School Leadership Review

Volume 11 | Issue 2 Article 3

2016

I'm Telling: A Quantitative Analysis of Reporting Cyberbullying versus Reporting of Traditional Bullying in a School Setting

Amy Burkman
Texas A&M Texarkana

I'm Telling: A Quantitative Analysis of Reporting Cyberbullying versus Reporting of Traditional Bullying in a School Setting

Amy Burkman[i]
Texas A & M Texarkana

Bullying is a widely used, familiar term for aggressive behavior traditionally perceived as a customary rite of passage, particularly during a child's early middle school and high school years (Lusk, 2012). The old adage, kids will be kids, is a common misperception based on lack of knowledge about the impact of bullying exhibited by parents, educators, and community members. Bullying in all forms has become a larger issue for law enforcement, educators, and society as a whole. An increasingly growing phenomenon, cyberbullying, has become a new form of this aggressive behavior in society. Bullies have essentially moved beyond the school's hallways, classrooms, and playgrounds and into cyberspace. Cyberbullying is a trend of deviancy in which juveniles use technology, such as cellphones, tablets, computers, and electronic devices as a means to target peers for harassment. It is expected that the incidence of cyberbullying will continue to significantly increase over the next few years, thereby creating a completely unique social problem similar to that of cyberstalking and other crimes of the Internet (Dooley, Pyzalski, & Cross, 2009).

Cyberbullying provides perpetrators with increased destructive reach by increasing levels of anonymity and access to peers. Educational leaders are in a unique position when dealing with cyberbullying because of the virtual, rather than physical, location of bullying. However, with the increased number of youth having cellphones and other electronic devices with internet accessibility, this trend will likely strengthen in the absence of prevention and intervention strategies (Slonje, Smith & Frisen, 2012) inside and outside of the school building. Educational leaders need be prepared to respond to all bullying behaviors because they impact the school environment, regardless of the location of the victimization.

The only way that educational leaders know that cyberbullying is taking place is through the reporting process; however, traditional bullying victims are hesitant to report being victimized (DeLara, 2012). The purpose of this study is to investigate if victims of cyberbullying report victimization at a similar rate to victims of traditional bullying as identified by the 2012 US Bureau of Justice Statistics publication *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2012* (Robers, Kemp, Truman, & Snyder, 2013). Until educational professionals understand the patterns of and likelihood of reporting victimization it is difficult to provide programming designed to reduce victimization.

---

[i] **Dr. Amy Burkman may be reached at** *aburkman@tamut.edu*

Conceptual Framework

The Structural-Functional Theory provides the conceptual framework for this research. The focus in this theory is the interconnectedness between different organizations, social units and structures. The relationships of educational organizations, parents, students and greater community services, such as police departments, are based on a set of norms and values that shape society. Through the Structural-Functional Theory lens, "the social relationships, of which the continuing network constitute social structure, are not haphazard conjunctions of individuals, but are determined by social process...In any relationship within the social structure a person knows he is expected to behave accordingly...and is justified in expecting that other persons should do the same" (Radliff-Brown, 1952, p. 10). When other persons do not follow the social structure, mechanisms should be in place to protect individuals that operate with the structural norms.

Literature Review

Research does exist looking at traditional bullying behaviors but not the unique characteristics of cyberbullying. For example, Morrison (2002) looked at a response to bullying and victimization from a restorative justice approach but did not address any elements of cyberbullying. Only aspects of traditional bullying were investigated. Brockenbrough (2001) and Farrington and Ttofi (2011) also examined peer victimization and bullying, but without regard to cyberbullying. This suggests that the research has not caught up with the advances in technology used to terrorize victims. Research on victimization and bullying needs to be updated to include a specific focus on the unique characteristics of cyberbullying. The first step in addressing this gap is to understand the similarities and differences in reporting behaviors between these two types of bullying.

Daily access to the Internet has skyrocketed according to a 2013 United States Census Bureau report. In 2011, nearly 76% of all American households surveyed reported having a computer within the home compared to only 8.2% in 1984, and nearly 62% in 2003. Of those surveyed, 71.7% reported daily access to the Internet in 2011, compared to 18% in 1997, and by all accounts, these numbers will continue to increase exponentially, particularly with the inclusion of sophisticated mobile and gaming devices (File & Ryan, 2014). Cyberbullying has undergone increasingly enormous changes in the number of cyberbullying incidents, frequency, and duration, which have been primarily attributed to the major advancements in technology (Bauman, 2013; Draa & Sydney, 2013; Patchin & Hinduja, 2011; Pieschl et al., 2013).

Advancement in technology also creates opportunity for increased cyberbullying. For the cyberbully, the convenience and accessibility to a limitless virtual audience that is mostly unsupervised and the methods used to victimize the intended targets, are evolving and intensifying with each passing year (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009; Kowalski, Limber, & Agatson, 2008). Hinduja and Patchin (2015) indicated that 34.4% of their study's participants reported being cyberbullied at least once in their lifetime. In spite of popular belief, one researcher found that the majority of cyberbullying victims knew the identity of the cyberbully, which suggests that anonymity does not have a strong influence on the dynamics of cyberbullying behaviors (Bryce & Fraser, 2013), although Barlett and Gentile (2012) and Burton et al (2013) disagree.

In regards to cyberbullying victimization, most studies do not focus on whether cyber bullying victims report being victimized, but if reporting is included there is no differentiation between reporting at home or at school and between reporting to a parent, other adult, or peer (Addington, 2013). Donegan (2012) noted that the percentages of children and adolescents reporting cyberbullying victimization in different studies varied greatly by the definition used and the age of participants surveyed. Some researchers believe that cyberbullying victims report incidents to parents and friends because harassment is likely occurring outside of school hours (Addington, 2013; Watkins & Maume, 2011), even if the cyberbullying impacts daily activities. Educational professionals need to encourage victims to report cyberbullying and need to understand how to respond to such reports. The question, however, remains: do cyberbullying victims report bullying at the same rates as traditional bullying victims?

Victims of traditional bullying rarely report incidents to adults regardless of opportunity or a school provided system being in place (DeLara, 2008; Mishna & Alaggio, 2005; Pepler, Jiang, Craig, & Connolly, 2008). Research indicates that this could be due to being told to ignore bullying (Yoon, Bauman, Choi, & Hutchinson, 2011) or because bullying is dealt with from a primarily adult perspective with little input from the victim. The research of DeLara (2012) showed that one reason adolescents won't report bullying victimization to adults is that they feel like adults don't understand how to respond to bullying. Until adults encourage students to report any instances of victimization and adults understand bullying from the perspectives of adolescents, self-reporting will continue to be low.

The first step in developing a response plan is to determine the frequency of reporting and if there needs to be an enhanced approach to encouraging cyberbullying victims to self-report. Understanding reporting behaviors starts with approaching the victims and asking about reporting behaviors. The purpose of this study is to address this need by determining if victims of cyberbullying report victimization at a similar rate to victims of traditional bullying as identified by the 2012 U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics publication, *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2012* (Robers, Kemp, Truman, & Snyder, 2013).

Methodology

This non-experimental correlational quantitative research study uses secondary data collected by the United States Bureau of Justice. This data was selected based on the large portions of data available, as well as the diversity of the population surveyed by this national government agency. The non-experimental design was selected based on the use of secondary data as opposed to the collection of primary data. Due to the use of a non-experimental research design and the use of secondary, rather than primary data, the research questions only involve statements about the observed relationship between two variables, not any implicit or inferential causation (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). The research question and variables are as follows:

> RQ: Is there a statistically significant correlation between the type of bullying (cyberbullying vs. traditional bullying) and the percentage of victims that report bullying to an adult in a school setting?

H: There is a statistically significant correlation between the type of bullying and the percentage of victims that report bullying to an adult in a school setting.

H_0: There is not a statistically significant correlation between the type of bullying and the percentage of victims that report bullying to an adult in a school setting.

This research used dummy variables. Dummy variables are assigned when a categorical data set is assigned 0 or 1 to differentiate between two distinct categories, as is the case in comparisons of cyberbullying and traditional bullying, and whether or not bullying is reported to an adult.

Source of Data

The secondary data source is the *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2012* (Robers, Kemp, & Truman, 2013). The populations on the various surveys used in this report vary slightly based on the parameters of the instrument; however, the population is households in the United States with juveniles. This study will use only data from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), which is housed within the *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2012*.

The NCVS contains data obtained from approximately 89,000 households with each member of the household ages 12 and up being interviewed first in person, and then every six months via telephone for three years. This comprehensive longitudinal study gathers data specific to whether the household participant was victimized by particular crimes identified within the survey. Of the 89,000 household that met the criteria for the survey, the participant homes were selected using a stratified, multistage cluster design. All members of the household, ages 12 and up were interviewed to determine if they had been victimized by the measured crimes within the previous 6 months. At each stage, the selection was proportionate to the population size and 72,000 individuals were surveyed (United States Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2012). The use of the national sample provides generalizable data that can be applied in a variety of settings.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were run to document means, percentages, and numerical data. To answer the research question, the Pearson Eta Correlation was used. The eta correlation ratio was used to analyze these data, as there was no linear relationship because this was a nominal data set. To run an Eta Correlation, an Analysis of Variance is first run to determine if there is a significant difference between the group's averages. With significance determined through the F-ratio, an Eta correlation can be calculated to determine the percentage of variation in the dependent variable that can be explained through the independent variable (Danacica & Babucea, 2007).

Findings

The research question asked if there was a statistically significant correlation between the type of bullying and the percentage of victims that reported bullying to an adult. The dependent variable was reporting bullying and the independent variable was whether the

participant had been a victim of traditional bullying or cyberbullying. The null hypothesis stated that there was no significant correlation between the reporting of bullying to an adult and the type of bullying (traditional or cyber) that occurred.

Table *1:*

Reporting Bullying to an Adult

Type of Bullying	Df	Sig.(2-tailed)	eta
Traditional Bullying	472	.000	1
Cyberbullying	472	.000	.495

Source: National Crime Victimization Survey: School Crime Supplement, 2012

Based on Cohen's guidelines (1994) for effect size, the null hypothesis is rejected for all types of bullying. The effect size exceeded the level of significance showing that students that experience cyberbullying are more likely to report the bullying to an adult than the victim of traditional bullying.

Discussion

Mitchell and Jones (2015) emphasized that cyberbullying appears to be increasing due to the recognizable ease, accessibility, and availability of electronic devices, predominantly among adolescents. They also suggested that cyberbullying be studied within a broader victimization framework and this study sought to accomplish that task. There is a need for more research examining cyberbullying and traditional bullying victimization, particularly since the research investigating traditional bullying victimization has been clearly established within the literature, yet less is known concerning cyberbullying victimization (Waasdorp & Bradshaw, 2015). More importantly, few studies have sought to investigate the co-occurrence of traditional bullying and cyberbullying's influence on adolescent victimization with specific demographic characteristics in mind (Mitchell & Jones, 2015; Waasdorp & Bradshaw, 2015). This study was designed as the first step in response to this gap in the research.

This study examined reporting practices of victims of traditional bullying and cyberbullying. Although most incidents of cyberbullying take place outside of the school day, cyberbullying impacts the learning environment as much as traditionally bullying. Therefore, while cyberbullying remains a serious social problem for settings outside of the school, the educational system needs to combat cyberbullying through prevention and intervention efforts and strategies and the implications for educational leadership need to be understood in light of the extension of cyberbullying beyond the school grounds.

The research question for this study asked if there was a statistically significant correlation between the type of bullying and the percentage of victims that reported bullying to an adult. Based on Cohen's guidelines (1994) for effect size, the null hypothesis was rejected for all types of bullying. The effect size exceeded the level of significance showing that students that experience cyberbullying were more likely to report the

bullying to an adult than the student victims of traditional bullying were. This relationship is new to the body of literature, which simply showed that overall reporting was minimal with no comparison between traditional and cyberbullying. This piece of information shows that, with appropriate opportunity and adult support systems, cyberbully victims can advocate for themselves. This only happens if adults in the school system are available to listen to the victims. Most research does not focus on reporting bullying victimization (Addington, 2013).

This study addresses this gap in the literature by looking at reporting, specifically the adults within the school environment. According to the findings, victims will report cyberbullying to an adult in a school at a significantly higher rate than traditional bullying victims. As a result, schools must respond by providing supportive adult access.

Implications for Practice

As noted in this study, there is no single, universally agreed upon definition of cyberbullying other than in acknowledging this behavior is inherently negative, entails unwanted harassing behavior, and is perpetrated through electronic means (Stewart & Fritsch, 2011). Stewart and Fritsch (2011) suggested that cyberbullying be categorized as cyber-deviance or cyber-violence since acts labeled as cyberbullying (i.e., being ignored by others or excluded) are not necessarily violations of the penal code, which encompasses the legal definition of a crime. By doing this, educational leaders can provide consequences to perpetrators of cyberbullying similar to consequences given to other violations of the penal code. Labeling a crime as cyberbullying does not allow for educational leaders to respond with severe consequences unless school policy specifically addresses cyberbullying in similar ways to traditional bullying because it largely occurs off campus.

Unfortunately, there is still a large disconnection between cyberbullying and traditional bullying in Student Codes of Conduct. In the majority of cases, cyberbullying must provide a substantial disruption to learning, which is a vague, challenging concept to prove. Typically, this is considered only for school-wide disruptions. For example, in *J.S. v. Bethlehem Area School District* (2000), J.S. was expelled for creating a website depicting graphic images of severed heads that included encouraging the hiring of a "hitman" and other threatening comments about a specific teacher. The Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania upheld the expulsion of J.S because the school had demonstrated substantial disruption in that the website could be accessed from school computers and the intended audience was the school population of teachers, students, and other school officials (Stewart & Fritsch, 2011). In a case like the aforementioned, the behaviors and actions exhibited are already prohibited under existing penal codes, including terroristic threats, harassment, menacing, stalking, and hate crimes, all of which can be used to prosecute cyber bullying in jurisdictions that lack specific cyberbullying statutes. In individual cases, the challenge of meeting the "substantial distraction" limits the power of the educational leader to intervene.

Although reporting of cyberbullying is more likely than the reporting of traditional bullying, particularly reporting to an adult, the school is responsible for creating an environment where victims, bystanders, and parents can get support for protecting victims. One way to do this is

for educational leaders to work with area law enforcement. Law enforcement officers struggles when trying to address cyberbullying issues due to the lack of reporting when coupled with the vagueness of some cyberbullying laws making investigating and prosecuting such crimes difficult (Stewart & Fritsch, 2011). This must change; however, the problem is compounded by the lack of resources and equipment to aid law enforcement, particularly local law enforcement agencies, which comprise the bulk of law enforcement agencies within the United States (Stewart & Fritsch, 2011). By working with local schools and receiving cross-training through the school districts, law enforcement can gain the skills for working with educational leaders to combat cyberbullying.

Training Needs

Training is required for school personnel, especially those in educational leadership, in order to be able to respond appropriately when a victim reports cyberbullying to an adult at the school. It has been suggested by Stewart and Fritsch (2011) that a national certificate program be designed to accommodate the training and ensure the acquisition of consistent, uniform information pertaining to cyberbullying. This need for cyberbullying training must not be exclusive to educators, but must include law enforcement, prosecutors, defense attorneys, judges, and corrections officials so that all parties may appreciate and acknowledge the harmful effects of cyberbullying and its association with criminal victimization, which frequently leads to adolescent suicide.

Needs for Educational Leaders

Resource needs for educational leaders must include, but not be limited to, equipment, support from the school board and district level leadership, and the formation of collaborative relationships between criminal justice personnel and educational leaders (Stewart & Fritsch, 2011). The formation of collaborate relationships between educational leaders and the criminal justice system has many advantages, one of which includes access to information and resources that would otherwise be unavailable or inadequate, particularly within smaller environments (Stewart & Fritsch, 2011). At the very least, the creation of a safe place or a reporting tool specific to cyberbulling should be developed. The findings of this study validate the need for recognition of and separation of cyberbullying and traditional bullying into separate response systems.

Legal System and Cyberbullying

Within the last five years, 49 states and the District of Columbia have enacted bullying statutes with the exception of Montana (Hinduja & Patchin, 2014). Only 20 of the 49 states included a cyberbullying subsection, with only 12 of those states included a criminal sanction for cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2014). Because cyber bullying violations and criminal sanctions are not clearly outlined (McQuade, Colt, & Meyer, 2009) criminal justice systems and school districts must work together to combat the continued victimization of adolescents by providing a safe place for reporting, a structure for additional consequences within the school system, and the recognition that cyberbullying is a problem for everyone and cannot be ignored.

Recommendations for Further Research

While research discusses traditional bullying victimization and victims, there is a gap in the literature discussing cyberbullying and victims. Further research is needed on the similarities between cyberbullying victimization and traditional bullying victimization to address the gap found in the literature. Another area of further study is to investigate to whom the students are reporting cyberbullying, i.e. teachers, counselors, or administrators. Finally, school districts need to evaluate current reporting tools to see if cyberbullying is being reported and at what rate.

Conclusion

Educational leaders should recognize cyberbullying as a distraction to the learning environment. This research showed that schools provide a safe place for reporting victimization of cyberbullying that is not available outside of the school environment. With the appropriate training and collaborative relationships with the criminal justice community, educational leaders can help reduce cyberbullying and the victimization of adolescents.

References

Addington, L. A. (2013). Reporting and clearance of cyberbullying incidents: Applying "offline" theories to online victims. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *29*(4), 454-474.

Barlett, C. P., & Gentile, D. A. (2012). Attacking others online: The formation of cyberbullying in late adolescence. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture, 1*(2), 123-135.

Bauman, S. (2013). Cyberbullying: What does the research tell us? *Theory Into Practice*, *52*(4), 249-256.

Brockenbrough, K. K. (2001). *Peer victimization and bullying prevention among middle school students.* (Order No. 3000186, University of Virginia). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses,* 233-233.

Bryce, J., & Fraser, J. (2013). 'It's common sense that it's wrong': Young people's perceptions and experiences of cyberbullying. *Cyber Psychology, Behavior & Social Networking*, *16*(11), 783-787.

Burton, K., Florell, D., & Wygant, D. B. (2013). The role of peer attachment and normative beliefs about aggression on traditional bullying and cyberbullying. *Psychology in the Schools*, *50*(2), 103-115.

Cohen, J. (1994). The Earth is round ($p < .05$). *American Psychologist, 49,* 997-1003.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education* (7th Ed.). Routledge.

Danacica, D. E., & Babucea, A.G. (2007). Methodological aspects in using Pearson coefficient in analyzing social and economical phenomena. *European Research Studies* 11(3-4), 89-97.

DeLara, E. W. (2012). Why Adolescents Don't Disclose Incidents of Bullying and Harassment.*Journal of School Violence*, *11*(4), 288-305

DeLara, E. W. (2008). Developing a philosophy about bullying and sexual harassment: Cognitive coping strategies among secondary school students. *Journal of School Violence*, 7, 72– 96.

Donegan, R. (2012). Bullying and cyberbullying: History, statistics, law, prevention and analysis. *The Elon Journal of Undergraduate Research in Communications, 3*(1), 33-42.

Dooley, J. J., Pyżalski, J., & Cross, D. (2009). Cyberbullying versus face-to-face bullying: A theoretical and conceptual review. *Zeitschrift Für Psychologie/Journal of Psychology, 217*(4), 182-188.

Draa, V. B., & Sydney, T. D. (2009). Cyberbullying: Challenges and actions. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 101*(4), 40-46.

Farrington, D. P., & Ttofi, M. M. (2011). Bullying as a predictor of offending, violence and later life outcomes. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 21*(2), 90-98.

File, T. and Ryan, C. (November, 2014). *Computer and Internet Use in the United States: 2013.* United States Census Bureau.

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

Hinduja, S. & Patchin, J. W. (2014). State cyberbullying laws: A brief review of state cyberbullying laws and policies. Cyberbullying Research Center. Retrieved from http://www.cyberbullying.us/Bullying_and_Cyberbullying_Laws.pdf

Hinduja, S. & Patchin, J. W. (2015, May 1). Teen tech use -12015. Retrieved September 17, 2015, from http://cyberbullying.org/2015-data/teen-tech-use-2015/

Kowalski, R.M., Limber, S.P., & Agatson, P.W. (2008). *Cyberbullying.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Lusk, B. (Producer). (2012, August 14). The relational aggression among youth: An interview with Michael Greene [Audio podcast manuscript]. *The Prevention Researcher Podcast.* Retrieved from www.tpronline.org/podcasts/transcript8.pd

McQuade, S. C., III, Colt, J. P., & Meyer, N. B. B. (2009). *Cyberbullying: Protecting Kids and Adults from online bullies.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Mishna, F., & Alaggio, R. (2005). Weighing the risks: A child's decision to disclose peer victimization. *Children and Schools*, 27, 217–226. doi:10.1093/cs/27.4.217

Mitchell, K. J., & Jones, L. M. (2015). Cyberbullying and bullying must be studied within a broader peer victimization framework. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 56*(5), 473-474.

Morrison, B. (2002). *Bullying and victimization in schools: A restorative justice approach.* Woden: Australian Institute of Criminology.

Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2011). Traditional and nontraditional bullying among youth: A test of general strain theory. *Youth & Society, 43*, 727-751.

Pepler, D., Jiang, D., Craig, W., & Connolly, J. (2008). Developmental trajectories of bullying and associated factors. *Child Development*, 79, 325–338.

Pieschl, S., Porsch, T., Kahl, T., & Klockenbusch, R. (2013). Relevant dimensions of cyberbullying — Results from two experimental studies. *Journal Of Applied Developmental Psychology, 34*(5), 241-252.

Radliff-Brown, A.R. (1952). *Structure and Function in Primitive Society, Essays and Addresses.* London: Cohen & West.

Robers, S., Kemp, J., Truman, J., & Snyder, T. D. (2013). *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2012.* United States Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs.

Slonje, R., Smith, P.K., & Frisen, A. (2012). The nature of cyberbullying, and strategies for prevention. *Computers in Human Behavior.*

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

Waasdorp, T., & Bradshaw, C. (2015). The overlap between cyberbullying and traditional bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 56*(5), 483-488.

Watkins, A. M., & Maume, M. O. (2011). School victims and crime reporting. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 9*, 333-351.

Yoon, J., Bauman, S., Choi, T., & Hutchinson, A. S. (2011). How South Korean teachers handle an incident of school bullying. *School Psychology International*, 32, 312–329.