

# INFORMATION SYSTEMS EDUCATION JOURNAL

In this issue:

4. **Student Characteristics and E-textbook Experiences: The Direct and Moderating Effects of Technology Savvy and Gender**  
Jun Sun, University of Texas - Pan American  
Javier Flores, University of Texas - Pan American
15. **A Comprehensive Survey on Cyberbullying Perceptions at a Major Metropolitan University – Faculty Perspectives**  
John C. Molluzzo, Pace University  
James Lawler, Pace University  
Jerry Manneh, Pace University
35. **Fostering Entrepreneurship in the CIS Sandbox**  
Mark Frydenberg, Bentley University
42. **Collaborative learning in online courses: Exploring students’ perceptions**  
Silvana Faja, University of Central Missouri
52. **Cyberbullying Presence, Extent, & Forms in a Midwestern Post-secondary Institution**  
J. A. Smith, University of Minnesota  
J. Yoon, University of Texas Arlington
79. **Reassessing the Skills Required of Graduates of an Information Systems Program: An Updated Analysis**  
John Legier, Southern Illinois University  
Belle Woodward, Southern Illinois University  
Nancy Martin, Southern Illinois University
90. **Effects of Social Networking on Adolescent Education**  
Muhammed Miah, Southern University at New Orleans  
Adnan Omar, Southern University at New Orleans  
Monique Allison Golding, Southern University at New Orleans
101. **A Systematic Approach to Faculty Development - Capability Improvement for Blended Learning**  
Ashraf Badawood, Taif University  
Annette Lerine Steenkamp, Lawrence Technological University  
Daw Al-Werfalli, Lawrence Technology University

The **Information Systems Education Journal** (ISEDJ) is a double-blind peer-reviewed academic journal published by **EDSIG**, the Education Special Interest Group of AITP, the Association of Information Technology Professionals (Chicago, Illinois). Publishing frequency is six times per year. The first year of publication is 2003.

ISEDJ is published online (<http://isedj.org>) in connection with ISECON, the Information Systems Education Conference, which is also double-blind peer reviewed. Our sister publication, the Proceedings of ISECON (<http://isecon.org>) features all papers, panels, workshops, and presentations from the conference.

The journal acceptance review process involves a minimum of three double-blind peer reviews, where both the reviewer is not aware of the identities of the authors and the authors are not aware of the identities of the reviewers. The initial reviews happen before the conference. At that point papers are divided into award papers (top 15%), other journal papers (top 30%), unsettled papers, and non-journal papers. The unsettled papers are subjected to a second round of blind peer review to establish whether they will be accepted to the journal or not. Those papers that are deemed of sufficient quality are accepted for publication in the ISEDJ journal. Currently the target acceptance rate for the journal is about 45%.

Information Systems Education Journal is pleased to be listed in the 1st Edition of Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Educational Technology and Library Science, in both the electronic and printed editions. Questions should be addressed to the editor at [editor@isedj.org](mailto:editor@isedj.org) or the publisher at [publisher@isedj.org](mailto:publisher@isedj.org).

### **2013 AITP Education Special Interest Group (EDSIG) Board of Directors**

Wendy Ceccucci  
Quinnipiac University  
President - 2013

Leslie J. Waguespack Jr  
Bentley University  
Vice President

Alan Peslak  
Penn State University  
President 2011-2012

Jeffrey Babb  
West Texas A&M  
Membership

Michael Smith  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
Secretary

George Nezlek  
Treasurer

Eric Bremier  
Siena College  
Director

Nita Brooks  
Middle Tennessee State Univ  
Director

Scott Hunsinger  
Appalachian State University  
Membership Director

Muhammed Miah  
Southern Univ New Orleans  
Director

Peter Wu  
Robert Morris University  
Director

S. E. Kruck  
James Madison University  
JISE Editor

Nita Adams  
State of Illinois (retired)  
FITE Liaison

Copyright © 2013 by the Education Special Interest Group (EDSIG) of the Association of Information Technology Professionals (AITP). Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this journal for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that the copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial use. All copies must bear this notice and full citation. Permission from the Editor is required to post to servers, redistribute to lists, or utilize in a for-profit or commercial use. Permission requests should be sent to Nita Brooks, Editor, [editor@isedj.org](mailto:editor@isedj.org).

# INFORMATION SYSTEMS EDUCATION JOURNAL

## Editors

**Nita Brooks**  
Senior Editor  
Middle Tennessee  
State University

**Thomas Janicki**  
Publisher  
University of North Carolina  
Wilmington

**Donald Colton**  
Emeritus Editor  
Brigham Young University  
Hawaii

**Jeffrey Babb**  
Associate Editor  
West Texas A&M  
University

**Wendy Ceccucci**  
Associate Editor  
Quinnipiac University

**Melinda Korzaan**  
Associate Editor  
Middle Tennessee  
State University

**George Nezek**  
Associate Editor

**Samuel Sambasivam**  
Associate Editor  
Azusa Pacific University

## ISEDJ Editorial Board

Samuel Abraham  
Siena Heights University

Cynthia Martincic  
Saint Vincent College

Michael Smith  
Georgia Institute of Technology

Ken Corley  
Appalachian State University

Fortune Mhlanga  
Lipscomb University

Karthikeyan Umapathy  
University of North Florida

Gerald DeHondt II

Muhammed Miah  
Southern Univ at New Orleans

Stuart Varden  
Pace University

Janet Helwig  
Dominican University

Alan Peslak  
Penn State University

Leslie Waguespack  
Bentley University

Scott Hunsinger  
Appalachian State University

Bruce Saulnier  
Quinnipiac University

Laurie Werner  
Miami University

Mark Jones  
Lock Haven University

Mark Segall  
Metropolitan State University of  
Denver

Bruce White  
Quinnipiac University

James Lawler  
Pace University

Anthony Serapiglia  
St. Vincent College

Peter Y. Wu  
Robert Morris University.

Terri Lenox  
Westminster College

Li-Jen Shannon  
Sam Houston State University

Ulku Yaylacicegi  
Univ North Carolina Wilmington

Michelle Louch  
Robert Morris University

# A Comprehensive Survey on Cyberbullying Perceptions at a Major Metropolitan University – Faculty Perspectives

John C. Molluzzo  
jmolluzzo@pace.edu

James Lawler  
jlawler@pace.edu

Jerry Manneh

Seidenberg School of Computer Science and Information Systems  
Pace University  
New York, New York 10038

## Abstract

Cyberbullying is a concern for any college or university. Digital harassment incidents are featured daily in the news. The authors of this study examine the perceptions of faculty on cyberbullying at a major metropolitan university. From the findings of a survey distributed to faculty in all schools of the university, the authors learn of high levels of perceptions on incidents as an issue but low levels of perceptions on infrastructural and instructional methods of preemption and resolution at the university. This study will be beneficial to faculty in colleges and universities, as cyberbullying is considered an issue more frequent in high schools.

**Keywords:** cyberbullying, cyberharassment, electronic media, faculty, hostility, internet, privacy, social networking, technology, victimization.

## 1. BACKGROUND

Cyberbullying is the abuse of choice of the “cyberimmersion generation” (Englander, 2009). Cyberbullying is “any behavior performed through digital or electronic media by [a college student or groups of college students] that repeatedly [over time] communicates aggressive or hostile messages intended to inflict discomfort or harm on [another student or other students]” (Tokunaga, 2010). Cyberbullying is about control (Roome, 2012) or dominance (Olthof, Goossens, Vermande, Aleva, & Van Der Meulen, 2011) over another student. The control is an

attempt of the attacker to bring oneself up by demeaning the other student and to improve the esteem of the attacker (Fertik & Thompson, 2010) by attacking the other students that have difficulty defining themselves. In brief, cyberbullying is “bullying [through] the Internet” (Vandebosch & Van Cleemput, 2008) – “a common risk” confronting students (Palfrey, Boyd, & Sacco, 2009) in “a new school yard” (Burnham, Wright, & Houser, 2011).

The attacker is empowered by the Internet. The behavior of attackers is evident in the following forms of cyberbullying:

- cellular or digital imaging messages considered derogatory, harmful or mean to another student;
- discussion board messages considered harmful or mean-spirited to another student;
- e-mails, instant messages, pictures, photographs or "sexting" of videos considered homophobic, racist or sexual if not humiliating and offensive to another student or students;
- "flaming" or messaging on profiles on gaming or social networking sites considered offensive to another student or students; and
- impersonating or messaging on gossip, personal polling or virtual reality sites or systems and "outing" or targeting other students if not stalking and threatening them (Reynolds, 2012).

This behavior may be initiated by a direct form of an attacker attacking the other student or an indirect form of an attacker engaging other students in attacking the student (Wong-Lo, Bullock, & Gable, 2009). The cyberbullying messaging of the attacker may be forwarded instantaneously to others to be bystander observers of the attacked student. The attacker may be cyberbullying on-line even other students without the increased risk (Dempsey, Sulkowski, Nichols, & Storch, 2009) that was evident when the bullying was off-line without the Internet. The bullying is moreover "non-stop" (Mishna, Saini, & Solomon, 2009), as the cyberbullying may be continuing beyond the location of the school. Impact is in increased internalizing psychological problems manifested in cyberbullied students (Greene, 2003, & Faryadi, 2011) – problems that may be resulting in school shootings (Chapell, Hasselman, Kitchin, Lomon, Maclver, & Sarullo, 2006) if not suicides. Clearly cyberbullying is not the "fact of life" or "kids are kids" that bullying was without the Internet (Scott, 2012).

Estimates in a consensus of the literature disclose that cyberbullying is experienced by 21% of high school students – 21.8% of female and 19.5% of male students (Patchin & Hinduja, 2012). High and middle school students experienced 17% of 1 or higher forms of incidents 2 to 3 times in the last 30 days and experienced 14% of incidents in generic hurtful or mean-spirited messaging, and 16.8% of high and middle school students were attackers or

perpetrators (Patchin & Hinduja, 2012). Literature discloses that cyberbullying may be experienced as frequently by college students in 22% of college students – 22% of female and 21.9% of male students – in 25% of incidents on social networking sites (Indiana State University, 2011), and 8.6% of college students were perpetrators (MacDonald & Roberts-Pittman, 2010), the bulk of whom were already middle, high or elementary school perpetrators or victims (Walker, Sockman, & Koehn, 2011). Literature discloses even female students to be more involved in both perpetration and victimization (Snell & Englander, 2010), though male students may be more involved in perpetration than female students (Chapell, Casey, De La Cruz, Ferrell, Forman, Lipkin, Newsham, Sterling, & Whittaker, 2004). The literature on cyberbullying is focused frequently however on high school and middle school students. The impression may be that cyberbullying is a feature of life in high and middle school students, not of college students who are considered emerging adults (Zacchilli & Valerio, 2011). Therefore, the authors of this study attempt to examine first the perceptions of faculty on cyberbullying of students at a major metropolitan university in the United States for initial perspectives on the issue.

## 2. INTRODUCTION TO STUDY

The authors attempted to examine cyberbullying in 2011 in a study of college students in courses in the School of Computer Science and Information Systems at Pace University in New York City (Molluzzo & Lawler, 2011). From this study, the authors learned that cyberbullying was experienced by 7% of the students – 25% of female and 25% of male students and that cyberbullying was perceived as an issue on the Internet (79%). The students experienced 1 to a few incidents in 43% of incidents on messaging and social networking Web sites and felt incidents were perpetrated towards gay (43%) and lesbian (25%) students, and 10% of the students were perpetrators. The authors learned that cyberbullying was perceived by a high 79% of the students to be managed insensitively by institutional methods of non-pro-action of the university. The limitation of the 2011 study was that faculty of the school and of the university was not included in the survey. Though the results from most of the responses of the survey were consistent in general with the literature, the survey without the faculty as players in pro-action of potential preemption and

resolution may have confined the culture perceptions of the study. In this paper, the authors examine cyberbullying in an expanded survey of the perceptions of faculty members in of the university, in order to explore the extent of cyberbullying fully as a norm in the university.

The paper of this new study posits the following considerations on cyberbullying at Pace University:

- extent to which faculty members perceive cyberbullying as a generic issue in society and in a university;
- extent to which faculty members perceive cyberbullying as a specific issue in which students known to them were victimized by other students in the university;
- extent to which faculty members perceive the culture of discussion of cyberbullying and cyberethics as a fabric of infrastructure and instruction in the university;
- extent to which faculty members perceive the culture of pro-action of pre-emption and resolution of cyberbullying by chair, department and institutional officials in the university; and
- extent to which faculty members perceive and propose recommendations of sensitivity solutions to cyberbullying in the university.

The paper is focused on the perceptions of the faculty members as to the seriousness or non-seriousness of cyberbullying at the university.

This paper is critical in learning the culture of cyberbullying in a major metropolitan university, as papers in the academic field focus more on cyberbullying prior to university (Zacchilli & Valerio, 2011). Cyberbullying is evident more in the practitioner publications, as in the sensational Tyler Clementi and Dharun Ravi story (Bazelon, 2012, Glaberson, 2012, & Rouba, 2011). Increased incident reporting of students may be indicating the increased seriousness of cyberbullying (Patchin & Hindjua, 2012). Faculty members and officials of a university need to be in a position to protectively but realistically respond to cyberbullying if students perceive perpetration problems, otherwise there may be liability potential (Willard, 2012) with the reality of victimization. Staff needs to respond in reinforcement and safety solutions (Snakenborg, Van Acker, & Gable, 2011), software systems (Lieberman, Dinakar, & Jones, 2011) and support shared with faculty members and students. This paper

will attempt to examine the extent of cyberbullying as perceived by faculty, so that in the event of perceived seriousness pre-emptive and resolution strategies may be proposed by the authors.

### 3. FOCUS OF STUDY

The focus of the authors is to examine the perceptions of faculty on cyberbullying in all schools of Pace University. The new study furnishes input into not only the prevalence of cyberbullying but also, as appropriate, recommended reinforcement and safety strategies for the full university (Collier, 2012). The findings of this study will exclude the perceptions of students in all schools of the university, which will be examined separately in a further study. This study of the faculty will be beneficial however to faculty members and staff in schools of computer science and information systems, if not all schools of a university, in considering the growing issue of cyberbullying, an issue that is often perceived as a problem in high schools but not in universities. The prevalence of cyberbullying, and the seriousness or non-seriousness of cyberbullying as an issue, learned now from the perceptions of the faculty will be reflected in the analysis of the findings of the study.

### 4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research methodology of this new study consisted of a survey of the perceptions of full-time and part-time faculty members at the university.

The survey consisted of a cyberbullying definition (Tokunaga, 2010) and 47 items:

- 6 demographic questions;
- 7 fundamental knowledge of cyberbullying questions;
- 9 knowledge and perception of group or individual incidents and methods of cyberbullying perpetration questions;
- 14 knowledge and perception of cyberbullying institutional response questions; and
- 11 perception of seriousness or non-seriousness of cyberbullying as an issue at the university questions.

The survey was distributed to the faculty in March to May 2012 through the e-mail system of the university, and the questions were furnished

through the Qualtrics software survey system. The responses returned to the authors were anonymous, and the faculty was assured of privacy of responses on the instrument of survey. There were 79 valid responses for a return rate of about 10%. The authors reviewed the responses for statistical interpretation (McClave, Sincich, & Mendenhall, 2007) in SPSS tools in May to June 2012.

The instrument of survey, which is furnished in Figure 1 of the Appendix of this study, was reviewed for feasibility and integrity by an Internal Review Board (IRB) consisting of a committee of faculty of the university, and was approved in February 2012 by the Dean of Students and the Provost for distribution to the faculty population.

## 5. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

### Demographic Data

Of the respondent faculty, 46% were full-time and 54% part-time; 51% were female and 49% were male. The distribution across the four faculty ranks was almost exactly even. The majority of respondents (59%) were from the Liberal Arts School with the remainder spread more or less evenly among the other four schools of the university. The university has two main campuses – one in a large city and one in the suburbs of that city. Of the faculty responding 51% were from the suburban campus and 49% were from the city campus. The survey asked how long the respondent had been a faculty member at the university. 59% of the respondents have been at the university for 10 or fewer years; 13% between 11 and 20 years; 29% for 21 or more years.

### Faculty Awareness of Cyberbullying Issues

Faculty were asked if they were aware of cyberbullying incidents at the university with 11% responding Yes. The survey also asked (using a 5-point Likert scale) if the respondent believed that cyberbullying was a serious issue at the university. 14% of the respondents Agreed or Strongly Agreed, 17% Strongly Disagreed or Disagreed, and 68% Neither Agreed Nor Disagreed.

Also using a 5-point Likert scale, the survey asked if cyberbullying was a serious issue to the faculty member and if the faculty member believed cyberbullying was a serious issue for

their students. The results of these questions are summarized in Table 1. Note that 73% of faculty believe cyberbullying is a serious issue for them (Agree or Strongly Agree) but only 56% believe it is a serious issue for their students.

The University Core requires that all students take UNIV 101, which introduces them to college life, fosters good study habits, etc., and CIS 101, a required computer technology course. The survey asked if the faculty believed that cyberbullying should be discussed in these courses. 97% of respondents believed it should be discussed in UNIV 101, while 83% believed that it should be discussed in CIS 101.

The survey asked several questions about if and where faculty may have discussed cyberbullying issues. The results of these questions are shown in Table 2, which shows that there has been a high level of discussion of cyberbullying in respondents' classes as well as at the department level.

Ninety-eight percent (98%) believe that cyberbullying is, pure and simple, wrong, and 87% of the respondents either Agree or Strongly Agree that cyberbullying is a violation of privacy. However, as Table 3 shows, the respondents do not feel knowledgeable on the laws of cyberbullying in the United States.

### Faculty Awareness of Cyberbullying Incidents

The survey asked if the respondents were aware of cyberbullying of students at the university. 12% (9) of the faculty replied Yes. Most of these reported knowing of just one incident and one person reported several incidents. Interestingly, 10% of the respondents reported being cyberbullied themselves either by fellow faculty members or by students usually through social networking sites.

Of the nine faculty who reported knowledge of cyberbullying incidents at the university, most incidents involved either female students (4) or gay students (2).

### Faculty Response to Cyberbullying

The survey asked whom a faculty member would contact if they were aware of a cyberbullying attack on one of their students. Table 4 lists the responses. The Department Chair, Dean of

Students, and Counseling Center all received more than 60%.

The survey also asked what should be the penalty for perpetrators of cyberbullying. Table 6 lists the responses. The most favored answer is a warning to the student, but a majority of respondents (52%) would also support suspension of the perpetrator.

### **Institutional Awareness**

Using a 5-point Likert scale, the survey asked several questions about institutional awareness of cyberbullying. Table 6 summarizes the results. It is interesting to note that only about 50% Agree or Strongly Agree on all the questions, with the lowest such response (39%) for the professors at the university. The survey also asked if the respondent was aware of the university's official policy on cyberbullying. Twenty-three percent (23%) either Agreed or Strongly Agreed that they were aware of the university's official policy, 32% Neither Agreed Nor Disagreed, and 46% Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed.

### **Institutional Response**

The survey asked several questions on what the faculty thought should be the university's response to the problems of cyberbullying. Table 7 summarizes the results. The data show that there is an overwhelming feeling among the faculty that the university needs to do more to educate students, faculty and staff in the harmful effects of cyberbullying.

### **Sensitivity to Cyberbullying Issues**

Three questions on the organizational sensitivity to the problems of cyberbullying resulted in the responses shown in Table 8. On all institutional levels - university, school, and department - at least half of the respondents Neither Agreed Nor Disagreed that the organizational unit was sensitive to cyberbullying issues.

## **6. DIFFERENCES AMONG DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS**

The survey asked several questions on a 5-point Likert scale. Because our sample size was relatively small ( $n = 79$ ), having five categories did not yield statistically valid results. It was felt that the Strongly Agree and Agree responses basically meant the same thing, and the other

three responses meant the opposite - the respondent did not agree with the statement. Therefore, we combined these categories into two responses, which enabled a chi-squared test of independence on 2x2 cross-tabs. Following is an analysis of some of the statistically significant results organized along some of the demographic categories of the respondents.

There were significant differences between full-time and part-time faculty responses to several questions. The first four rows of Table 9 show that there are significant differences in the full-time and part-time faculty perceptions of the sensitivity of various university units to cyberbullying. In all five cases, significantly more part-time faculty agreed with the statements.

There was a slight, albeit not a statistically significant, difference ( $p = 0.054$ ) in gender on the question "Cyberbullying is a serious issue for you" with a higher percentage of females (82.5%) agreeing as opposed to males (63.2%).

There were statistically significant differences between faculty on the two university campuses on two related questions as shown in Table 10. On Question 74, significantly more faculty on the suburban campus agree with the statement, while on Question 61 significantly more urban faculty agree with the statement.

The responses to Q73, How long have you been a faculty member at the university?, were combined just two responses: 1-5 years (i.e. junior faculty) and 6 or more years (more senior faculty.) Running a 2x2 cross tabs, there was one significant difference ( $p=0.034$ ) between these two groups on Question 8 - You are aware of cyberbullying as an activity on the Internet. As might be expected, 100% of the junior faculty agreed, while 86.7% of the more senior faculty agreed.

In addition to the Likert scale questions, there were many Yes/No questions in the survey. On these questions we performed chi-squared tests of independence on 2x2 cross-tabs. There was a significant difference ( $p<0.03$ ) in gender on Question 56 Should the university sponsor sensitivity seminars for professors on the problems of cyberbullying as an activity that is harmful to students with 78.4% of female faculty and only 54.3% of the male faculty wanting such seminars.

Another interesting significant difference ( $p=0.031$ ) between senior ranked professors (Full and Associate Professors) and junior ranked professors (Assistant Professors and Instructors) was in Question 76, Have you discussed cyberbullying in your classes?, with 48.4% of senior faculty responding Yes and 24.4% of the junior faculty responding Yes.

## 7. IMPLICATIONS OF STUDY

The study shows that cyberbullying is a serious issue for faculty. A vast majority also believe that cyberbullying is wrong and a violation of one's privacy. This belief is confirmed by Table 5, which shows that a majority of faculty want perpetrators of cyberbullying suspended from the university.

The study shows that although cyberbullying is a serious issue for faculty (73%, see Table 1), only 56% believe that cyberbullying is a serious problem for their students.

The study also revealed some information that might be useful to a university's administration. Only 35% of the faculty reported discussing cyberbullying in their classes. Also, 51% of the faculty believe that the university is not knowledgeable of cyberbullying as an activity harmful to students. Finally, as shown in Table 7, a vast majority of faculty believe the university should do a lot more to educate the university community on the problems of cyberbullying.

## 8. LIMITATIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR FURTHER STUDY

The findings from a faculty population at one university may not be generalized without caution. The difficulty of a cyberbullying survey is in potential respondent sensitivity to questions that may obscure perpetration in the population of the survey (Cole, Cornell, & Sheras, 2006, even of faculty populations in a university. The extent of victimization in a largely metropolitan urban university moreover may not be as representative of cyberstalking vulnerability as in a largely suburban university (Daniloff, 2009).

The opportunity in this field is fruitful however for further study (Mishna, Cook, Saini, Wu, & MacFadden, 2009). Research in this field is more often in high school settings and is relatively limited in the post-secondary settings

of universities. This university is interested in partnering with other universities in the United States in a larger population and setting study that might be performed in a longitudinal survey annually, as perceptions of faculty and students might shift on the topic with novel usage of the technology. Resources for further cyberbullying study are furnished in Table 11 of the Appendix.

## 9. CONCLUSION

This study confirmed that cyberbullying is a concern for the faculty of the university. Knowledge of the faculty of the proactive processes for safety steps with the institutional problems of perpetration and victimization were disclosed in the study. The study also showed that the university needs to be more proactive in educating the university community in the problems of cyberbullying and that these problems are evident in the setting of a university and are not limited to high school settings. In a forthcoming paper by the authors, a large study ( $n > 350$ ) of student attitudes towards cyberbullying will be described. In addition, a comparison of student and faculty attitudes will be reported.

## 10. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge the cooperation of the Provost, Dean of Students and the Internal Review Board (IRB) at Pace University, in the formulation of the program for the faculty population survey at the university.

## 11. REFERENCES

- Bazon, E. (2012). Make the punishment fit the cyber-crime. *The New York Times*, Op-Ed, March 20.
- 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), 4.
- Chapell, M., Casey, D., De La Cruz, C., Ferrell, J., Forman, J., Lipkin, R., Newsham, M., Sterling, M., & Whittaker, S. (2004). Bullying in college by students and teachers. *Adolescence*, 39, 53-64.
- Chapell, M., Hasselman, S.L., Kitchin, T., Lomon, S.N., Macliver, K.W., & Sarullo, P. (2006).

- Bullying in elementary school, high school and college. *Adolescence*, 41, 633-648.
- Cole, J.C.M., Cornell, D.G., & Sheras, P. (2006). Identification of school bullies by survey methods. *Professional School Counseling*, 9(4), 305-313.
- Collier, A. (2012). A "living internet": Some context for the cyberbullying discussion. In J.W. Patchin, & S. Hinduja (Eds.), *Cyberbullying Prevention and Response: Expert Perspectives*. Boca Raton, Florida: Taylor & Francis Group, 3,5.
- Daniloff, C. (2009). Cyberbullying goes to college. *Bostonia: The Alumni Magazine of Boston University*, Spring, 5.
- Dempsey, A.G., Sulkowski, M.L., Nichols, R., & Storch, E.A. (2009). Differences between peer victimization in cyber and physical settings and associated psychosocial adjustment in early adolescence. *Psychology in the Schools*, 46, 962-972.
- Englander, E. (2009). Cyberbullying and information exposure: User-generated content in post-secondary education. *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology, Special Edition: Violence and Society in Twenty-First Century*, 46(2), 4.
- Faryadi, Q. (2011). Cyberbullying and academic performance. *International Journal of Computational Engineering Research*, 1(1), 23.
- Fertik, M., & Thompson, D. (2010). Wild west 2.0: How to protect and restore your on-line reputation on the untamed social frontier. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, 26(1103), 1108.
- Glaberson, W. (2012). Verdict repudiates notion of youth as legal defense. *The New York Times*, March 18, 20.
- Greene, M.B. (2003). Counseling and climate change as treatment modalities for bullying in school. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling*, 25(4), 293-302.
- Lieberman, H., Dinakar, K., & Jones, B. (2011). Let's gang up on cyberbullying: The novel design of social network software can help prevent and manage the growing problem of cyberbullying. *IEEE Computer*, September, 93-96.
- MacDonald, C.D., & Roberts-Pittman, B. (2010). Cyberbullying among college students: Prevalence and demographic differences. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 2005.
- McClave, J., Sincich T., & Mendenhall, W. (2007). *Statistics*, 11<sup>th</sup> Edition. Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- Mishna, F., Cook, C., Saini, M., Wu, M.J., & MacFadden, R. (2009). Interventions for children, youth, and parents to prevent and reduce cyberabuse. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 2.
- Mishna, F., Saini, M., & Solomon, S. (2009). On-going and on-line: Children and youths' perceptions of cyberbullying. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31, 1222-1228.
- Molluzzo, J.C., & Lawler, J.P. (2011). A study of the perceptions of college students on cyberbullying. *Proceedings of the Information Systems Educators Conference (ISECON)*, Wilmington, North Carolina, 28(1633), 1-25.
- Olthof, T., Goossens, F.A., Vermande, M.M., Aleva, E.A., & Van Der Meulen, M. (2011). Bullying as strategic behavior: Relations with desired and acquired dominance in the peer group. *Journal of School Psychology*, 49(3), 339-359.
- Palfrey, J.G., Boyd, D., & Sacco, D. (2009). *Enhancing Child Safety and On-Line Technologies: Final Report of the Internet Safety Technical Task Force*. North Carolina Academic Press, Durham, North Carolina.
- Patchin, J.W., & Hinduja, S. (2012). *Cyberbullying Prevention and Response: Expert Perspectives*. Taylor & Francis Group, Boca Raton, Florida, 17-18,20,28.
- Reynolds, G.W. (2012). *Ethics in Information Technology*. Cengage Learning: Course Technology, Boston, Massachusetts, 365.

- Roome, D. (2012). Cyberbullying Is Never Alright: Dealing with the Pain of Cyberabuse. Debbie Roome, Lexington, Kentucky, 28.
- Rouba, K. (2011). Tragedy brings rise in support for gay students: High schools, colleges revamp programs in wake of Tyler Clementi case. *The Times*, June 12, A1,A9.
- Scott, A.O. (2012). Behind every harassed child? A whole lot of clueless adults. *The New York Times*, March 30, C10.
- Snakenborg, J., Van Acker, R., & Gable, R.A. (2011). Cyberbullying: Prevention and intervention to protect our children and youth. *Preventing School Failure*, 55(2), 94.
- Snell, P.A., & Englander, E.K. (2010). Cyberbullying victimization and behaviors among girls: Applying research findings in the field. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(4), 510.
- Tokunaga, R.S. (2010). Following you from home: A critical review and synthesis of research in cyberbullying victimization. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26, 278.
- Vandebosch, H., & Van Cleemput, K. (2008). Defining cyberbullying: A qualitative research into the perceptions of youngsters. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*, 11, 499-503.
- Walker, C.M., Sockman, B.R., & Koehn, S. (2011). An exploratory study of cyberbullying with undergraduate university students. *TechTrends*, March / April, 31.
- Willard, N. (2012). Cyberbullying and the law. In J.W. Patchin, & S. Hinduja (Eds.), *Cyberbullying Prevention and Response: Expert Perspectives*. Boca Raton, Florida: Taylor & Francis Group, 47.
- Wong-Lo, M., Bullock, L.M., & Gable, R.A. (2009). Cyberbullying: Facing digital aggression. *Proceedings of the Conference of the Teacher Education Division of the Council of Exceptional Children*, Charlotte, North Carolina.
- Zacchilli, T.L., & Valerio, C.Y. (2011). The knowledge and prevalence of cyberbullying in a college sample. *Journal of Scientific Psychology*, March, 21.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2011). Bullying still occurs in college, professors find. *Indiana State University (ISU) Newsroom*, October 20, 1-2.

## APPENDIX

**Figure 1: Instrument of Survey:** Note that the numbering of the survey questions is that imposed by the survey software.

Q6 To which school of the university do you belong?

- Liberal Arts (1)
- Education (2)
- College of Health Professions and Nursing
- School of Business (4)
- School of Computing (5)

Q5 Which is your "home" campus?

- New York (1)
- Pleasantville (2)
- White Plains (3)

Q71 What is your faculty status?

- Full-time (1)
- Part-time (Adjunct) (2)

Q72 What is your faculty rank?

- Full Professor (1)
- Associate Professor (2)
- Assistant Professor (3)
- Instructor/Lecturer (4)

Q73 How long have you been a faculty member at the university?

- 1-5 years (1)
- 6-10 years (2)
- 11-15 years (3)
- 16-20 years (4)
- 21 or more years (5)

Q4 Gender?

- Male (1)
- Female (2)

Q7 Cyber-bullying is any behavior performed through electronic or digital media by individuals or groups that repeatedly communicates hostile or aggressive messages intended to inflict harm or discomfort on others. In cyber-bullying experiences, the identity of the bully may or may not be known. Cyber-bullying can occur through electronically-mediated communication at school; however, cyber-bullying behaviors commonly occur outside school as well.

Q8 You are aware of cyber-bullying as an activity on the Internet

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q9 Cyber-bullying is a serious issue for you.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q74 Cyber-bullying is a serious issue for your students.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q10 You are aware of cyber-bullying activities at other schools (for example the Rutgers student who committed suicide as a result of cyber-bullying)?

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q46 Might it be acceptable for freshman or sophomore students to be cyber-bullied by junior or senior students?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q47 Have you discussed issues of cyber-bullying in your department or at the University?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q48 Should cyber-bullying be discussed in UNIV 101?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q49 Should cyber-bullying be discussed in CIS 101?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q75 Are you aware of instances of cyber-bullying at the university?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q76 Have you discussed cyber-bullying in any of your classes?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q50 Do you know if professors at the university, other than yourself, have discussed incidents or issues of cyber-bullying in their classes?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q51 How many professors have done so?

Q52 Should the university do any of the following? Please respond to all.

Q53 Publicize more its policy on cyber-bullying.

- Yes (1)  No (2)

Q54 Publicize more the problems of cyber-bullying as an activity harmful to students.

- Yes (1)  No (2)

Q55 Sponsor seminars for students on the problems of cyber-bullying as an activity harmful to students.

- Yes (1)  No (2)

Q56 Sponsor sensitivity seminars for professors on the problems of cyber-bullying as an activity harmful to students.

- Yes (1)  No (2)

Q57 Sponsor sensitivity seminars for staff on the problems of cyber-bullying as an activity harmful to students.

- Yes (1)  No (2)

Q58 What should be the penalty for perpetrators of cyber-bullying? Choose as many as appropriate.

- No penalty by the University (1)
- Warning sent to the student by the University (2)
- University informs police of the incident (3)
- Student is suspended by the University (4)
- University immediately expels the student (5)

Q59 If a student of yours is a victim of cyber-bullying, whom would you contact. Choose as many as appropriate.

- The President of The university (1)
- The Dean of Students (2)
- The Dean of your school (3)
- The Chair of your department (4)
- The Counseling Center (5)
- The Security Department (6)
- Your local Police Department (7)
- Your fraternity or sorority (8)
- Your best friend (9)
- Your parents (10)
- No one (11)

Q60 The administration of the university is knowledgeable of cyber-bullying as a activity that is harmful to students.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q77 My dean is knowledgeable of cyber-bullying as a activity that is harmful to students.

- Strongly Disagree (1)

- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q78 My chairperson is knowledgeable of cyber-bullying as an activity that is harmful to students.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q61 Cyber-bullying is a serious issue at the university.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q62 Professors at the university are knowledgeable on cyber-bullying as an activity that is harmful to students.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q79 Professors in my school are knowledgeable on cyber-bullying as an activity that is harmful to students.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q80 Professors in my department are knowledgeable on cyber-bullying as an activity that is harmful to students.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q63 You are aware of the official policies of the university on cyber-bullying.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q64 The university, as an institution, is sensitive to the problems of cyber-bullying.

- Strongly Disagree (1)

- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q81 My school, as an organization within the university, is sensitive to the problems of cyber-bullying.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q82 My department, as an organization within the university, is sensitive to the problems of cyber-bullying.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q65 You are knowledgeable of the laws on cyber-bullying in the United States.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q66 Cyber-bullying is a violation of privacy, regardless of the intent of the perpetrator.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q67 Cyber-bullying, pure and simple, is wrong.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Q11 Are you aware of incidents of cyber-bullying at the university?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q12 Of how many incidents are you aware?

Q13 How many perpetrators were involved?

Q14 How many victims were involved?

Q15 Have you ever consciously or unconsciously been a perpetrator of cyber-bullying?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q16 Have you ever been a victim of cyber-bullying at The university?

- Yes (1)  No (2)

Q17 How many times were you victimized?

Q18 How many perpetrators were there?

Q20 Which method was used to cyber-bully you. Choose as many as appropriate.

- Looking in to your cell phone (1)
- Looking in to your email (2)
- Sending you harassing emails (3)
- Sending you harassing pictures (4)
- Sending you pornographic images (5)
- Posting harassing messages on a social networking site (6)
- Posting harassing pictures on a social networking site (7)
- Preventing a friend from contacting others on a social networking site (8)
- Sexting (9)
- Other (10)

Q21 Have you ever been a victim of cyber-bullying outside the university - at another university, in high school, or at work?

- Yes (1)  No (2)

Q23 How many perpetrators were there?

Q25 Which method was used to cyber-bully you. Choose as many as appropriate.

- Looking in to your cell phone (1)
- Looking in to your email (2)
- Sending you harassing emails (3)
- Sending you harassing pictures (4)
- Sending you pornographic images (5)
- Posting harassing messages on a social networking site (6)
- Posting harassing pictures on a social networking site (7)
- preventing a friend from contacting others on a social networking site (8)
- Sexting (9)
- Other (10)

Q26 Are you aware of cyber-bullying of any of the following groups at the university? Choose as many as appropriate.

- Male students (1)
- Female students (2)
- Asian students (3)
- Gay students (4)
- Lesbian students (5)
- Physically disabled students (6)
- African-American students (7)
- Hispanic students (8)
- Muslim students (9)
- African students (10)
- Developmentally disabled (11)
- Other (12)

Q28 For each of the following pairs, choose the one you think is more likely to be a VICTIM of cyber-bullying at the university.

Q29

- Male (1)  Female (2)

Q30

- Foreign (1)  Non-foreign (2)

Q31

- Gay (1)  Straight (2)

Q32

- Lesbian (1)  Straight (2)

Q33

- Disabled (1)  Non-disabled (2)

Q34

- African-American (1)  White (2)

Q35

- Hispanic (1)  White (2)

Q36

- Muslim (1)  White (2)

Q69

- Asian (1)  White (2)

Q37 For each of the following pairs, choose the one you think is more likely to be a PERPETRATOR of cyber-bullying at the university.

Q38

- Male (1)  Female (2)

Q39

- Foreign (1)  Non-foreign (2)

Q40

- Gay (1)  Straight (2)

Q41

- Lesbian (1)  Straight (2)

Q42

- Disabled (1)  Non-disabled (2)

Q43

- African-American (1)  White (2)

Q44

- Hispanic (1)  White (2)

Q45

Muslim (1)

White (2)

Q70

Asian (1)

White (2)

**TABLES**

**Table 1**

Answer	Cyberbullying is a Serious Issue for You	Cyberbullying is a Serious Issue for Your Students
Strongly Disagree	5%	4%
Disagree	10%	6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	11%	34%
Agree	43%	43%
Strongly Agree	30%	13%

**Table 2**

Answer	Have Discussed Cyberbullying in Your Classes	Have Discussed in Your Department	Know of Other Professors Who Have Discussed in Their Classes
Yes	35%	16%	18%
No	65%	84%	82%

**Table 3**

**You are Knowledgeable of the Laws of Cyberbullying in the United States**

Answer	%
Strongly Disagree	6%
Disagree	31%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	31%
Agree	21%
Strongly Agree	11%

**Table 4**

**If a Student of Yours is a Victim of Cyberbullying, Whom Would You Contact?**

Answer	%
The President of the University	4%
The Dean of Students	61%
The Dean of your school	43%
The Chair of your department	72%
The Counseling Center	60%
The Security Department	41%
Your local Police Department	7%
Your fraternity or sorority	1%
Your best friend	7%
Your parents	3%
No one	1%

**Table 5**

**What should be the penalty for perpetrators of cyberbullying?**

Answer	%
No penalty by the University	4%
Warning sent to the student by the University	67%
University informs police of the incident	43%
Student is suspended by the University	52%
University immediately expels the student	23%

**Table 6**

**Who is knowledgeable on cyberbullying as an activity that is harmful to students?**

Answer	The University Administration	My Dean	My Chairperson	Professors at the University	Professors in My school	Professors in My Department
Strongly Disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Disagree	0%	0%	3%	6%	6%	6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	51%	48%	43%	55%	42%	38%
Agree	38%	36%	39%	35%	44%	45%
Strongly Agree	11%	16%	15%	4%	8%	11%

Answer	Publicize More Its Policy on Cyberbullying	Publicize More the Problems of Cyberbullying as an Activity Harmful to Students.	Sponsor Seminars for Students on the Problems of Cyberbullying as an Activity Harmful to Students.	Sponsor Sensitivity Seminars for Professors on the Problems of Cyberbullying as an Activity Harmful to Students.	Sponsor Sensitivity Seminars for Staff on the Problems of Cyberbullying as an Activity Harmful to Students.
Yes	95%	93%	78%	67%	73%
No	5%	7%	22%	33%	27%

**Table 8**

**The following are sensitive to the problems of cyberbullying**

Answer	The University	My School	My Department
Strongly Disagree	0%	0%	0%
Disagree	0%	0%	3%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	56%	54%	51%
Agree	38%	39%	36%
Strongly Agree	7%	7%	11%

**Table 9**

**Significant Differences: Part-time vs. Full-time Faculty**

<b>Question</b>	<b>p &lt; 0.01</b>	<b>p &lt; 0.05</b>
Q60: The administration of the university is knowledgeable of cyberbullying as an activity that is harmful to students		0.016
Q64: The university, as an institution, is sensitive to the problems of cyberbullying		0.034
Q81: My school, as an organization within the university, is sensitive to the problems of cyberbullying		0.022
Q82: My department, as an organization within the university, is sensitive to the problems of cyberbullying		0.030
Q66: Cyberbullying is a violation of privacy, regardless of the intent of the perpetrator	0.010	

**Table 10**

**Significant Differences: Urban vs. Suburban Campuses**

<b>Question</b>	<b>p &lt; 0.05</b>
Q74: Cyberbullying is a serious issue for your students	0.024
Q61: Cyberbullying is a serious issue at the university	0.041

**Table 11**

**Cyberbullying Resources for Faculty and Staff**

<a href="http://www.bullyonline.org">www.bullyonline.org</a>
<a href="http://www.bullysafeusa.com">www.bullysafeusa.com</a>
<a href="http://www.cyberbully.org">www.cyberbully.org</a>
<a href="http://www.cyberbullying.us">www.cyberbullying.us</a>
<a href="http://www.cyberbullying-news.com">www.cyberbullying-news.com</a>
<a href="http://www.cyberbully411.com">www.cyberbully411.com</a>
<a href="http://www.cybersmart.org">www.cybersmart.org</a>
<a href="http://www.digizen.org">www.digizen.org</a>
<a href="http://www.ikeepsafe.org">www.ikeepsafe.org</a>
<a href="http://www.isafe.org">www.isafe.org</a>
<a href="http://www.lifeafteradultbullying.com">www.lifeafteradultbullying.com</a>
<a href="http://www.MARCcenter.org">www.MARCcenter.org</a>
<a href="http://www.ncpc.org/cyberbullying">www.ncpc.org/cyberbullying</a>
<a href="http://www.stopbullying.gov">www.stopbullying.gov</a>
<a href="http://www.wiredsafety.com">www.wiredsafety.com</a>