my study will be listed in aggregate. In addition, I'll be audio recording this interview, and the transcript will be available to you in the coming weeks. You may choose to withdraw from participation at any time. Is this all understood and acceptable to you? Great! With that, let's begin.

1. As I mentioned in my email, I'm researching student affairs policy and practice regarding online harassment among students. To jog your memory and to give me an idea of how online harassment manifest itself in your work, please give me some examples of the types of online harassment you've dealt with, from the more manageable incidents to more extreme cases and in between.
2. Please name for me all of the forms of online harassment that you've been aware of as part of your work.
    a. *Probe*: for example, negative postings on Facebook or other social media sites, instant messages, emails, text messages, incidents in chat rooms, etc

3. Please describe one example of online harassment that you have dealt with in more detail, from the moment the report came to your attention to the incident's ultimate resolution.

    a. *Probe:* In what ways does your office interact with other departments on campus to address online harassment?

4. What are the policies are that guide your work when dealing with online harassment?

    a. *Probe, if they say they use existing harassment policy*: How does the use of existing harassment policy function when addressing a relatively new phenomenon of online harassment that does not yet have its own specific policy?

5. How does your office define online harassment?

    a. *Probe*: Is there a campus-wide definition? If so, what is it, and how is it made known to students?

6. What are the disciplinary consequences for perpetrators of online harassment? How are students informed of the consequences for misuse of technology as it pertains to online harassment?

7. In your experience, what is the prevalence of online harassment among UR/UW/UB students?

8. What do you find most challenging in handling reports of online harassment?

9. In what ways does UR/UW/UB attempt to prevent online harassment among students?

10. What resources are provided to students to address online harassment they may have experienced?
    a. *Probe*: How are those resources publicized?
11. Which other departments would you recommend I speak with about online harassment among UR/UW/UB students?
12. Can you refer me to any printed or online materials that might be helpful for my study?
13. Do you ever use the term cyberbullying to describe anything we've talked about?

Appendix D: Relevance of Interview Questions to Research Questions

Though my interview protocols vary slightly depending on the type of student affairs administrator I will interview, the questions in each protocol follows the same general format, and are linked to my research questions as shown:

Research Question	Interview Question(s)
1. How do student affairs administrators define cyberbullying at their institution?	Please give me some examples of the types of online harassment you've dealt with, from the more manageable incidents to more extreme cases and in between. Please name for me all of the forms of online harassment that you've been aware of as part of your work. Please describe one example of online harassment that you have dealt with in more detail, from the moment the report came to your attention to the incident's ultimate resolution. How does your office define online harassment? In your experience, what is the prevalence of cyberbullying among UR/UW/UB students? What are the policies that guide your work when dealing with online harassment? Does your office use the term cyberbullying to describe anything we've talked about?
2. What policies and practices do student affairs administrators say they use to address cyberbullying?	Please describe one or two examples of cyberbullying that you have dealt with in your professional capacity, from the moment the report came to your attention to the incident's ultimate resolution. How does your office define online harassment? What resources are provided to students to address online harassment they may have experienced? Please describe one example of online harassment that you have dealt with in more detail, from the moment the report came to your attention to the incident's ultimate resolution. What are the disciplinary consequences for perpetrators of online harassment? How are students informed of the consequences for misuse of technology as it pertains to online harassment? What are the policies that guide your work when dealing with online harassment? In what ways does UR/UW/UB attempt to prevent online harassment among students? In what ways does your office interact with other departments on campus to address online harassment?
3. What challenges (professional, ethical, legal, or otherwise) do student affairs administrators say they face in their implementation of policies that address cyberbullying?	What do you find most challenging (professionally, ethically, legally or otherwise) in handling reports of online harassment? How does the use of existing harassment policy function when addressing a relatively new phenomenon of online harassment that does not have its own specific policy?

Appendix E: University Red Student Code of Conduct

The portions of University Red's code of conduct that pertain to online harassment read as follows (policy and section numbers have been redacted to maintain the confidential identity of University Red):

- **XXX.XX**: Harassment, defined as conduct that is so severe and/or pervasive, and objectively offensive, and that so substantially impairs a person's access to University programs or activities that the person is effectively denied equal access to the University's resources and opportunities.

  Harassment includes, but is not limited to, conduct that is motivated on the basis of a person's race, color, national or ethnic origin, citizenship, sex, religion, age, sexual orientation, gender identify, pregnancy, marital status, ancestry, service in the uniformed services, physical or mental disability, medical condition, or perceived membership in any of these classifications. Pursuant to section XXX.XX, sanctions may be enhanced for conduct motivated on the basis of the above classifications.

- **XXX.XX**: Stalking behavior in which a student repeatedly engages in a course of conduct directed at another person and makes a credible threat with the intent to place that person in reasonable fear for his or her safety, or the safety of his or her family; where the threat is reasonably determined by the University to seriously alarm, torment, or terrorize the person; and where the threat is additionally determined by the University to serve no legitimate purpose.

- **XXX.XX**: Making a video recording, audio recording, taking photographs, or streaming audio/video of any person in a location where the person has a reasonable expectation of privacy, without that person's knowledge and express consent. Looking through a hole or opening, into, or otherwise viewing, by means of any instrumentality, the interior of a private location without the subject's knowledge and express consent. Photographs and recordings made in private locations of sexual activity or that contain nudity, may not be posted online or otherwise shared or distributed in any manner without the knowledge and express consent of all recorded parties, even if the photograph or recording was originally made with the knowledge and express consent of those parties. Making a video recording, audio recording, or streaming audio/video of private, non-public conversations and/or meetings, without the knowledge and express consent of all recorded parties. These provisions do not extend to public events or discussions, nor to lawful official law or policy enforcement activities. These provisions may not be utilized to impinge upon the lawful exercise of constitutionally protected rights of freedom of speech or assembly.

Definitions

• "Express consent" is clear, unmistakable and voluntary consent that may be in written, oral or nonverbal form.

• "Private locations" are settings where the person reasonably expected privacy. For example, in most cases the following are considered private locations: residential living quarters, bathrooms, locker rooms, and personal offices.

• "Nudity" means the absence of an opaque covering which covers the genitals, pubic hair, buttocks, perineum, anus or anal region of any person or any portion of the breast at or below the areola thereof of any female person.

• "Private, non-public conversations and/or meetings" include any communication carried on in circumstances that reasonably indicate that any party wants the communication to be confined to the parties, but excludes a communication made in a public gathering, or in any other circumstance in which the parties to the communication may reasonably expect that the communication may be overheard or recorded.

Appendix F: University Red Student Housing Policy

The portions of University Red's student housing policies that pertain to online harassment read as follows (policy and section numbers have been redacted to maintain the confidential identity of University Red):

P.XX Violence, Abuse, and Threatening Behavior

Both direct and indirect forms of verbal and written abuse, threats, physical harassment, intimidation, and violence against another person or their property, as well as conduct that threatens the health and safety of self (including threats or attempts of suicide), are prohibited within housing communities or on the campus at large. Violations of this policy can be reported to the XX Police at (XXX) XXX-XXXX, and may result in action by the University as well as criminal charges.

Appendix G: California Penal Code Relevant to Online Harassment

The relevant portion of the California Penal Code reads:

653m. (a) Every person who, with intent to annoy, telephones or makes contact by means of an electronic communication device with another and addresses to or about the other person any obscene language or addresses to the other person any threat to inflict injury to the person or property of the person addressed or any member of his or her family, is guilty of a misdemeanor.

(c) Any offense committed by use of a telephone may be deemed to have been committed when and where the telephone call or calls were made or received. Any offense committed by use of an electronic communication device or medium, including the Internet, may be deemed to have been committed when and where the electronic communication or communications were originally sent or first viewed by the recipient.

(g) For purposes of this section, the term "electronic communication device" includes, but not limited to, telephones, cellular phones, computers, video recorders, facsimile machines, pagers, personal digital assistants, smartphones, and any other device that transfers signs, signals, writing, images, sounds, or data. "Electronic communication device" also includes, but is not limited to, videophones, TTY/TDD devices, and all other devices used to aid or assist communication to or from deaf or disabled persons. "Electronic communication" has the same meaning as the term defined in Subsection 12 of Section 2510 of Title 18 of the United States Code. (CAL. PEN. CODE § 653m; http://www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Appendix H: University White Student Conduct Code

The portions of University White's student code of conduct that pertain to online harassment read as follows (policy and section numbers have been redacted to maintain the confidential identity of University White):

XXX.XX: **Stalking**

Stalking behavior in which a student repeatedly engages in a course of conduct directed at a specific person, that places that person in reasonable fear for his or her safety, or the safety of a third person or persons.

XXX.XX: Harassment

Harassment is defined as conduct that is so severe and/or pervasive, and objectively offensive, and that so substantially impairs a person's access to University programs or activities that the person is effectively denied equal access to the University's resources and opportunities.

Sanctions may be enhanced where the individual was selected for harassment because of the individual's race, color, national or ethnic origin, citizenship, sex, gender, gender expression, religion, age, sexual orientation, gender identity, pregnancy, marital status, ancestry, service in the uniformed services, physical or mental disability, medical condition, or perceived membership in any of these classifications.

XXX.XX: Expectation of Privacy

The following is prohibited:

Making a video recording, audio recording, taking photographs, or streaming audio/video of any person in a location where the person has a reasonable expectation of privacy, without that person's knowledge and express consent.

Looking through a hole or opening, into, or otherwise viewing, by means of any instrumentality, the interior of a private location without the subject's knowledge and express consent.

Photographs and recordings made in private locations of sexual activity or that contain nudity, may not be posted online or otherwise shared or distributed in any manner without the knowledge and express consent of all recorded parties, even if the photograph or recording was originally made with the knowledge and express consent of those parties.

"Nudity" means the absence of an opaque covering which covers the genitals, pubic hair,
buttocks, perineum, anus or anal region of any person or any portion of the breast at or
below the areola thereof of any female person.

"Private locations" are settings where the person reasonably expected privacy. For example, in most cases the following are considered private locations: residential living quarters, bathrooms, locker rooms, and personal offices.

"Private, non-public conversations and/or meetings" include any communication carried on in circumstances that reasonably indicate that any party wants the communication to be confined to the parties, but excludes a communication made in a public gathering, or in any other circumstance in which the parties to the communication may reasonably expect that the communication may be overheard or recorded.

"Express consent" is clear, unmistakable and voluntary consent that may be in written, oral or nonverbal form.

These provisions do not extend to public events or discussions, nor to lawful official law or policy enforcement activities. These provisions may not be utilized to impinge upon the lawful exercise of constitutionally protected rights of freedom of speech or assembly.

Appendix I: University White Student Housing Policies

The portions of University White's student housing policies that pertain to online harassment read as follows (policy and section numbers have been redacted to maintain the confidential identity of University White):

X.X Disruptive Behavior/Complicity

a. Behavior that disrupts or interferes with the orderly functions in or around the On Campus Housing community is prohibited. Additionally, acts or behaviors that disrupt or interfere with others' normal use of facilities or privileges are prohibited.

b. Encouraging or permitting others in the commission or attempted commission of misconduct is a violation of the On Campus Housing Regulations. Students are expected to notify an appropriate university official of the misconduct and/or remove themselves from the situation.

X.X Threatening Behavior

Conduct that threatens the health and safety of oneself or any other person in or around the On Campus Housing community is prohibited.

Appendix J: University White Computer, Network, and Information Services Acceptable Use Policy

The portions of University White's computer, network, and information services acceptable use policy that pertain to online harassment read as follows:

Definition/Examples of Misuse

The following list, while not exhaustive, characterizes unacceptable behavior which may be subject to disciplinary action:

- Attempts to gain unauthorized access to any information facility, whether successful or not. This includes running programs that attempt to calculate or guess passwords, or that are designed and crafted to trick other users into disclosing their passwords. It also includes electronic eavesdropping on communications facilities.
- Any violation of state law as described in the Penal Code.
- Any action that invades the privacy of individuals or entities that are the creators, authors, users, or subjects of information resources.
- Using electronic mail, talk or other programs as pranks or in a threatening or harassing manner.
- Misrepresenting in any manner, your identity, your account or a computer in an email or other electronic communication.
- Sending mass mailings to individuals who have not expressly agreed to be contacted in this manner.
- Posting on electronic bulletin boards materials that violate existing laws or the University's codes of conduct.

Appendix K: University Blue Student Conduct Code

The portions of University Blue's student code of conduct that pertain to online harassment read as follows (policy and section numbers have been redacted to maintain the confidential identity of University Blue):

- **XXX.XX**: **Sexual, Racial, and Other Forms of Harassment**
  Harassment, defined as conduct that is so severe and/or pervasive, and objectively offensive, and that so substantially impairs a person's access to University programs or activities that the person is effectively denied equal access to the University's resources and opportunities.

  Harassment includes, but is not limited to, conduct that is motivated on the basis of a person's race, color, national or ethnic origin, citizenship, sex, religion, age, sexual orientation, gender identify, pregnancy, marital status, ancestry, service in the uniformed services, physical or mental disability, medical condition, or perceived membership in any of these classifications. Pursuant to section XXX.XX, sanctions may be enhanced for conduct motivated on the basis of the above classifications.

- **XXX.XX**: **Stalking Behavior**
  Stalking behavior in which a student repeatedly engages in a course of conduct directed at another person and makes a credible threat with the intent to place that person in reasonable fear for his or her safety, or the safety of his or her family; where the threat is reasonably determined by the University to seriously alarm, torment, or terrorize the person; and where the threat is additionally determined by the University to serve no legitimate purpose.

- **XXX.XX**: **Viewing, Recording, Photographing, Sharing, Distributing Without Consent** Making a video recording, audio recording, taking photographs, or streaming audio/video of any person in a location where the person has a reasonable expectation of privacy, without that person's knowledge and express consent.

  Looking through a hole or opening, into, or otherwise viewing, by means of any instrumentality, the interior of a private location without the subject's knowledge and express consent.

  Photographs and recordings made in private locations of sexual activity or that contain nudity, may not be posted online or otherwise shared or distributed in any manner without the knowledge and express consent of all recorded parties, even if the photograph or recording was originally made with the knowledge and express

consent of those parties.

Making a video recording, audio recording, or streaming audio/video of private, non-public conversations and/or meetings, without the knowledge and express consent of all recorded parties.

These provisions do not extend to public events or discussions, nor to lawful official law or policy enforcement activities. These provisions may not be utilized to impinge upon the lawful exercise of constitutionally protected rights of freedom of speech or assembly.

Definitions

• "Express consent" is clear, unmistakable and voluntary consent that may be in written, oral or nonverbal form.
• "Private locations" are settings where the person reasonably expected privacy. For example, in most cases the following are considered private locations: residential living quarters, bathrooms, locker rooms, and personal offices.
• "Nudity" means the absence of an opaque covering which covers the genitals, pubic hair, buttocks, perineum, anus or anal region of any person or any portion of the breast at or below the areola thereof of any female person.
• "Private, non-public conversations and/or meetings" include any communication carried on in circumstances that reasonably indicate that any party wants the communication to be confined to the parties, but excludes a communication made in a public gathering, or in any other circumstance in which the parties to the communication may reasonably expect that the communication may be overheard or recorded.

Appendix L: University Blue Student Housing Policies

The portions of University Blue's student housing policies that pertain to online harassment read as follows (policy and section numbers have been redacted to maintain the confidential identity of University Blue):

X.XX ABUSE, THREATENING BEHAVIOR, HARASSMENT, AND VIOLENCE

X.XX.X Direct and Indirect Forms of Abuse – Direct and indirect forms of abuse, threats, coercion, harassment, intimidation, stalking, bullying, unwanted personal contact, violence against another person or their property or causing the reasonable apprehension of physical or verbal harm, are prohibited. This policy includes but, is not limited to, physical, electronic, written, and verbal interactions

X.XX GENERAL COMPUTER USE

X.XX.X Masking Identity – Masking the identity of an account or machine is prohibited.

X.XX.X Online Harassment – E-mail spamming and other forms of abuse or harassment are not permitted. This includes the use of the network to connect to and use 3rd-party sites (i.e. MySpace, Facebook, etc…) for the purpose of abuse and/or harassment.

Appendix M: University Blue Electronic Communication Policy

University Blue's website has a 10-page electronic communications policy section which covers legal issues surrounding file sharing, password security suggestions, tips for avoiding computer viruses, and University-specific policies for acceptable use. The section of the policy that pertains to online harassment reads in part:

Use of campus electronic resources comes with certain responsibilities and is subject to constraints required for reliable operations and respect for others' use of these services. As you use University Blue's various e-resources, please keep in mind the following guidelines designed to ensure secure and effective access for everyone.

- All University policies, such as those relating to sexual harassment, govern the use of these services.
- All applicable federal, state, and local laws apply to your use campus electronic resources.
- If you violate the Electronic Communications Policy, or other University Blue policies or guidelines related to the use of campus electronic resources, your access may be suspended. Illegal activities, such as the illegal file sharing of copyrighted music, may also result in legal action.

References

Abbott, M. (2011). *Cyberbullying experiences of ethnic minorities.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest dissertations & theses.

Agatston, P. W., Kowalski, R., & Limber, S. (2007). Students' perspectives on cyber bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41,* 59-60. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.09.003

Akbulut, Y., & Eristi, B. (2011). Cyberbullying and victimization among Turkish university students. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 27*(7), 1155-1170. Retrieved from http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet27/akbulut.html

Aluede, O., Adeleke, F., Omoike, D., & Afen-Akpaida, J. (2008). A review of the extent, nature, characteristics and effects of bullying behaviour in schools. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 35*(2), 151-158.

Arıcak, O. T. (2009). Psychiatric symptomatology as a predictor of cyberbullying among university students. *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 34,* 167-184.

Baldasare, A., Bauman, S., Goldman, L., & Robie, A. (2012). Cyberbullying? Voices of college students. *Cutting-edge Technologies in Higher Education, 5,* 127-155.

Back, L. (2002). Aryans reading Adorno: Cyber-culture and twenty-first century racism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 25,* 628-651.

Barr, J., & Lugus, E. (2011). Digital threats on campus: Examining the duty of colleges to protect their social networking students. *Western New England Law Review, 33,* 757-788.

Bartow, A. (2009). Internet defamation as profit center: The monetization of online harassment. *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender, 322*, 383-430.

Bauman, S., & Del Rio, A. (2006). Preservice teachers' responses to bullying scenarios: Comparing physical, verbal, and relational bullying. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*(1), 219-231. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.98.1.219

Beran, T., & Li, Q. (2005). Cyber-harassment: A study of a new method for an old behavior. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 32*(3), 265-277.

Bishop, H. N., & Casida, H. (2011). Preventing bullying and harassment of sexual minority students in schools. *The Clearing House, 84,* 134-138. doi:10.1080/00098655.2011.564975

Burgess, A., Garbarino, C., & Carlson, M. I. (2006). Pathological teasing and bullying turned deadly: Shooters and suicide. *Victims & Offenders, 1*(1), 1-14. doi:10.1080/15564880500498705

Burnham, J. J., Wright, V. H., & Houser, R. A. (2011). Cyberbullying: Emergent concerns for adolescents and challenges for school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling, 9*(15), 1-25. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=EJ933181

California Education Code, §48900. Retrieved from http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=EDC&division=4.& title=2.&part=27.&chapter=6.&article=1

Chapell, M., Hasselman, S., Kitchin, T., Lomon, S., MacIver, K., & Sarullo, P. (2006). Bullying in elementary school, high school, and college. *Adolescence, 41*(164), 633-648.

Clark, M. (2004). *The effects of bullying on student attendance* (Master's dissertation). Retrieved from the Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University's online database.

Cohen, A. (1998). *The shaping of American higher education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Coleyshaw, L. (2010). The power of paradigms: a discussion of the absence of bullying research in the context of the university student experience. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education, 15*(4), 377-386.

Council for the Advancement of Standards. (2012). *2012 general standards.* Retrieved from http://www.cas.edu/index.php/cas-general-standards/

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

Crothers, L. M., & Kolbert, J. B. (2008). Tackling a problematic behavior management issue: Teachers' intervention in childhood bullying problems. *Intervention in School & Clinic, 43*(3), 132-139. Retrieved from http://navigatoriup.passhe.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ehh&AN=31464813&site=ehost-live

Del Principio, A. (2012). *The effects of bullying on student academic performance*. (Doctoral dissertation.) Retrieved from ProQuest dissertations & theses.

Dilmac, B. (2009). Psychological needs as a predictor of cyber bullying: A preliminary report on college students. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 9*(3), 1307-1325.

Duncan, S. (2010). College bullies – precursors to campus violence: What should universities and college administrators know about the law? *Villanova Law Review, 55*(2), 269.

Duriez, B., & Van Hiel, A. (2002). The march of modern fascism: A comparison of social dominance orientation and authoritarianism. *Personality & Individual Differences, 32*(7), 1199.

Englander, E., Mills, E., & McCoy, M. (2009). Cyberbullying and information exposure: User-generated content in post-secondary education. *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology, 46*(2), 215-230.

Finn, J. (2004). A survey of online harassment at a university campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(4), 468-481.

Gathers, E. (2005). *At the hands of the "mean girls": The effects of bullying on young women in the secondary classroom*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

Geach, N., & Haralambous, N. (2009). Regulating harassment: Is the law fit for the social networking age? *Journal of Criminal Law, 723,* 241-257.

Gross, E. F. (2009). Logging on, bouncing back: An experimental investigation of online communication following social exclusion. *Developmental Psychology, 45*(6), 1787-1793. doi:10.1037/a0016541

Griffiths, M. (2003). Internet abuse in the workplace: Issues and concerns for employers and employment counselors. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 402,* 87-96.

Gutshall, A. (2012). *Cyberbullying in higher education: The experiences and perceptions of first-year college students and university administrators.* (Unpublished master's thesis). James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA.

Hale, D. Y. (2002). *Understanding the effects of bullying as a precursor to school violence.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL.

Hay, C., Meldrum, R., & Mann, K. (2010). Traditional bullying, cyber bullying, and deviance: A general strain theory approach. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 26*(2), 130-147. doi:10.1177/1043986209359557

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

Hoff, D. L., & Mitchell, S. N. (2009). Cyberbullying: Causes, effects, and remedies. *Journal of Educational Administration, 47*(5), 652-665. doi:10.1108/09578230910981107

Johnson, C. L. (2011). *An examination of the primary and secondary effects of cyberbullying: Development and testing of a cyber-bullying moderator/mediator model.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest dissertations & theses.

Juvonen, J., & Gross, E. F. (2008). Extending the school grounds? Bullying experiences in cyberspace. *Journal of School Health, 78*(9), 496-505.

Kim, N. (2008). Imposing tort liability on websites for cyberharassment. *Yale Law Journal Pocket Part, 118,* 115-118.

Klomek, A., Sourander, A., & Gould, M. (2010). The association of suicide and bullying in childhood to young adulthood: A review of cross-sectional and longitudinal research findings. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 55*(5), 282-288.

König, A., Gollwitzer, M., & Steffgen, G. (2010). Cyberbullying as an act of revenge? *Australian Journal of Guidance & Counseling, 20*(2), 210-224. doi:10.1375/ajgc.20.2.210

Kowalski, R. M., & Limber, S. P. (2007). Electronic bullying among middle school students. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41,* 22-30. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.08.018

Kuzma, J. (2013). Empirical study of cyber harassment among social networks. *International Journal of Technology and Human Interaction, 9*(2), 53-65.

Leenaars, L., & Rinaldi, C. M. (2010). Male and female university students' experiences of indirect aggression. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 25*(1), 131-148. doi:10.1177/0829573509350062

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

Li, Q. (2007). New bottle but old wine: A research of cyberbullying in schools. *Computers in Human Behavior, 23*(4), 1777-1791. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2005.10.005

Li, Q. (2008). A cross-cultural comparison of adolescents' experience related to cyberbullying. *Educational Research, 50*(3), 223-234. doi:10.1080/00131880802309333

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

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Macdonald, C., & Roberts-Pittman, B. (2010). Cyberbullying among college students: Prevalence and demographic differences. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 9,* 2003-2009.

McNeil, L., Herbst, D., Hamashige, H., Mascia, K., & Jessen, M. (2010). Bullied to death? *People, 73*(7), 62-65.

Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Misawa, M. (2010). Racist and homophobic bullying in adulthood: Narratives from gay men of color in higher education. *New Horizons in Adult Education & Human Resource Development, 24*(1), 7-23.

Moreno, M. A., & Hornbeck, K. (2011). *Social networks and cyber bullies: What are your patients telling you?* Retrieved from http://contemporarypediatrics.modernmedicine.com/contemporary-pediatrics/news/modernmedicine/modern-medicine-feature-articles/social-networks-and-cyb?page=full

Nansel, T., Overpeck, M., Haynie, D., Ruan, J., & Scheidt, P. (2003). Relationships between bullying and violence among US youth. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 157,* 348-353.

Nuss, E. (2003). The development of student affairs. In J. H. Schuh, S. R. Jones, & S. R. Harper (Eds), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 65-88). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

O'Connell, K. (2008). *Internet law - Cyber fraud and online bullying affect 44% of small Irish businesses.* Retrieved from http://www.ibls.com/internet_law_news_portal_view.aspx?s=latestnews&id=1954

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Overbeck, J. R., Jost, J. T., Mosso, C. O., & Flizik, A. (2004). Resistant versus acquiescent responses to in-group inferiority as a function of social dominance orientation in the USA and Italy. *Group Processes Intergroup Relations, 7*(1), 35-54. doi:10.1177/1368430204039972

Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2006). Bullies move beyond the schoolyard. *Youth Violence & Juvenile Justice, 4*(2), 148-169. doi:10.1177/1541204096286288

Pitcher, G. (2007). *One in 10 workers experiences cyber-bullying in the workplace.* Retrieved from http://www.personneltoday.com/hr/one-in-10-workers-experiences-cyber-bullying-in-the-workplace/

Pondell, N. (2011). *Psychosocial effects of bullying on adolescent victims and bully/victims and analysis of coping sources.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Midwestern University, Downers Grove, IL.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67(4), 741-763. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., & Levin, S. (2006). Social dominance theory and the dynamics of intergroup relations: Taking stock and looking forward. *European Review of Social Psychology, 17,* 271-230.

Raskauskas, J., & Stoltz, A. D. (2007). Involvement in traditional and electronic bullying among adolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, *43*(3), 564-575. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.43.3.564

Rivers, I., Poteat, V. P., Noret, N., & Ashurst, N. (2009). Observing bullying at school: The mental health implications of witness status. *School Psychology Quarterly, 24*(4), 211-223. doi:10.1037/a0018164

Schenk, A. (2011). *Psychological impact of cyberbully victimization among college students.* (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest dissertations & theses.

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sengupta, A., & Chaudhuri, A. (2011). Are social networking sites a source of online harassment for teens? Evidence from survey data. *Children & Youth Services Review, 33*(2), 284-290. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2010.09.011

Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2010). The personality bases on ideology: A one-year longitudinal study. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 150*(5), 540-559.

Sidanius, J., Sinclair, D., & Pratto, F. (2006). Social dominance orientation, gender, and increasing educational exposure. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*(7), 1640-1653.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Sinkkonen, H., Puhakka, H., & Meriläinen, M. (2012). Bullying at a university: Students' experiences of bullying. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*(1), 153-165. doi:10.1080/03075079.2011.649726

Slonje, R., & Smith, P. K. (2008). Cyberbullying: Another main type of bullying? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 49,* 147-154. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9450.2007.00611.x

Smith, K., Grimm, J., Lombard, A., & Wolfe, B. (2012). Chapter 11: Cyberbullying: It doesn't stop after high school. In L. A. Wankel & C. Wankel (Eds), *Misbehavior online in higher education* (pp. 207-242). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Emerald.

Smith, P. K., Mahdavi, J., & Carvalho, M. (2008). Cyberbullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry, 49*(4), 376-385. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01846.x

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,* 441-464. doi:10.1348/000709906x105689

Spears, B., Slee, P., Owens, L., & Johnson, B. (2009). Behind the scenes and screens: Insights into the human dimension of covert and cyberbullying. *Journal of Psychology, 217*(4), 189-196. doi:10.1027/0044-3409.217.4.189

Spitzberg, B. H., & Hoobler, G. (2002). Cyberstalking and the technologies of interpersonal terrorism. *New Media and Society, 4,* 71-92.

Staubli, S., & Killias, M. (2011). Long-term outcomes of passive bullying during childhood: Suicide attempts, victimization and offending. *European Journal of Criminology*, *8*(5), 377-385.

Suler, J. (2004). The psychology of cyberspace. *CyberPsychology and Behavior, 7,* 321-326.

Taulke-Johnson, R. (2008). Moving beyond homophobia, harassment and intolerance: Gay male university students' alternative narratives. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 29*(1), 121-133. doi:10.1080/01596300701802813

Tellis, W. (1997). Application of case study methodology. *The Qualitative Report, 3*(3), 1-17.

The United States Department of Education's Higher Education Center for Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Violence Prevention. (2012). *Prevention update: Bullying and cyberbullying at colleges and universities.* Retrieved from http://www.higheredcenter.org/

The United States Secret Service. (2002). *Final report and findings of the safe school initiative: Implications for the prevention of school attacks in the United States.* Retrieved from http://www.secretservice.gov/ntac/ssi_final_report.pdf

Vandebosch, H., & Van Cleemput, K. (2008). Defining cyberbullying: A qualitative research into the perceptions of youngsters. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 11*(4), 499-503. doi:10.1089/cpb.2007.0042

Walker, C., Sockman, B., & Koehn, S. (2011). An exploratory study of cyberbullying with undergraduate university students. *TechTrends*, *55*(2), 31-38.

Weatherby, G., Strachila, S., & McMahon, B. (2010). School shootings: The deadly result of teasing and ostracism? *Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice Research & Education, 2*(1), 1-15.

Weinhold, B. K. (2011). Bullying and school violence: The tip of the iceberg. *Teacher Educator, 35*(3), 28-33.

Willard, N. E. (2007). *Cyberbullying and cyberthreats: Responding to the challenge of online social aggression, threats, and distress.* Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Williams, K. R., & Guerra, N. G. (2007). Prevalence and predictors of Internet bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41,* 14-21. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.08.018

Wolak, J., Mitchell, K. J., & Finkelhor, D. (2007). Does online harassment constitute bullying? An exploration of online harassment by known peers and online only contacts. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41,* 51-58. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.08.019

Wright, V. H., Burnham, J. J., Inman, C. T., & Ogorchock, H. N. (2009). Cyberbullying: Using virtual scenarios to educate and raise awareness. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education, 26*(1), 35-42.

Ybarra, M. L., & Mitchell, K. K. (2004). Youth engaging in online harassment: Associations with caregiver-child relationships, Internet use, and personal characteristics. *Journal of Adolescence, 27*(3), 319-336. doi:10.1016/j.adolescnence.2004.03.007

Ybarra, M., & Mitchell, K. (2007). Prevalence and frequency of Internet harassment instigation: Implications for adolescent health. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41*(2), 189-195. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.03.005

Ybarra, M. L., Diener-West, M., & Leaf, P. J. (2007). Examining the overlap in Internet harassment and school bullying: Implications for school intervention. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41*, 42-50. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.09.004

Zagorski, M. A. (2010). *Effects of bullying on students emotional health and possible risk of development of at risk behavior*. University Park, IL: Governor's State University Press.