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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

President Barack Obama (2011) stated, “As adults, we all remember what it was like to see kids picked on in the hallways or in the school yard. And I have to say, with big ears and the name that I have, I wasn’t immune….we overlook the real damage that bullying can do” (White House, 2011, p. 1). Bullying has become a social phenomenon in the United States, which resulted in President Barack Obama developing an action plan to bring awareness about this growing disease within our youth culture.

In 2011, President Barack Obama brought national attention through cyberspace communication about bullying by hosting the first White House Conference on Bullying Prevention. The purpose of the conference was to educate students, teachers, coaches and parents on how to identify and explain the effects of cyberbullying. Furthermore, bullying is problematic for Americans and the practice of cyberbullying can only become obsolete with the help and involvement of all individuals functioning in today’s society. (White House, 2011).

The expansion of societal knowledge grows considerably as bullying behaviors grow globally. As a result, this social phenomenon is no longer a secret or a whisper among college, universities, outreach programs, the health system,
state and governmental institutions, churches and other social institutions.

With an appearance of a formal invitation addressed from the White House, President Barack Obama immediate formulated an action. This action established the first White House Conference on Bullying Prevention whose goal was to educate about and identify bullying (White House, 2011). President Barack Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama (2012) avidly asserted:

A third of middle school and high school students have reported being bullied during the school years. Almost 3 million students have said they were pushed, shoved, tripped, even spit on. It's also more likely to affect kids that are seen as different, whether it's because of the color of their skin, the clothes they wear, the disability they may have, or sexual orientation.

Today, bullying doesn't even end at the school bell—it can follow our children from the hallways to their cellphones to their computer screens. And in recent months, a series of tragedies has drawn attention to just how devastating bullying can be. We have just been heartbroken by the stories of young people who endured harassment and ridicule day after day at school, and who ultimately took their own lives. Instead, they felt like they had nowhere to turn, as if they had no escape from taunting and bullying that made school something they feared (p.1).

This breaking news led social workers and other pertinent professions to advocate, educate and offer resources to cease bullying among the youth culture.

Although, awareness has grown there still remains and existence of ignorance about this topic. As a social worker, I spend considerable time
researching various social implications and only became aware of this while working on another project, the MYRA project, a non-profit for young women and girls. This breaking, headline news story was discovered while obtaining information about this project. Upon further investigation, several websites, journal entries and online articles were found dedicated to extolling the horrors of bullying, in particular, cyberbullying. Among those found was information pertaining to cyberbullying as well as offensive discourse among adolescents. As a result of this shameful discovery, more research was implemented with the inclusion of topic-dedicated books, focusing on President Obama’s decree and centering all further attention to cyberbullying and offensive discourse.

Globally, the mission of social workers is to enhance human-well-being and help meet the basic human needs of all people. Moreover, Social Workers promote is to guide the ecological system.

As a social worker who is honored to be in a community of great scholars at Clark Atlanta University, Whitney M. Young Jr., School of Social Work Master’s Program I was ecstatic to know I joined a league of Social Workers that believes in the words, “To Empower”. As a mentor, scholar, sociologist, advocate of young women and girls, I have devoted my life and studies to enhancing lives and improving society as a whole. My personal, professional, volunteering experiences, along with my ultimate goal of becoming a License Clinical Social Worker (LCSW), have all led me to orchestrate a non-profit called, MYRA: May-You-Reign-Angels Foundation.
In addition, as an aspiring author, journalist and philanthropist, I find it critical to learn in order to impact. Knowledge is necessary to take efficient action and relay this information to the communities that are affected.

The MYRA project is a foundation created in memory of my beloved mother. The foundation is dedicated to promoting social, cultural, and health education to cultivate and raise self-esteem among adolescents and women female population. These young women, who are typically selected from underrepresented minority communities, are exposed to professional development workshops, group discussions, and volunteerism.

To spearhead the MYRA project, I found that I needed to create a better channel of communication to the population I was targeting. After toying with a few approaches, imminently I navigated towards creating a free Facebook account as well as other online social networking sites, as a cost effective measure of dispersing and marketing the MYRA project to adolescent female populations. Through my promotional methods, I began to recognize a pattern in negative social networking issues among adolescents, specifically in mental behavior. This pattern concerned me as both an individual and a social worker. As an individual, it unnerved me due to my own moral and ethical conscience. As a social worker, it prompted me to evaluate my ethical duties towards my profession. It also helped nurture a complex yet supportive relationship with the mentally ill, “Noting that social workers probably provide more care for the severely mentally ill than any other professional group” (Barusch, 2009, p. 24).
In the 21st century, the internet has become oversaturated with information. Therefore allowing adolescents to have access to a plethora of material and putting them at risk of becoming potential victims of cyber-crimes. Specifically, with this in mind, it led me to beg the question, “Are we parenting our authority as a body and policing laws inclusively to protect adolescents using the internet?” I thereby posit that while policies have been constructed to combat this social phenomenon, the issue continues to grow, limitlessly (Daniels, 2007).

There have been policies and laws implemented to control unwanted behaviors, acts, and crimes among adolescents on the internet. For instance, the Children’s Internet Protection Act (CIPA), signed and approved by President Bill Clinton in 2000 was one of the first measures which the United States government sought to protect adolescents in the cyber world (Federal Communication Commission, 2009). Since then, there has been much discourse in other avenues of litigation and policy concerning adolescent protection in cyberspace. However, the policies seem to lack barriers and/or respect among cyberspace communities. In our contemporary times, to our adolescent populations, the cyberspace world is a convoluted and troubled community that fosters cyber bullying and offensive discourse among adolescents. While the initial vision of the Internet (1969) was implemented to bring together a global world segregated by geography, the negative facets that would manifest among latter generations makes one consider the positive impacts versus the negative. This consideration leads to the question, “Have we created more trouble than good?”
After discovering this social phenomenon, I accepted the responsibility as a social worker to advocate, research and invest. Most important, I accepted the responsibility to write a thesis that entitles: A Study of the Effects of Cyberbullying and Offensive Discourse Among Adolescents in Cyberspace. According to an article from the Center of Disease Control (2010) it is suggested that bullies are identified as middle school, high school and college students with social anxiety, depression, social isolation, nervousness, low self-esteem, deficits in school performance and impaired health (Center Of Disease Control, 2010). To further elaborate and identify cyberbullying behaviors the following examples are given:

- Sending someone mean or threatening emails, instant messages, or text messages
- Excluding someone from an instant messenger buddy list or blocking their email for no reason
- Tricking someone into revealing personal or embarrassing information and sending it to others
- Breaking into someone's email or instant message account to send cruel or untrue messages while posing as that person
- Creating websites to make fun of another person such as a classmate or teacher
- Using websites to rate peers as prettiest, ugliest, etc.

According to the National Crime Prevention Council (2010), “Cyberbullying is similar to other types of bullying, except it takes place online and through text messages sent to cell phones” (National Crime Prevention Council, 2010, p. 1). Cyberbullying does not discriminate based on race, creed, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, sex, or disability among youth culture but targets victims who refuse to seek immediate help.

“With a click of a button.....when friendship sours, it is common for children to steal
each other’s passwords and break into e-mail, IM accounts and personal profiles, sending destructive messages under assumed identities” (Daniels, 2007, p. 114). Referring to the aforementioned statement about the Children Internet Protection Act (2000), their purpose is to cease offensive content on the internet.

In recent years, there has been a large amount of cases demonstrating online criminal behavior in youth culture. Although there are rules and regulations established by social networking sites, once an account is created on these sites, an individual has the ability to remain anonymous. Then this allows them the space to create fabricated profiles, comprised of fraudulent names, ages, locations, and other personal data that will manipulate other cyberspace participants from knowing one’s true identity.

Most important, youth culture is already struggling with social issues consisting of low self-esteem, dating violence, street harassments, and other negative social phenomena in youth culture. One of the most igniting cases of cyberbullying in our popular culture looks at the haunting suicidal death of Ms. Megan Meier’s (2006). Meier’s character was slandered for several weeks on MySpace, a social networking sites, by who she believed was her peers. After Meier’s ensuing suicide, investigators discovered that her death was directly attributed to the cyberbullying started by a classmate and former friend’s mother, Lori Drew, who had guised herself as a student. I posit that Ms. Meier’s identity was slandered based on the social acceptance theory, and her suicide proved evident the dramatic affects that the internet has on an individual’s mental stability. A concept, which in turn, calls to question the notion that once something is communicated in cyberspace world, it then becomes fluid. Therefore, youth
culture follows and believes in movements. Ms. Meier’s self-esteem was victimized within this cyberspace movement, which led her to commit suicide. As a result, the Megan Meier Cyberbullying Prevention Act (2009) was implemented to prevent future disasters like this from reoccurring on social networking sites (The Library of Congress, 2012). In addition, in 2010 the Megan Meier Foundation was established to bring awareness about cyberbullying and promote positive change (Megan Meier Foundation, 2010).

Cyberbullying is not solitaire in its ability to bring about negative implications from online interactions. Offensive discourse may include, but is not limited to, coarse language, hate speech, and sexually derogatory comments. Offensive discourse on the Internet has the possibility to become viral and dangerous among youth culture. There are over forty plus internet text acronyms used to communicate and create dialogue among the youth; a language that in and of itself, may supersede the knowledge of their authoritative figures. If parents, guardians, adults and the school systems do not monitor, educate, and bring awareness to the youth culture’s new wave of communication, which encompasses instant messaging, “Chatrooms”, and blogging, we will not only continue to have a rise in non-fatal cyber crimes, but also in cyber-related fatalities. Some languages are offensive, degrading and most importantly life threatening. Merchant (2001) wrote that “Is strangely familiar as new electronic modes of communication provoke similar anxieties amongst critics who express concerns that young people are at risk” (Merchant, 2001, p. 294).
Sex Exploitation has become a hunter among predators who seek to gain access to adolescents deceived by misjudgment and entertainment. Young children, tweens and teens may be unsupervised online, or could have created fictitious profiles. However, that does not give a predator the right to sexually take advantage of our minors. “The enticement of children over the internet for sexually-oriented interactions occurs through various methods of contact, including chat rooms, instant massagers, and email” (O’Leary & D’Ovido, 2010, P. 2). In wake of this insight, I will assert that issues of cyberspace related sexual exploitation has arrived at new heights. It increases incidences of pedophilia, prostitution, and human trafficking. According to this Washington Post (2010) online news article:

Craigslist says it opposes illegal prostitution, human trafficking, and sexual exploitation of children. However, a substantial and growing part of its business [is based] upon advertisements for sexual services, that almost certainly include prostitution and may well sometimes involve human trafficking and sexual exploitation of children. While it may not charge services advertisements in other nations, it provides an iconic platform for their disseminations (p. 1).

In light of these pervaded uses of the internet, it remains imperative to inform the youth culture of what is at stake for them, with each down spiraling click of the mouse. Confined awareness may not only subject them to victimization, but it may also expose them future to other methods of self-destruction.

Critically, our youth culture should take caution when creating profiles, posting pictures, and dialoguing on cyberspace. “Internet have become overshadowed by the
moral panic surrounding girls’ vulnerability online...scholars have begun to explore sexuality and identity construction in girls’ bulletin board posting” (Stokes, 2007, p. 172).

All things considered, this social phenomenon influences the minds of the youth by seducing them into partaking in behavior which may compromise their character and identity formation, and thereafter, jeopardize their reputation. Scarcely, does one observe a young person who marinates over the negative rippling affects which might arise from what could be considered a few moments of social entertainment and expression.

Taking all into account this study will examine the Atlanta University Center (AUC) students’ attitudes on adolescent cyberbullying and offensive discourse in cyberspace. Contrary to the myth, black college students are not statistically part of the rise of cyber bullying and offensive discourse. In fact, research shows that black college students actually participate less than white college students in incidents which involve cyberbullying and engaging in offensive discourse in on the Internet. This encourages the need to evaluate the feelings of these students on the impact this social catastrophe brought on to the younger generations. According to Kretchnm and Carveth (2001) “African Americans are the largest ethnic minority group online, with about 7.5 million users....African American Internet users are younger...children under 18” (Kretchmer & Carveth, 2001, p. 9).

Statement of the Problem

This social phenomenon seduces the minds of the young to risk their character, identities and reputations for moments of social entertainment and expression on the
internet that may ultimately lead to self-destruction. This study will examine the Atlanta University Center (AUC) student’s attitudes on adolescents cyber bullying and offensive discourse in cyberspace. Some of the major social influences are classification, major, ethnicity, age, sex, environment, social status, income, family history, mental-health, social organizations, and social interaction /acceptance. Cyberbullying and offensive discourse are normally identified with Caucasian students and most research is focused on mainstream society. Conversely, we find that African-American students are not as exposed because most research is not geared towards them.

Major social influences that lurk within adolescents circles circumvent on social influences. Few seem to realize that these social influences have no racial distinctions, and may therefore infiltrate all adolescents groups. Susan B. Kretchmer and Rod Carveth (2001), collectively state that black college students are less likely than whites to
......“use email either to sustain relationships with friends or to increase frequency of communication with friends or family” (Kretchmer & Carveth, 2001. P. 9).

As I undertake this topic, I want to first locate the cause that stimulate the youth cultures internal and external fascination with the internet, and then I want to investigate whether these etiologies are tied to cyberbullying and offensive discourse. Specifically, I will first attempt to divert the attention to the various alternative channels that the youth culture can uptake for positive internet usage; and then I ultimately want to attempt to measure why resulting to cyberbullying, offensive discourse and other socially destructive means has become common practice among adolescents.
As a social scientist, this brings me then to uncover the brick work and enact public policy, which forms the foundation behind such phenomenon. While it has been previously contested that public policy did little to impose upon internet accessibility in its infancy, as time has progressed, our contemporary society unveils that new policies that have emerged to try and obstruct improper internet usage. These policies include, but are not limited to, Children’s Internet Protection Act (2000), the Child Pornography Prevention Act (1996), the Child Online Protection Act (1998), the Child Online Privacy Protection (1998), the Center of Disease Control (1946), and the Wire Safety.org; all of which provide a plethora of information to advocate awareness about dangers in cyberspace.

Purpose of the Study

To reiterate, it is imperative that the media, internet, literature, hospitals, churches, and the board of education continue to educate the public about adolescent cyber bullying and offensive discourse in cyberspace. According to Irving Janis’ (1972) groupthink concept, cyberspace interaction is not a social activity done alone but more so dictated by group socialization. Thus meaning that it is typical behavior for students to roam the internet but not alone. Rather, their internet usage is gauged by group settings, found through social networking sites like Facebok, Myspace and Twitter. These groups’ settings then permit them to engage in activities that may reflect cyberbullying and offensive discourse. The purpose of this research is to investigate whether adolescent’s cyber bullying and offensive discourse is becoming a serious problem and developing on
black college campuses and/or universities such as those in the Atlanta University Center (AUC).

Research Questions

The research questions of the study are:

1: How does the Atlanta University Center (AUC) influence students' attitudes towards cyberbullying and offensive discourse in cyberspace?
2: Have you seen offensive language while socializing with friends online?
3: Have your parents talk with me about how to communicate with others online?

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for the study are:

1: First year college students are more likely to cyberbully on the internet than juniors and seniors.
2: Students who feel alienated from campus life spend more time cyberbullying on the internet (Using Social Media) than students who are more integrated into campus life.

Significance of the Study

I find this study to be significant because it will allow me to measure the social factors that influence cyberbullying and offensive discourse in cyberspace. The goal of my thesis is to explore whether classification, major, ethnicity, age, sex, environment, social status, income, family history, mental-health, social organizations, and social
interaction /acceptance influences a student's character and identity construction, self-esteem, and behavioral construction in cyberspace. I would like to analyze how these variables may be directly tied to the rise of cyberbullying and offensive discourse.

There are many pertinent questions that will be addressed to investigate the causes and effects associated with African Americans students’ perceptions towards this prominent phenomenon. Most importantly, I will attempt to dichotomize the differences in college students’ attitudes on adolescent cyberbullying and offensive discourse due to the varying traditions, beliefs, and practices and incorporate various social agencies from over years of critical exposure to socialization. I question do adolescents feel socially connected on the internet? What presents them with that ‘sense of belonging’ among peers? Are they subconsciously aware of all the destructive aftermath that may culminate from wrongful usage?

Cybullying and offensive discourse may result in life altering problems such as academic failure, reckless sexual behavior, un-wanted pregnancies, low self-esteem, rapes, and suicide. There has been a rise in adolescent arrest because of social networking sites like Facebook. According to a Fox 5 (2010) online news article, “Paulding County authorities say a teen arrested for making threatening statements on Facebook posted that he would use a firearm against three of his class mates” (FOX 5 News, 2010, p. 1). On another note, recent studies indicate that it does not stop at criminalization. Currently, there has been a rise in suicide cases specifically connected to cyberspace interaction. “There have been several high-profile cases involving teenagers taking their own lives in part of being harassed and mistreated over the internet. This mental behavior has been
referenced and termed as cyberbullicide-suicide indirectly or directly influenced by experiences of online aggression” (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010, p. 1). Undoubtedly, this literature and others, provide one with an abundance of reasonable material to spark an investigation into a mounting phenomenon plaguing our youth culture.

Collectively, over the course of my research, I will use questionnaires and secondary data from previously conducted empirical studies to support my scholarship. In accordance with Weinback and Grinnell (2008), I find it pertinent that my discourse as a social worker connects with my audience and formulate a fluid narrative. The goal is to connectively distribute my voice and thoughts, while seamlessly bringing awareness to the black youth’s perceptions on the phenomena of adolescent cyberbullying and offensive discourse throughout the internet.

In summation, as a future License Clinical Social Worker (LCSW), my academics, research and experiences from the Whitney M. Young, Masters of Social Work program at Clark Atlanta University will prepare me to pursue a Doctorate degree, publish books, own a private practice, and expand the MYRA project. As a prior government employee, I witnessed many college-aged students entering courthouse doors for their illegal activities such as bullying, gang association, substance abuse, prostitution, and dating violence. I asked myself why and how the younger generation involves themselves in legal issues, despite their potential for a promising future. I speculated that negative influences are easily allowed to penetrate the household, when their environments and social agencies systematically fail them. I therefore ponder on the drawbacks of single-parented households, adolescent peer-to-peer relationships, and the
effects of crime-infused environments— to name a few, on the villainous adolescent’s decision making process. Typically, I posit that their academic standards, self-esteem, and social acceptance may be low.

Thus, my passion is to bring awareness to this existing concern, and educate the youth culture. This may result in the avoidance of this occurrence form rooting itself into their own lives. As I pursue my future endeavors, I believe that my experience derived from this study will teach me how students make decisions based on their race, class and gender.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of presenting this review of literature was to lay a scholarly foundation in order to establish a need for this study. This chapter is a review of the current literature on recent efforts to research cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace.

Although, there are many narratives that efficiently address cyberbullying and offensive discourse topics, many argue about the intersectional relationship these phenomena have with familial, educational, social, communal, and political issues in the adolescents' lives. Few focus on an individual and/or group, nor the initial cause from which the issue arises; leaving little to be done to at least curtail it and at most prevent it. While focusing merely on the external facets that contribute to the overall issue, many negate to address that unlimited accessibility to the internet makes the internet itself a culprit used to facilitate, enable, and nurture the rise of cyberbullying and offensive discourse. Considering that greater limitations and supervision can hinder and inhibit the growth of these dysfunctional aspects of internet usage suggest that there should be an emphasis of blame shed onto cyberspace itself.
Historical Perspective

In their study concerning the negative and fatal consequences of adolescents internet usage Medaris and Girouard (2002) study argues that, “In the internet of today, the electronic actions of the unwary and vulnerable can lead to stalking, theft, and other malicious or criminal actions. In the worst instances, children and teenagers can become victims of molestation by providing personal information.....developing relationships with offenders who lure them from their homes for sexual purposes” (Medaris & Girouard, 2002, p. 1).

Conversely, they fail to address how the tool, the internet, is being used. Disregarding the issue with the tool itself, leaves little to room for improvement. Therefore, curiosity drives to understand why fewer studies address the means in which the internet is used, as opposed to who is using it. When young minds are given access to a tool with such a broad audience, limits should be established. Vague boundaries and limitless access can lead to an insurmountable number of negative outcomes especially when the person given the mechanism is not aware of the extent to which that tool may cause damage. Comparably, a study completed by Hinduja and Patchin (2010) reports, “The most commonly-reported form of cyber-bullying... [was], posting something online about another person to make others laugh” (Medaris and Girouard, 2002, p. 1). The adolescents’ response, indicates their nonchalant assessment of their own actions, and furthermore suggests that they have yet to comprehensively digest the ramifications and repercussions of these actions.
Hinduja and Patchin (2010) employs Herbert Kelman’s (1958) social influence theory, to explain how individual's thoughts, feelings, or actions are affected by their peers’ misconduct in the cyberspace realm. Subsequently, this demonstrates that students within the adolescent community are highly susceptible to their peers’ opinions and actions. Ultimately, students are more likely to emulate their peers’ behaviors than any other social group. This too often results in performing actions for the sole purpose of becoming socially accepted regardless of the positive or negative nature of those actions and/or behaviors (Harvard University, 2010).

In Sameer Hinduja’s and Justin Patchin’s (2009), Bullying Beyond the Schoolyard: Preventing and Responding to Cyberbullying book, the authors reported that “One of the reasons why cyberbullying is not taken seriously is that there remains a number of adults who continue to perceive traditional bullying as simply “a rite of passage among adolescents,” as “boys being boys,” or even an inevitable and instructive element of growing up” (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009, p. 7). Failure to acknowledge the parallels that exists between traditional bullying and “bullying 2.0” or cyberbullying, evokes a disconnect in how cyberbullying is perceived, interpreted, and understood by the cyberspace community. This barrier in the interpretation of these deviant behaviors sheds light onto a greater issue surrounding a dark topic.

This greater issue may thereby, signify that collectively cyberspace may need to be completely reconstructed. Ideally, more emphasis should be allocated to technological advancements used to hinder or cease all forms of cyberbullying. Moreover, polices may
need to be more thoroughly enforced with stronger penalties, which may subsequently lead to the decline of dysfunctional cyberspace behaviors among adolescents.

Cyberbullying

One angle from which we can understand the total impact of cyberbullying is through the personal narratives that aim to identify all the implications of this phenomenon. In Shaheen Shariff (2008), *Cyber-Bullying: Issues and Solutions for the School, the Classroom and the Home* book, he uses the experiences of victims of cyberbullying, to assess the impact of modern form of torture. Excerpts from the book, exemplify the emotional distress experienced by these adolescent victims. One adolescent quarreled, “I would like my story to be anonymous. I am a 14-year-old girl who has been called fat online for many years...cyberbullying ruined my life” (p.4). Another disputed, “I get bullied every day and I just want to hang myself” (p. 6). Lastly, an adolescent grappled, “They have taken over my Bebo account more than once and sent messages around saying that I had a sex change” (p.7).

Shariff (2008) argues that bullying was once seen as a way of growing up in the early 1920s. It was considered an avoidance of maturity if a child did not accept the practice of bullying (Shariff, 2008). Keeping that in mind, Shariff (2008) seems to allude to the idea, that bullying was utilized as an avenue guiding children and adolescents towards normalcy and conformity. Adolescents, who are bullies, reportedly identified their victims as being strange, or different by their peers (Shariff, 2008). However, from those aforementioned adolescent testimonies and considering that the social and communal dynamics of the 1920’s by no means draws parallels to those of our
contemporary society, it is safe to say that there is nothing remotely neither ordinary nor appropriate about rearing adolescents within such a hostile climate.

As previously cited, cyberbullying communication among adolescents has been assumed to be an extension of "traditional" bullying. Consequently, the nature of cyberbullying may be an even greater beast than expected, as there seems to be confusion around who is responsible for tackling it. There is a disagreement among parents and the education system as to who is totally responsible for monitoring and preventing children and young people from bullying their peers online. Through the process of socialization, peer-to-peer relationships derive. Yet, generally speaking, cyberbullying is believed to occur within the privacy of the students' homes, personal computers, and cell phones. As a result, the school does not take total responsibility for the repercussions of their students' actions and behaviors.

On the other hand, parents can rarely intervene in this socialization process, as it takes place on school property. Thus, while one may argue that the fundamental problem is rooted in the devices provided to the adolescent at home, the other may counter, stating that the problem may not have existed if the social issues between the students were better identified and handled at the school. All the while, as the argument of who is to blame progresses, Shariff (2008) proposes that adolescents will more likely become victims of exploitation, slander, threats and suicide because these negated activities are not within the walls of schools and are never reported to parents; parents' oblivion to these circumstances prevents them from taking measures to police these unwanted behaviors.
Cyberbullying has become an ongoing problem among adolescents. This leads me to ponder that prior scholars focus on mainstream communities but Historically Black Community University (HBCU) students are actively on the internet. Thus, recommending not to stereotype or label mainstream public and/or private schools with having problems with cyberbullying because it does not discriminate towards race, class and gender. Although, mainstream public and private schools are in the forefront for cyberbullying, African-American adolescents are cyberbullying too. This leads to the question, who is causing the bullying? According to Shaheen Shariff (2008),

According to Shaheen Shariff (2008):

Ethnic background and religion are more frequently mentioned among older males as reasons for bullying, whereas gender is more frequently the reason for discrimination by adolescents males as a male taunt. Perceptions of being rich or poor and family background are of limited concern, but the way people look and dress is a significant motivation to bully, especially girls. Boys attack hard workers more than girls in adolescents, but victim “cleverness” motivates students of both genders to bully until grade 11. Being different causes 10 percent to discriminate (p. 18).

In Shaheen Shariff (2009), Confronting Cyberbullying: What Schools Need to Know to Control Misconduct and Avoid Legal Consequences book enlightens that there are two principal types of bullying: physical and psychological, “Physical bullying usually involves open attacks on a victim that often get worse if others are watching. Psychological bullying is either inflicting mental anguish to cause their targets to fear for
their physical safety, or breaking down self-esteem and confidence” (Shariff, 2009, p. 34). Shariff (2009) continues to suggest that homophobic physical bullying consist of random forms of physical bullying just described and physiological sexual harassment comprises sexual proposals and threats and name-calling (Shariff, 2009). These actions and/or behaviors have long term and life threatening results such as suicide.

Hinduja and Patchin (2009) assert with the following quotes of victimized adolescents, “People told me I was retarded, that I didn’t fit in. This girl said……. that I was a bitch and that she wished I was dead” (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009, p. 66), “Jeff is a faggot. He needs to die. A stalker or many sorts. He lies and says girls stalk him” (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009, p. 67), “I am not going to put you in the hospital, I am going to put you in the morgue” (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009, p. 68). Unfortunately, these victims resulted to cyberbullicide that is taking their own lives. This supports Herbert Kelman (1958), social influence theory that peer pressure can influence or persuade an individual to behave positive or negative to a social situation. As mention earlier, Meier (2006) committed suicide because she was repeatedly harassed, the feelings that emerged from these situations ultimately resulted in her self-termination.

Offensive Discourse

This leads to the question, “If there was no offensive discourse language there will be less exploitation, slander, threats, and deaths related to cyberspace?” Shaheem Shariff (2008) reports, “Mr. Richardson testified that the words used by the students were ‘part of the high school vocabulary’, and words like ‘gay’ were used to described
someone, something, or a situation that a student didn’t like” (Shariff, 2008. P. 14). This discourse is considered teasing but especially discriminating. The language on the internet is a major contributor to the actions and/or behaviors among adolescents.

In Sonia Livingstone and Leslie Haddon (2009), *Kids Online: Opportunities and Risks for Children* book, discusses the offensive discourse and stresses, “The possibility that children could encounter inappropriate content online receives less public attention than the risk that they may contact with people met online……..pornography, racist material, violent and gruesome content, self-harm sites, commercially exploitation material and more” (Haddon, 2009, p. 135). These two scholars hypothesized that adolescents who displayed “risky” behavior were more likely to encounter inappropriate behavior.

**Summary**

To reiterate my previously mentioned goals, the purpose of this research is to undergo a thorough analysis of the negative implications associated with adolescent behavior and unlimited cyberspace accessibility. In Calvert, Jordan and Cocking (2002), *Children in the Digital Age: Influences of Electronic Media on Development* book, the authors explore recent studies have indicated that among adolescents, there has been a surge of violent, criminal, and sexually deviant behaviors channeled through the Internet and its many social networking sites in the forms of cyber bullying and offensive discourse (Calver, Jordan & Cocking, 2002).

My study attempts to focus on the rise of this troubling phenomenon as it appeals to college students, residing in the technology savvy gates of black college campuses
and/or universities, resembling that of the Atlanta University Center (AUC). As a product of Generation X these students possess a narrative of one whom has formulated and internalized a specific relationship with technology, that generations before are alienated by. Therefore, these students' ongoing fluid relationship with the cyberspace realm, whether it be for personal or formal academia matters, elicit a narrative, as one which is both unique and scarcely heard and sought after.

Additionally, since these college students are not as far removed from their adolescent counterparts, both in age and familiarity with technology, suggesting parents and school figures, they may better relate to the adolescent group they are analyzing. Consequently, it is my task to allow their voices to resonate, as college students attempt to draw significant correlations to adolescent identity markers which adolescents may struggle with daily. These can include, but are not limited to, classification, major, ethnicity, age, sex, environment, social status, income, family history, mental-health, social organizations, and social interaction/acceptance.

These markers, coupled with their methodical perceptions and widespread interpretations of the external world in which they live in, are used to gauge and determine how adolescent behaviors escalate into cyberbullying and depictions of offensive discourse within the youth communities. Understanding how they formulate these identities solicits a grander goal; one which ultimately seeks to comprehend how they may then construct and digest aspects of their identity, along with their self-esteem, to ultimately project a more suitable relatable identity to their peers, overall. Thus it is my goal to focus on the means which provide this end. These college students' perspectives,
and/or universities, resembling that of the Atlanta University Center (AUC). As a product of Generation X, these students possess a narrative of one whom has formulated and internalized a specific relationship with technology, that generations before are alienated by. Therefore, these students' ongoing fluid relationship with the cyberspace realm, whether it be for personal or formal academia matters, elicit a narrative, as one which is both unique and scarcely heard and sought after.

Additionally, since these college students are not as far removed from their adolescent counterparts, both in age and familiarity with technology, suggesting parents and school figures, they may better relate to the adolescent group they are analyzing. Consequently, it is my task to allow their voices to resonate, as college students attempt to draw significant correlations to adolescent identity markers which adolescents may struggle with daily. These can include, but are not limited to, classification, major, ethnicity, age, sex, environment, social status, income, family history, mental-health, social organizations, and social interaction/acceptance.

These markers, coupled with their methodical perceptions and widespread interpretations of the external world in which they live in, are used to gauge and determine how adolescent behaviors escalate into cyberbullying and depictions of offensive discourse within the youth communities. Understanding how they formulate these identities solicits a grander goal; one which ultimately seeks to comprehend how they may then construct and digest aspects of their identity, along with their self-esteem, to ultimately project a more suitable relatable identity to their peers, overall. Thus it is my goal to focus on the means which provide this end. These college students' perspectives,
is of exponential importance, as it may give rise to a new discourse that could reconnect a
disconnected line, between parents and their teens.

What we know now from high profile reports of cyberbullying suicides and
unbelievable accounts of internet stimulated sexual attacks, is that there is a wall grander
than any firewall, barricading the pathway of communication about the daily violence
that adolescents are experiencing both in their classrooms and in the sanctity of their own
homes. Without a safe space, a place where a student can be backed up with affirmation
of oneself and feel comfortable enough to speak and be heard by their authoritative
figures, they are vulnerable to the socially deviant viruses lurking out there in the cyber
world.

Afrocentric Perspective

Jerome H. Schiele (2000), Human Services and the Afrocentric Paradigm
textbook, largely reference the empowerment of “cultural pluralism”, and serve has a
guide to assistant individuals to better understand the Afrocentric modality. Moreover,
Schiele’s work, models a more holistic tone towards knowing and understanding.

The Afrocentric Perspective is practiced by many scholars and/or researchers to
identify, educate, advocate, and to understand social, culture, economic and political
challenges within marginalized communities. The Afrocentric Perspective formulates a
notion of life that recognizes African-American culture geneses rather than European
cultural geneses projected by Eurocentric scholars and/or researchers. For instance,
cyberbullying and offensive discourse in cyberspace within the youth culture has become
a social phenomenon. Social workers are serving and collaborating with the erudition
system, legal system, and clinical grassroots programs to advocate and educate on how youth culture can use technology a healthier and safer way.

The etiology of cyberbullying and offensive discourse within the youth culture derives from social factors that influence abnormal behaviors.

According to Jerome H. Schiele (2000):

It has been estimated that by the time youths complete high school, they will have watched 15,000 to 18,000 hours of televisions....Low-income and at-risk children have the highest average television viewing time, particularly of violent material, and perhaps this is attributed to their need to live out their fantasies to be affluent through the media projections. Teen youths can be extremely susceptible to visual images of the “good life” and its associations with group acceptance because these youths are, consistent with psychosocial theory, grappling with issues of peer acceptance (p. 84).

To understand youth culture one must question their practices and/or activities they partake in daily. If youth culture is spending countless hours watching television and/or time in cyberspace he or she is more likely to become a victim and/or witness cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace.

The Afrocentric Perspective identifies social factors and/or influences by understanding the geneses of cyberbullying and offensive discourse that leads to physical, verbal, emotional, passive, sexual, and psychological violence. According to B. F. Skinner Behavioral Theory (2010), youth culture is a space where behavior is learned among peers (Skinner, 2010). Therefore, it is essential that the media understand how
some cultures' philosophies and/or practices are affected, treated and threatened differently with social factors than other cultures.

Cyberbullying and offensive discourse do not discriminate towards the oppressed but youth culture is more likely to become victims of this social phenomenon. Jerome Shiele (2000) posits, "The problem with the pervasiveness of violence in the visual media for youths is the media not only arouse youths by appealing to a wide range of human emotions and perceptions but also are considered by many as the legitimate and ultimate source of information or "truth" about the world (Schiele, 2000, p. 84). Does at-risk culture have the resources to understand the truth and/or have access to education to accept that some activity or behavior is not accepted in any given society?

Social workers theorize that at-risk youth behavior in cyberspace is influenced by social factors. Having access to technology, music, movies, and other cyberspace software may increase abnormal behaviors and misconduct within the youth culture. The consequences for youth culture that results in cyberbullying will less likely be stricter because of lack of education, resources and lack of parental guidance. However, mainstream society youth culture who demonstrate the same behaviors may have access to education, resources and parental guidance may have more less punishment, which is identified in mainstream society as a privilege.

According to Jerome Schiele (2000):

Through the Afrocentric lens, is that the pervasiveness of violence in a seductive, authoritative, and societal sanctioning instrument such as the visual media places all youths who are exposed to it at risk of accepting aggression as normal for
human intercourse. It places the young person who never commits a violent act at risk of possibly committing his or her first, and a young individual who consistently participates in violence in jeopardy of participating even more. With the increase and expansion of mass, visual media outlets, especially interactive video games, the “at-risk” status of youths is likely to increase, placing many more in jeopardy of internalizing the edicts of spiritual alienation and reciprocal objectification (p. 85).

Hence, the Afrocentric Perspective educates to decrease behaviors that will victimize youth culture. It is imperative that policies against cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescent continues to be implemented among the youth culture so they can see their self-worth, value and strengths. This will allow them to demonstrate positive behaviors while social networking in cyberspace.

In summation, the Afrocentric Perspective advocates by decreasing behaviors that promote cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace. Social Workers must understand how technology works and how the youth culture socializes within cyberspace. First, social workers must accept this is a learned behavior within the youth culture. Second, social workers must send visuals, texts and imagery in cyberspace that speaks to youth culture in positive and healthy ways. Finally, social workers need to continue to collaborate with other advocates that will cease this social phenomenon and/or trend called cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace.
Theoretical Framework

Albert Bandura (1977), theorist, extensively researched the Social Learning Theory (SLT), which led him to publish several books. The SLT is based on observation, which explains how human behavior is almost entirely determined through learning that takes place as a result of reinforcement of our behaviors by others or as a result of our observation of behaviors modeled by others (Bandura, 1977). According to Albert Bandura (1977), Social Learning Theory (SLT), there are three models that formulate this practice, which are the live model, verbal interaction and symbolic (Schriver, 2011). Furthermore, there are several steps that formulate the SLT, and in turn, define cyberbullying and offensive discourse in cyberspace.

First, the youth culture must agree, accept, learn and practice negative behaviors like cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace; they must pay attention and accept the messages and/or symbols of the modeled behavior from their counterparts. Second, after youth culture has agreed, accepted, learned and practiced the negative behaviors, they must remember the details of the modeled behaviors by practicing route learning. Third, once youth culture has reproduced the negative behaviors, they must organize their responses in accordance with the modeled behaviors (Schriver, 2011).

In essence, the Social Learning Theory (SLT) implies that youth culture must have motivation to drive the negative behaviors. Most important, the social factors that influences these unwanted behaviors are jealously, relationship problems, defamation of character, slandering, and sexuality. As a result, the agreed, accepted, learned and
practiced behaviors create rumors, suicide, depression and criminal activities, which
develops from cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Chapters III elucidate the methods and procedures that were utilized in producing the final assessment of the study. The following were discussed in this chapter: research design, description of the site, sample and population, instrumentation, treatment of data, and limitations of the study.

Research Design

A descriptive and explanatory research design was applied in the study (Weinbach & Grinnell, 2010). This research design measured the variables that influenced cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace. Also, the study was designed to collect statistical data in order to identify and explicate the effects of cyberbullying and offensive discourse in cyberspace. Moreover, the study accurately determined if there was a relationship amongst the variables cyberbullying and offensive discourse.

The research design allowed for the descriptive analysis of the demographic behaviors of the respondents. Furthermore, the design ameliorated the analysis of three research questions and two hypotheses that were designed to bring awareness about cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace.
Research Design

A descriptive design was implemented in the study to determine if there was a relationship between three variables. First, there is no relationship between cyberbullying and the Atlanta University Center promotes awareness about cyberbullying. Second, there is no relationship between cyberbullying and if I knew someone being cybersbullied I would try to help them. Last, there is no relationship between discourse and my parents have talked with me about how to communicate with others online.

Prior to beginning the researcher design at the Whitney M. Young, Jr., School of Social Work, Clark Atlanta University (CAU), the Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviewed and approved the researcher HR2012-8-447-1/A application before the researcher investigated the participant’s attitudes and/or experiences on cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) played a significant role in the study because they evaluated the researcher position and purpose of study to determine if it was ethical.

Description of the Site

The study was conducted on the beautiful campus of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), a Historically Black College and University (HBCU), located at 223 James P. Brawley Drive, Southwest, Atlanta, Georgia, 30318. The site was selected because of it is convenience to the population served. Participants were recruited through Market Thursday and the researcher approved flyers from the Student Government Association (SGA) were posted throughout Clark Atlanta University (CAU) campus only. During Market Thursday, the researcher dispensed out survey questionnaires and cyberbullying
awareness packages published by the Center of Disease Control (CDC) and the Cyberbullying Research Center (CRC).

First, in order to successfully recruit, the researcher contacted the Student Government Association (SGA) services at Clark Atlanta University (CAU) 404- 880-6360 to complete an application and to reserve a table for Market Thursday.

Second, the researcher contacted Clark Atlanta University (CAU) professors in the School Arts and Sciences, School of Business, School of Education, and School of Social Work by email and/or by approaching them, if seen on campus, to recruit students from freshmen, sophomore, juniors, senior(s), and graduate classes to participant with complete surveys.

The researcher asked professors from Clark Atlanta University (CAU) may the researcher attend one of their class lectures to have a few moments so Clark Atlanta University (CAU) students can participant in the research by completing surveys. The researcher provided surveys and pens. In addition, all participants received awareness packages about adolescent cyberbullying and offensive discourse published by the Center of Disease Control (CDC) and the Cyberbullying Research Center. If recruited at Market Thursday, participants (N=235) received an awareness package, Papa John’s pizza and a Pepsi product. If recruited during classroom times, participants received an awareness packages on cyberbullying, only. There were a total of 235 participants. The researcher total summation for the research study equated to $320.00.
Sample and Population

In this study the researcher used convenience sampling to survey students at the Atlanta University Center (AUC) on attitudes about cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace. Surveys were given to target 50 freshmen, 50 sophomores, 50 juniors, 50 seniors, 40 masters and 10 PhD students. The survey analysis was to test participant’s attitudes about cyberbullying and offensive discourse adolescents in cyberspace. The number for the size of participants (N=235) within this study was determined through the use of sample size estimation and convenience sampling. Through this technique, participants were determined to be a satisfactory number in order to achieve accurate and reliable statistical findings.

Prior to administering all surveys, there was a brief presentation on the researcher position and the purpose for the Whitney M. Young, Jr., School of Social Work, Clark Atlanta University (CAU) study. All participants filled out a consent form prior to participating in the study. Freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors, and graduate students were informed there were no foreseeable risks and/or discomforts.

Participants were notified if there was a question(s) they desired not to answer, they had the right to skip the question(s). There was information about treatment if student’s believed they were at risk at Clark Atlanta University (CAU), Counseling Service at 404-880-8044. Each participant completed surveys within ten minutes. However, if participants needed additional time to complete the survey more time was granted. After successfully returning back surveys the researcher placed surveys in a folder for Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) data, for input only.
There was no personal and/or identifiable information gathered through this research assignment (i.e. social security numbers or names). The information provided by the participants was only be used to analyze the participants attitudes from undergraduate and graduate students. Once the researcher received the consent forms, the surveys were placed in a folder until the research was successfully completed. Once the research was completed, the researcher housed the statistical data from the findings in the Whitney M. Young, Jr., School of Social Work, Clark Atlanta University (CAU) for the next three years authorized by the Institutional Review Board (IRB).

The study was only interested in freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors, and graduate attitudes about cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in the Atlanta University Center (AUC). All participants received educational literature on cyberbullying and offensive published by the Center of Disease Control (CDC) and the Cyberbullying Research Center. There was a high level of confidentiality if they participated in this research.

The targeted population for this research study consisted of males and females from ages 17 and older. The researcher employed individual questionnaires by recruiting 50 freshmen, 50 sophomores, 50 juniors, 50 seniors, 40 masters and 10 PhD students.

Instrumentation and Measure

The study was utilized as an assessment tool for the measurement of this academic research study. The questionnaire was entitled: A Study of the Effects of Cyberbullying and Offensive Discourse among Adolescents in Cyberspace. The
dichotomy of the questionnaires was divided into binary sections. The first section investigated the demographic information of the participants was titled, “Section I: Demographic Information.” The second was entitled, “Section II: How much do you agree with the following statements?” Section II of the questionnaire was divided into three different sections and obtained a total of fifty questions. The questionnaires measured the participants attitudes based on the Likert Scale (4 =Strongly Agree, 3 =Agree, 2= Disagree and 1 =Strongly Disagree).

The Likert Scale (4 =Strongly Agree, 3 =Agree, 2= Disagree and 1 =Strongly Disagree) was used to scrutinize the participants (N=235) attitudes about cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace. The questionnaires demographics of the first section, section I and there appointed variables: My age group (AGEGRP), My classification (CLASS), My gender (GENDER), My school (COLLEGE), My parent and/or guardian attended college (ATTEND) and I use social media sites on the internet (USE).

Similarly, the questionnaires of the second section, section I and there appointed six variables: Atlanta University Center (AUC) promotes awareness about Cyberbullying (PROMOTE), I have an active social network profile (PROFILE), I use the internet at school (SCHOOL), I use the internet in my dorm-room (DORM), I use the internet at home (HOME), I have received a threatening message online (RECEIVE), I use the internet to communicate with family and friends (COMMUNI), I have sent a threatening message online (SENT), I have seen offensive language while socializing with friends online (SEEN), I believe students between the ages of 12-18 have enough role models in
their community (ROLE), I participate in extra-curricular activities at your school (PARTICI), My parents have talked with me about how to communicate with other's online (PARENT), Students would rather be online than watching television (TELEVIS), and Atlanta University Center (AUC) community should require all students to take a workshop on Cyberbullying (WORKSHOP).

Similarly, the questionnaires of the first section, section II and there appointed fourteen variables: I believe males cyberbully more than females (FEMALE), I believe females cyberbully more than males (MALE), I would inform my parents if I could not stop myself from being cyberbullied (INFORM) I would tell a school staff member if I was bullied at school (WERE), I would report to my parent(s) or school staff if I knew a victim of cyberbullying (WAS), If I were in the environment where someone was being cyberbullied I would avoid or leave the online environment (AVOID), If I knew someone was being cyberbullied, I would read the material but not contribute (CONTRIB) If I knew someone was being cyberbullied, I would complain to others, but not directly to the Cyberbully (COMPLAIN), If I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would try to help the victim privately (HELP), If I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would tell the Cyberbully to stop the behavior (STOP), If I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would support the victim publicly (PUBLIC), Cyberbullying promotes depression (DEPRESS), Cyberbullying promotes hatred (HATE) and, Cyberbullying promotes suicide (SUICIDE).

Likewise, the questionnaires first section, section III and there appointed sixteen variables: Cyberbullying promotes violence (VIOLENCE), Cyberbullying promotes
harassment (HARRASS), Cyberbullying promotes fear (FEAR), Cyberbullying promotes mental illness (MENTAL), Cyberbullying promotes rumors (RUMOR), I witnessed online social networking sites sexually explicit images of women (WOMEN), I witnessed online social networking sites sexually explicit images of men (MEN), I witnessed online social networking sites cyberstalking (CYBERS), Cyberbullying causes academic failure (FAILURE), Cyberbullying can increase criminal activity (CRIMINAL), Are you aware of any cyberbullying laws (LAWS), Cyberbullying laws can reduce criminal behavior (BEHAVIOR), Social networking sites should promote cyberbullying awareness (AWARE), Social networking sites create positive friendships (FREINDS), Social networking sites increase social networking (INCREASE), and Social networking sites are fun (FUN). Both, the questionnaires were tested by the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) evaluation.

Treatment of Data

The raw data was collected and stored in the office of the Whitney M. Young, Jr., School of Social Work, Clark Atlanta University department. The Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) for statistical evaluation was used to investigate the data presented to the participants. The evaluation employed the descriptive statistics, which incorporated and measured the frequency distribution and cross-tabulation. The demographic profile incorporated questions that identified the participant's age group, classification, gender, college-school, parents and/or guardian attended college and I use
social media sites. A frequency distribution analyzed the data and a cross-tabulation was utilized in examining the relationship between the variables.

A frequency distribution of the demographic information was utilized to obtain acuity about the participants of the study. Frequency distributions were also used to examine and abridge the variables in the study.

Cross-tabulation was utilized to calculate the Chi-square, statistical test, which was used to determine if there was a statistical significant relationship between the main variables of the study.

The three cross-tabulations statistical test listed:

1. Cross-tabulation of the computed variable (BULLYING) participant’s perception about bullying by the computed variable (PROMOTES) perception of promotes awareness about cyberbullying. (N=235)

2. Cross-tabulation of the computed variable (BULLYING) participant’s perception about bullying by the computed variable (PARENT) my parent have talked with me about how to communicate with others online. (N=235)

3. Cross-tabulation of the computed variable (BULLYING) participant’s perception about bullying by the computed variable (OFFENSIVE) I have seen offensive language while socializing with friends online. (N=235)

Limitation of the Study

There were two limitations in this study. First, the questionnaire was not recycled from a preceding study; it was created by the researcher and used solely for the
examination of this study. Second, the Atlanta University Center (AUC) is a predominately African American community; therefore, testing other races on attitudes about cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace was limited. Thus, the researcher did not have equal ethnicity groups.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter was to present the findings of the final evaluation of the study. The questionnaires were administered to Clark Atlanta University (CAU) community. However, if a participant (N=235) attended Spelman College or Morehouse College who were located within the community of Clark Atlanta University (CAU) they were awarded the opportunity to participate in this approved Institutional Review Board (IRB) study. The purpose of this study was to statically test and explain how social factors influence cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace. The results of the study are computed and organized into the following two sections: demographic data, research questions and hypotheses.

Demographic Data

The demographic profile consisted of descriptive statistics that were used to analyze the following: gender, school age, classification, parents, and the use of social media sites. The study target population was composed of Two-Hundredth and Thirty-Five (N=235) African American college students who indicated that their ages were 18-23 (81.3%), 24-31 (11.1%), 32 – 39 (3.4%) and 40 and older (4.3%). Participants indicated that their gender were female (57.4%) and male (41.7%). Participants indicated
their classifications were freshmen (11.9%), sophomores (21.3%), juniors (25.5%), seniors (22.1%) masters (16.2%) and PhD (3.0%). Participants indicated their schools were Clark Atlanta University (77.0%), Spelman College (4.3%) and Morehouse College (18.7%). Participants indicated that their parents and/or guardian attended college were yes (61.7%) and no (38.3%). Lastly, the participants indicated they use social media sites on the internet were yes (94.0%) and no (6.0%).

Table 1

Demographic Profile of Study Respondents (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Atlanta University</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelman</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehouse</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 up</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parents attended college

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>145</th>
<th>61.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use social media on the Internet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>220</th>
<th>93.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 is a profile of the study participants. It presents the frequency distribution of the demographic variables. The table represents the frequency distributions of the participant’s demographic variables utilized in the study. As depicted in Table 1, the typical respondent of the study was a Clark Atlanta University (CAU) female student, between the ages of 18-2 years old, a junior, with parents and/or guardians who attended college and who use social media sites on the internet.
Table 2

Atlanta University Center (AUC) promotes awareness about Cyberbullying (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating whether the Atlanta University Center (AUC) promotes awareness about cyberbullying. Of the 235 participants, 77.2% disagreed that the Atlanta University Center (AUC) does not promote awareness about cyberbullying. However, 22.8% agreed that the Atlanta University Center (AUC) does promote awareness about cyberbullying.

Table 3

I have an active social networking profile (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CA), indicating whether I have an active social networking profile. Of the 235 participants,
10.6% disagreed I have an active social networking profile. However, 89.4% agreed that I have an active social networking profile.

Table 4

I use the internet at school (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating I use the internet at school. Of the 235 participants, 4.7% disagreed I use the internet at school. However, 95.3% agreed that I use the internet at school.

Table 5

I use the internet in my dorm-room (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of college students, indicating I use the internet in my dorm-room. Of the 235 participants, 19.0% disagreed I
use the internet in my dorm-room. However, 81.0% agreed that I use the internet in my
dorm-room.

Table 6

I use the internet at home (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University
(CAU), indicating I use the internet at home. Of the 235 participants, 3.0% disagreed I
use the internet at home. However, 97.0% agreed that I use the internet at home.

Table 7

I have received a threatening message online (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University
(CAU), indicating I have received a threatening message online. Of the 235 participants,
74.5% disagreed I have received a threatening message online. However, 25.5% agreed that I have received a threatening message online.

Table 8

I use the internet to communicate with family and friends (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating I use the internet to communicate with family and friends. Of the 235 participants, 8.5% disagreed I use the internet to communicate with family and friends. However, 91.5% agree that I use the internet to communicate with family and friends.

Table 9

I have sent a threatening message online (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating I have sent a threatening message online. Of the 235 participants,
86.0% disagree I have sent a threatening message online. However, 14.0% agree that I have sent a threatening message online.

Table 10

I have seen offensive language while socializing with friends online (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating I have seen offensive language while socializing with friends online. Of the 235 participants, 17.4% disagreed I have seen offensive language while socializing with friends online. However, 82.6% agreed that I have seen offensive language while socializing with friends online.

Table 11

I believe students between the ages of 12-18 have enough role models (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating I believe student between the ages of 12-18 have enough role models in their community. Of the 235 participants, 78.3% disagreed I believe student between the ages of 12-18 have enough role models in their community. However, 21.7% agreed that I believe student between the ages of 12-18 have enough role models in their community.

Table 12

I participate in extra-curricular activities at your school (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating I participate in extra-curricular activities at your school. Of the 235 participants, 28.1% disagreed I participate in extra-curricular activities at your school. However, 71.9% agreed that I participate in extra-curricular activities at your school.
Table 13

My parents have talked with me about how to communicate with others online (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating my parents have talked with me about how to communicate with others online. Of the 235 participants, 52.6% disagreed my parents have talked with me about how to communicate with others online. However, 47.4% agreed that my parents have talked with me about how to communicate with others online.

Table 14

Students would rather be online than watching television (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating students would rather be online than watching television.
Of the 235 participants, 15.0% disagreed students would rather be online than watching television. However, 84.3% agreed that students would rather be online.

Table 15

Atlanta University Center should require all students to take a workshop (N=235).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU) indicating Atlanta University Center (AUC) community should require all students to take a workshop on Cyberbullying. Of the 235 participants, 60.9% disagreed Atlanta University Center (AUC) community should require all students to take a workshop on Cyberbullying. However, 39.1% agree that Atlanta University Center (AUC) community should require all students to take a workshop on Cyberbullying.

Table 16

I believe males cyberbully more than females (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating I believe males cyberbully more than females. Of the 235 participants, 86.6% disagreed I believe males cyberbully more than females. However, 13.4% agreed that I believe males cyberbully more than females.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating I believe females cyberbully more than males. Of the 235 participants, 68.5% disagreed I believe females cyberbully more than males. However, 31.5% agreed that I believe females cyberbully more than males.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating I would inform my parents if I could not stop myself from being cyberbullied (N=235)
Table 18 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating I would inform my parents if I could not stop myself from being cyberbullied. Of the 235 participants, 30.6% disagreed I have an active I would inform my parents if I could not stop myself from being cyberbullied. However, 69.4% agreed that I would inform my parents if I could not stop myself from being cyberbullied.

Table 19

I would tell a school staff member if I were to be bullied at school (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating I would tell a school staff member if I were to be bullied at school. Of the 235 participants 47.9% disagreed I would tell a school staff member if I were to be bullied at school. However, 52.1% agreed that I would tell a school staff member if I were to be bullied at school.
Table 20

I would tell a school staff member if I was bullied at school (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating I would tell a school staff member if I was bullied at school. Of the 235 participants, 50.0% disagreed I would tell a school staff member if I was bullied at school. However, 50.0% agreed that I would tell a school staff member if I was bullied at school.

Table 21

I would report to my parent(s) or school staff if I knew a victim of cyberbullying (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating I would report to my parent(s) or school staff if I knew a
victim of cyberbullying. Of the 235 participants, 32.9% disagreed I would report to my parent(s) or school staff if I knew a victim of cyberbullying. However, 67.1% agreed that I would report to my parent(s) or school staff if I knew a victim of cyberbullying.

Table 22

If I were in the environment where someone was being cyberbullied I would avoid or leave the online environment (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating if I were in the environment where someone was being cyberbullied I would avoid or leave the online environment. Of the 235 participants, 46.6% disagreed I were in the environment where someone was being cyberbullied I would avoid or leave the online environment. However, 53.4% agreed that I were in the environment where someone was being cyberbullied I would avoid or leave the online environment.
Table 23

If I knew someone was being cyberbullied, I would read the material but not contribute (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating if I knew someone was being cyberbullied, I would read the material but not contribute. Of the 235 participants, 41.5% disagreed I knew someone was being cyberbullied, I would read the material but not contribute. However, 58.5% agreed that I knew someone was being cyberbullied, I would read the material but not contribute.

Table 24

If I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would complain to others, but not directly to the Cyberbully (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating if I knew someone was being cyberbullied, I would complain to others, but not directly to the cyberbully. Of the 235 participants, 72.3% disagreed if I knew someone was being cyberbullied, I would complain to others, but not directly to the cyberbully. However, 27.7% agreed if I knew someone was being cyberbullied, I would complain to others, but not directly to the cyberbully.

Table 25

If I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would try to help the victim privately (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating if I knew someone was being cyberbullied, I would try to help the victim privately. Of the 235 participants, 17.9% disagreed if I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would try to help the victim privately. However, 82.1% agreed if I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would try to help the victim privately.
Table 26

If I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would tell the Cyberbully to stop the behavior (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating if I knew someone was being cyberbullied, I would tell the cyberbully to stop the behavior. Of the 235 participants, 30.2% disagreed if I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would tell the Cyberbully to stop the behavior. However, 69.8% agreed if I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would tell the Cyberbully to stop the behavior.

Table 27

If I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would support the victim publicly (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating if I knew someone was being cyberbullied, I would support the victim publicly. Of the 235 participants, 24.7% disagreed if I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would support the victim publicly. However, 75.3% agreed that if I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would support the victim publicly.

Table 28

Cyberbullying promotes depression (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating cyberbullying promotes depression. Of the 235 participants, 7.7% disagreed cyberbullying promotes depression. However, 92.3% agreed that cyberbullying promotes depression.
Table 29

Cyberbullying promotes hatred (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University, indicating cyberbullying promotes hatred. Of the 235 participants, 8.5% disagreed cyberbullying promotes hatred. However, 91.5% agreed that cyberbullying promotes hatred.

Table 30

Cyberbullying promotes suicide (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating cyberbullying promotes suicide. Of the 235 participants, 12.8% disagreed cyberbullying promotes suicide. However, 87.2% agreed that
cyberbullying promotes suicide.

Table 31

Cyberbullying promotes violence (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating cyberbullying promotes violence. Of the 235 participants, 6.4% disagreed cyberbullying promotes violence. However, 93.6% agreed that cyberbullying promotes violence.

Table 32

Cyberbullying promotes harassment (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University, indicating cyberbullying promotes harassment. Of the 235 participants, 4.3 %
disagreed cyberbullying promotes harassment. However, 95.7% agreed that cyberbullying promotes harassment.

Table 33

Cyberbullying promotes fear (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating cyberbullying promotes fear. Of the 235 participants, 6.4% disagreed cyberbullying promotes fear. However, 93.6% agreed that cyberbullying promotes fear.

Table 34

Cyberbullying promotes mental illnesses (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 34 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating cyberbullying promotes mental illnesses. Of the 235 participants, 29.9% disagreed cyberbullying promotes mental illnesses. However, 70.1% agreed that cyberbullying promotes mental illnesses.

Table 35

Cyberbullying promotes rumors (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CU), indicating cyberbullying promotes rumors. Of the 235 participants, 3.0% disagreed cyberbullying promotes rumors. However, 97.0% agreed that cyberbullying promotes rumors.
Table 36

I witnessed online social networking sites sexually explicit images of women (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating I witness online social networking sites sexually explicit images of women. Of the 235 participants, 14.5% disagreed I witnessed online social networking sites sexually explicit images of women. However, 85.5% agreed that I witnessed online social networking sites sexually explicit images of women.

Table 37

I witnessed online social networking sites sexually explicit images of men (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating I witness online social networking sites sexually explicit images of men.
images of men. Of the 235 participants, 38.9% disagreed I witnessed online social networking sites sexually explicit images of men. However, 61.1% agreed that I witnessed online social networking sites sexually explicit images of men.

Table 38

I witnessed online social networking sites cyberstalking (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating I witnessed online social networking sites cyberstalking. Of the 235 participants, 41.0% disagreed I witnessed online social networking sites cyberstalking. However, 59.0% agreed that I witnessed online social cyberstalking.

Table 39

Cyberbullying causes academic failure (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 39 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating cyberbullying causes academic failure. Of the 235 participants, 37.9% disagreed cyberbullying causes academic failure. However, 62.1% agreed that cyberbullying causes academic failure.

Table 40

Cyberbullying can increase criminal activity (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CU), indicating cyberbullying can increase criminal activity. Of the 235 participants, 19.6% disagreed cyberbullying can increase criminal activity. However, 80.4% agreed that cyberbullying can increase criminal activity.

Table 41

Are you aware of any cyberbullying laws (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 40 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating are you aware of any cyberbullying laws. Of the 235 participants, 65.1% disagreed are not aware of any cyberbullying laws. However, 34.9% agreed they are aware of any cyberbullying laws.

Table 42: Cyberbullying laws can reduce criminal behavior (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating cyberbullying laws can reduce criminal behavior. Of the 235 participants, 40.0% disagreed cyberbullying laws can reduce criminal behavior. However, 60.0% agreed that cyberbullying laws can reduce criminal behavior.
Table 43

Social networking sites should promote cyberbullying awareness (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating social networking sites should promote cyberbullying awareness. Of the 235 participants, 6.8% disagreed social networking sites should promote cyberbullying awareness. However, 93.2% agreed that social networking sites should promote cyberbullying awareness.

Table 44

Social networking sites create positive friendships (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating social networking sites create positive friendships. Of the
235 participants, 16.2% disagreed social networking sites create positive friendships. However, 83.8% agreed that social networking sites create positive friendships.

Table 45

Social networking sites increase social networking (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating social networking sites increase social networking. Of the 235 participants, 6.0% disagreed social networking sites increase social networking. However, 94.0% agreed that social networking sites increase social networking.

Table 46

Social networking sites are fun (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 46 is a frequency distribution of 235 participants of Clark Atlanta University (CAU), indicating social networking sites are fun. Of the 235 participants,
9.0% disagreed social networking sites are fun. However, 91.0% agreed that social networking sites are fun.

Testing of Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Questions

The research questions of the study are:

1: How does the Atlanta University Center (AUC) influence students’ attitudes towards cyberbullying and offensive discourse in cyberspace?

2: Have you seen offensive language while socializing with friends online?

3: Have your parents talk with me about how to communicate with others online?

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for the study are:

1: First year college students are more likely to cyberbully on the internet than juniors and seniors.

2: Students who feel alienated from campus life spend more time cyberbulling on the internet (Using Social Media) than students who are more integrated into campus life.
Table 47

Cross-tabulation of the computed variable (BULLYING) participant's perception about bullying by the computed variable (PROMOTES) perception of promotes awareness about cyberbullying. (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BULLYING</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = .183  df = 1

Table 47 is a cross-tabulation of the perception about cyberbullying by the computed variable bullying in comparison with the perception of Atlanta University Center (AUC) promotes awareness about cyberbullying by the computed variable promote. Of the 228 participants, 159 (69.7%) reported negatively, and disagreed that the Atlanta University Center (AUC) does not promote awareness about cyberbullying. Fifty (21.9%) of the 228 participants reported positively and agreed that my parent have not talked with me about how to communicate with others online.

According to table 47, Chi-square, statistical test, displays there is no significant statistical relationship (0.183) between cyberbullying and the Atlanta University Center (AUC) promotes awareness about cyberbullying at the 0.05 level of probability amongst the two variables in the study ($\chi^2 = 2.047, p=1.776^a$).
Table 48

Cross-tabulation of the computed variable (BULLYING) participant's perception about bullying by the computed variable (PARENT) my parent have talked with me about how to communicate with others online. (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = .627 df = 1

Table 48 is a cross-tabulation of the perception about cyberbullying by the computed variable bullying in comparison with my parent have talked with me about how to communicate with others online. Out of 234 participants, 112 (47.9%) reported negatively and disagreed that my parent have not talked with me about how to communicate with others online. One-hundred and three (44.0%) of the 234 participants reported positively, and agreed that my parent have talked with me about how to communicate with others online.

According to table 47, Chi-square, statistical test, displays there is no significant statistical relationship (0.627) between cyberbullying and my parent have not talked with me about how to communicate with others online at the 0.05 level of probability amongst the two variables in the study ($\chi^2 = 2.047, p = .236$).
Table 47

Cross-tabulation of the computed variable (BULLYING) participant’s perception about bullying by the computed variable (OFFENSIVE) I have seen offensive language while socializing with friends online. (N=235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFENSIVE</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = .407 df = 1

Table 47 is a cross-tabulation of the perception about offensive discourse by the computed variable offensive in comparison with I have seen offensive language while socializing with friends online by the computed variable offensive. Of the 235 participants, 194 (82.6%) reported positively, and agreed that I have seen offensive discourse language while socializing with friends online. Forty-one (17.4%) of the 235 participants, reported negatively and disagreed that I have not seen offensive discourse language while socializing with friends online.

According to table 47, Chi-square, statistical test, displays there is no significant statistical relationship (0.844) between cyberbullying and I have seen offensive discourse language while socializing with friends online at the 0.05 level of probability amongst the two variables in the study ($\chi^2 = 2.047, p=.687^*$).
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The study was designed to describe and explain how social factors influence cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace. Moreover, the study analyzed the target population and answered four research questions about cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace. By identifying the social influences of cyberbullying and offensive discourse, and challenging some of the Biopsychosocial factors that aid in the progression of this social phenomenon, provide space for possible pioneer Social Work services, therapeutic treatments, and/or interventions procedures for all race, class and genders. As a result, social workers can now implement, practice, apply those resources, which lead to effectiveness.

Summary of the Study

It is often suggested that qualitative analysis is the paramount approach to achieve validity when executing research in including human subject (Weinbach & Grinnell, 2010). In support of such notion, surveys were presented to participants (N=235) in order to obtain a better implication and/or how cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace were predisposed, and the efficacy of its Social Work their classification were freshmen (11.9%), sophomores (21.3%), juniors (25.5%), seniors (22.1%) masters (16.2%) and PhD (3.0%). Participants indicated there schools were
services, therapeutic treatments, and/or interventions after being implemented, practiced, applied and practiced.

The conclusions and recommendations of the research findings are presented in this chapter. Each question is presented in order to summarize the significant findings of interest.

Research Question 1: How does the Atlanta University Center influences students’ attitudes towards cyberbullying and offensive discourse in cyberspace?

A cross-tabulation was completed to determine if there was a significant relationship between cyberbullying and does the Atlanta University Center (AUC) influences students’ attitudes towards cyberbullying and offensive discourse in cyberspace. The first cross-tabulation consisted of the perception about their attitudes towards bullying by the computed variable (\([\text{VIOLENCE} + \text{HARASS} + \text{FEAR}] / 3\)) in comparison with the perception of the Atlanta University (AUC) Center influences students attitudes towards cyberbullying and offensive discourse by the computed variable (\([\text{PROMOTE}]\)).

According to the Chi-square, statistical test, the results indicated that there is not a significant statistical relationship (0.183) between cyberbullying and does the Atlanta University Center (AUC) influences students’ attitudes towards cyberbullying and offensive discourse at the 0.05 level of probability.

Of the 228 participants, 159 (69.7%) reported negatively, and disagreed that the Atlanta University Center (AUC) does not promote awareness about cyberbullying. Fifty
(21.9%) of the 228 participants reported positively and agreed that my parent have not talked with me about how to communicate with others online.

The finding suggested that the Atlanta University Center (AUC) does not promote awareness about cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace.

Research Question 2: I have seen offensive language while socializing with friends online.

A second cross-tabulation was completed to determine if there was a significant relationship between cyberbullying and I have seen offensive language while socializing with friends online. The cross-tabulation consisted of the perception about their attitudes towards cyberbullying by the computed variable ([VIOLENCE+HARASS+FEAR]/3) in comparison with the perception of I have seen offensive language while socializing with friends online by the computed variable ([SEEN]).

According to the Chi-square, statistical test, the results indicated that there is not a significant statistical relationship (0.005) between cyberbullying and I have seen offensive language while socializing with friends online at the 0.05 level of probability. Of the 234 participants, 167 (71.4%) reported positively, and agreed that I have seen offensive discourse language while socializing with friends online. Thirty-Five (15.0%) of the 234 participants, reported negatively and disagreed that I have not seen offensive discourse language while socializing with friends online.

The finding suggested that they have seen offensive language while socializing with friends online.
Research Question 3: My parents have talked with me about how to communicate with others online.

A third cross-tabulation was completed to determine if there was a significant relationship between offensive discourse and my parents have talked with me about how to communicate with others online. A cross-tabulation of the participant's perception about offensive discourse in cyberspace by the computed variable \([(DEPRESS+HATE+SUICIDE)/3]\) in comparison with the perception of my parents have talked with me about how to communicate with others online by the computed variable (\([PARENTS]\)).

According to the Chi-square, statistical test, the results indicated a significant statistical relationship (0.005) between offensive discourse and my parents have talked with me about how to communicate with others online at the 0.005 level of probability.

Out of 234 participants, 112 (47.9%) reported negatively and disagreed that my parent have not talked with me about how to communicate with others online. One-hundred and three (44.0%) of the 234 participants reported positively, and agreed that my parent have talked with me about how to communicate with others online.

The finding suggested that parents did have a talk with me about how to communicate with others online.
According to the Chi-square, statistical test, the hypotheses results indicated:

**Hypotheses**

The hypotheses for the study are:

1. There is no significance statistical relationship between first year college students are cyberbullying more on the internet than juniors and seniors.

2. There is no significance statistical relationship between students who feel alienated from campus life who spend more time cyberbullying on the internet (Using Social Media) than students who are more integrated into campus life.

**Implication for Social Work Policy, Practice and Research**

The study illuminates the significance of awareness in connection to knowledge-base interventions, treatment modalities, services and research. Framed from a humanistic perspective with emphasis on attention to the-whole (biopsyshcosocial), this study suggests practicing effective ways that will cease cyberbullying. Going noticed, pertaining to the implication of knowledge-base, social work is a growing field of practice and it is imperative to continue in the research of effective modalities.

According to the research topic, "A Study of the Effects of Cyberbullying and Offensive Discourse Among Adolescents in Cyberspace", the results from the research questions and hypotheses does not show a significance statistical relationship.
As social workers competence in the understanding of human behaviors and how individuals are influenced by the ecological environments is one of the core values which play major role in how we perceive, practice, serve and advocate.

The results of this study provided insights on how social workers can implement programs, facilitate trainings and/or offer resources about cyberbullying and offensive discourse in cyberspace, which leads to effectiveness. Utilizing the findings from the study, social workers have the opportunity to advocate cyberbullying. It is essential that social workers educate how to effectively use technology to reduce criminal behavior and/or activity. The implications of social work have the potential to improve adolescents using social media sites. There is no statistical significance relationship in this study because there were only 235 participants.

As a result of the findings of this study, the researcher is recommending the following general practice stages:

1. Engagement- Social workers should identify and help adolescent’s engage in the problem-solving process. Social workers should serve as brokers by connecting adolescents with resources. Moreover, Social workers should collaborate with college and/or universities, outreach programs, the health system, state and governmental institutions, and churches to continue research to identify students who are promoting cyberbullying.

2. Data Collection-Social workers should collect information that will help with treatment process.
3. Assessment- Social workers should advocate the strength perspective that will direct students to focus on their goals, which they can empower while using social media sites.

4. Intervention- Social workers should begin to establish intervention methods of alleviation for future generations suffering with cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace.

5. Evaluation- Social workers should have a knowledge and understanding of human relationships.

6. Evaluation- Social workers should measure the results of the process.

7. Termination- Social workers should engage in additional research that will identify, define and address the risk factors of cyberbullying and offensive discourse among adolescents in cyberspace.

In summation, social workers must create positive reinforcements that will direct adolescents to use the internet positively. Thus, this social phenomenon that President Barack Obama called to action will eventually be a conversation in the past because social workers, and college and/or universities, outreach programs, the health care system, state and governmental institutions, and churches will advocate and educate loudly to cease cyberbullying and offensive discourse in cyberspace.
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SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF CYBERBULLYING AND OFFENSIVE DISCOURSE AMONG ADOLESCENTS IN CYBERSPACE

SECTION I: Demographic Information

Please answer the following demographic questions that best apply to you. Place a mark (X) next to the appropriate item. Choose only one answer for each statement.

1. My age group:
   1) ____ 18-23   2) ____ 24-31   3) ____ 32-39   4) ____ 40 and older

2. My classification:
   1) ____ Freshmen   2) ____ Sophomore   3) ____ Junior
   4) ____ Senior   5) ____ Master   6) ____ PhD

3. My gender:
   1) ____ Male   2) ____ Female

4. My school:
   1) ____ Clark Atlanta University   2) ____ Spelman College
   3) ____ Morehouse College

5. My parents(s) and/or guardian(s) attended college:
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1) ____Yes  2) ____No

6. I use social media sites on the internet:
    1) ____Yes  2) ____No

SECTION II: Instrument

How much do you agree with the following statements? Write the appropriate number (1-4) in the blank space in front of each statement on the questionnaire. Please respond to all questions.

4 =Strongly Agree  3 =Agree  2 = Disagree  1 =Strongly Disagree

____7. Atlanta University Center (AUC) promotes awareness about Cyberbullying?
____8. I have an active social network profile?
____9. I use the internet at school?
____10. I use the internet in my dorm-room?
____11. I use the internet at home?
____12. I have received a threatening message online?
____13. I use the internet to communicate with family and friends?
____14. I have sent a threatening message online?
____15. I have seen offensive language while socializing with friends online?
____16. I believe students between the ages of 12-18 have enough role models in their community?
____17. I participate in extra-circular activities at your school?
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____18. My parents have talked with me about how to communicate with other's online?

____19. Students would rather be online than watching television?

____20. Atlanta University Center community should require all students to take a workshop on Cyberbullying?

SECTION II: Instrument (continue)

How much do you agree with the following statements? Write the appropriate number (1-4) in the blank space in front of each statement on the questionnaire. Please respond to all questions.

4 =Strongly Agree   3 =Agree   2 = Disagree   1 =Strongly Disagree

____21. I believe males cyberbully more than females?

____22. I believe females cyberbully more than males?

____23. I would inform my parents if I could not stop myself from being cyberbullied?

____24. I would tell a school staff member if I were to be bullied at school?

____25. I would tell a school staff member if I was bullied at school?

____26. I would report to my parent(s) or school staff if I knew a victim of cyberbullying?

____26. If I were in the environment where someone was being cyberbullied I would avoid or leave the online environment?

____27. If I knew someone was being cyberbullied, I would read the material but not contribute?

____28. If I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would complain to others, but not directly to the Cyberbully?

____29. If I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would try to help the victim privately?
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30. If I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would tell the Cyberbully to stop the behavior?

31. If I knew someone was being Cyberbullied, I would support the victim publicly?

32. Cyberbullying promotes depression?

33. Cyberbullying promotes hatred?

34. Cyberbullying promotes suicide?

SECTION II: Instrument (continue)

How much do you agree with the following statements? Write the appropriate number (1-4) in the blank space in front of each statement on the questionnaire. Please respond to all questions.

4 =Strongly Agree 3 =Agree 2 =Disagree 1 =Strongly Disagree

35. Cyberbullying promotes violence?

36. Cyberbullying promotes harassment?

37. Cyberbullying promotes fear?

38. Cyberbullying promotes mental illness?

39. Cyberbullying promotes rumors?

40. I witnessed online social networking sites sexually explicit images of women?

41. I witnessed online social networking sites sexually explicit images of men?

42. I witnessed online social networking sites cyberstalking?

43. Cyberbullying causes academic failure?

44. Cyberbullying can increase criminal activity?

45. Are you aware of any cyberbullying laws?

46. Cyberbullying laws can reduce criminal behavior?
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47. Social networking sites should promote cyberbullying awareness?
48. Social networking sites create positive friendships?
49. Social networking sites increase social networking?
50. Social networking sites are fun?
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INFORMED CONSENT FORM

"A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF CYBERBULLYING AND OFFENSIVE DISCOURSE AMONG ADOLESCENTS IN CYBERSPACE"

INVITATION
As a participant in the Whitney M. Young, Jr., School of Social Work, Clark Atlanta University, you are invited to be in a research study focusing on the subject of cyberbullying and offensive discourse in cyberspace. This study is under the supervision of Makeba Williams, a candidate of Whitney M. Young, Jr., School of Social Work. As a survey participant, I hope that you become more aware of cyberbullying and offensive discourse in cyberspace. If you agree to participate in this study I ask that you:

1. Read this form and survey questions carefully
2. Ask any questions pertaining to this study before agreeing participating in the study
3. Complete the entire survey for the above topic
4. All surveys should take 15 minutes, but if participant(s) request more time, the request will be granted.

RISK, HARM & BENEFITS
There are no risks to completing this survey. As a participant, I can not guarantee you will receive any benefits from this research.

After successfully completing the survey the participant will receive the following at Market Thursday an awareness package about cyberbullying and two slices of Papa Johns pizza and a soda. If participant(s) completes surveys in class they will receive awareness package about cyberbullying, only.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The record of this study is confidential. Any report published, will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a participant. Your identity as a participant will not be disclosed to any unauthorized person(s); only the researcher from Whitney M. Young, Jr., School of Social Work, Clark Atlanta University. Your participation in this study is strictly voluntarily. You may refuse to participate and at anytime withdraw from participating in this study.
You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later about the research, you may contact the researcher(s) at: Makeba Williams, @ 678-668-4969 and/or my advisor Dr. Joyce G. Goosby, @ 404-880-8529 at Whitney M. Young, Jr., School of Social Work Department, Clark Atlanta University.

If you have any questions now, or later, related to the integrity of the research, (the rights of research subjects or research-related injuries, where applicable), you are encouraged to contact Dr. Georgianna Bolden at the Office of Sponsored Programs 404 880-6979 or Dr. Paul I. Musey, (404) 880-6829 at Clark Atlanta University.

Your signature indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty.

CONSENT
Statement of Consent: I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature __________________________________________ Date: _______

Signature of Investigator _______________________________ Date: _______
Ms. Makeba Williams, <Mentoringgirlsintopears@yahoo.com>
School of Social Work
Clark Atlanta University
Atlanta, GA 30314

RE: A Study Of The Effects Of Cyberbullying and Offensive Discourse Among Adolescents In Cyberspace.

Principal Investigator(s): Makeba Williams

Human Subjects Code Number: HR2012-8-447-1

Dear Ms. Williams:

The Human Subjects Committee of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed your protocol and approved of it as exempt in accordance with 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2).

Your Protocol Approval Code is HR2012-8-447-1/A

This permit will expire on August 19, 2013. Thereafter, continued approval is contingent upon the annual submission of a renewal form to this office. The CAU IRB acknowledges your timely completion of the CITI IRB Training in Protection of Human Subjects – “Social and Behavioral Sciences Track”. Your certification is valid for two years.

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Georgianna Bolden at the Office of Sponsored Programs (404) 880-6979 or Dr. Paul I. Musey, (404) 880-6829.

Sincerely:

[Signature]

Paul I. Musey, Ph.D.
Chair
IRB: Human Subjects Committee

cc. Office of Sponsored Programs, “Dr. Georgianna Bolden” <gbolden@cau.edu>
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SPPS PROGRAM ANALYSIS

TITLE 'A STUDY OF CYBERBULLYING IN THE UNIVERSITY CENTER'.
SUBTITLE 'Makeba Williams - MSW Program'.

DATA LIST FIXED/
ID 1-3
AGEGRP 4
CLASS 5
GENDER 6
COLLEGE 7
ATTEND 8
USE 9
PROMOTE 10
PROFILE 11
SCHOOL 12
DORM 13
HOME 14
RECEIVE 15
COMMUNI 16
SENT 17
SEEN 18
ROLE 19
PARTICI 20
PARENT 21
TELEVIS 22
WORKSHOP 23
FEMALE 24
MALE 25
INFORM 26
WERE 27
WAS 28
VICTIM 29
AVOID 30
CONTRIB 31
COMPLAIN 32
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HELP  33
STOP  34
PUBLIC  35
DEPRESS  36
HATE  37
SUICIDE  38
VIOLENCE  39
HATE  40
FEAR  41
MENTAL  42
RUMOR  43
WOMEN  44
MEN  45
CYBERS  46
FAILURE  47
CRIMINAL  48
LAWS  49
BEHAVIOR  50
AWARE  51
FRIENDS  52
INCREASE  53
FUN  54.

VARIABLE LABELS
ID 'Case number'
PROMOTE 'Q1 AUC promotes awareness about cyberbullying'
PROFILE 'Q2 I have an active social network profile'
SCHOOL 'Q3 I use the internet at school'
DORM 'Q4 I use the internet in my dorm room'
HOME 'Q5 I use the internet at home'
RECEIVE 'Q6 I have received a threatening message online'
COMMUNI 'Q7 I use the internet to communicate with family and friends'
SENT 'Q8 I have sent a threatening message online'
SEEN 'Q9 I have seen offensive language while socializing with friends online'
ROLE 'Q10 I believe students between the ages of 12-18 have enough role models in their community'
PARTICI 'Q11 I participate in extra-curricular activities at your school'
PARENT 'Q12 My parents have talked with me about how to communicate with others online'
TELEVIS 'Q13 Students would rather be online than watching television'
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WORKSHOP 'Q14 AU Center community should require all students to take a workshop on cyberbullying'
FEMALE 'Q15 I believe males cyberbully more than females'
MALE 'Q16 I believe females cyberbully more than males'
INFORM 'Q17 I would inform my parents if I could not stop myself from being cyberbullied'
WERE 'Q18 I would tell a school staff member if I were to be bullied at school'
WAS 'Q19 I would tell a school staff member if I was bullied at school'
VICTIM 'Q20 I would report to my parents or school staff if I knew a victim of cyberbullying'
AVOID 'Q21 If I were in the environment where someone was being cyberbullied I would avoid or leave the online environment'
CONTRIB 'Q22 If I knew someone was being cyberbullied, I would read the material but not contribute'
COMPLAIN 'Q23 If I knew someone was being cyberbullied I would complain to others but not directly to the cyberbully'
HELP 'Q24 If I knew someone was being cyberbullied I would try to help the victim'
STOP 'Q25 If I knew some was being cyberbullied I would tell the cyberbully to stop the behavior'
PUBLIC 'Q26 If I knew some was being cyberbullied I would support the victim publicly'
DEPRESS 'Q27 Cyberbullying promotes depression'
HATE 'Q28 Cyberbullying promotes hatred'
SUICIDE 'Q29 Cyberbullying promotes suicide'
VIOLENCE 'Q30 Cyberbullying promotes violence'
HARASS 'Q31 Cyberbullying promotes harassment'
FEAR 'Q32 Cyberbullying promotes fear'
MENTAL 'Q33 Cyberbullying promotes mental illness'
RUMOR 'Q34 Cyberbullying promotes rumors'
WOMEN 'Q35 I witnessed online social networking sites sexually explicit images of women'
MEN 'Q36 I witnessed online social networking sites sexually explicit images of men'
CYBERS 'Q37 I witnessed online social networking sites cyberstalking'
FAILURE 'Q38 Cyberbullying causes academic failure'
CRIMINAL 'Q39 Cyberbullying can increase criminal activity'
LAWS 'Q40 Are you aware of any cyberbullying laws'
BEHAVIOR 'Q41 Cyberbullying laws can reduce criminal behavior'
AWARE 'Q42 Social networking sites should promote cyberbullying awareness'
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FRIENDS 'Q43 Social networking sites create positive friendships'
INCREASE 'Q44 Social networking sites increase social networking'
FUN 'Q45 Social networking sites are fun'
AGEGRP 'Q46 My age group'
CLASS 'Q47 My classification'
GENDER 'Q48 My gender'
COLLEGE 'Q49 My college-school'
ATTEND 'Q50 My parents - guardian attended college'
USE 'Q51 I use social media sites on the internet'.

COMPUTE OFENSIVE = (DEPRESS + HATE + SUICIDE) / 3.
COMPUTE BULLYING = (VIOLENCE + HARASS + FEAR) / 3.

VALUE LABELS
PROMOTE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
PROFILE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
SCHOOL
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
DORM
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
HOME
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
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RECEIVE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/

COMMUNI
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/

SENT
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/

SEEN
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/

ROLE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/

PARTICI
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/

PARENT
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/

TELEVIS
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
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4 'Strongly Agree'/
WORKSHOP
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
FEMALE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
MALE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
INFORM
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
WERE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
WAS
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
VICTIM
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
AVOID
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
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3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'
CONTRIB
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'
COMPLAIN
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'
HELP
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'
STOP
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'
PUBLIC
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'
DEPRESS
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'
HATE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'
SUICIDE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response 1</th>
<th>Response 2</th>
<th>Response 3</th>
<th>Response 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIOLENCE</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARASS</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEAR</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENTAL</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUMOR</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYBERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
FAILURE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
CRIMINAL
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
LAWS
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
BEHAVIOR
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
AWARE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
FRIENDS
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
INCREASE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
FUN
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1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
AGEGRP
1 '18-23'
2 '24-31'
3 '32-39'
4 '40 up'/
CLASS
1 'Freshman'
2 'Sophomore'
3 'Junior'
4 'Senior'
5 'MASTERS'
6 'PhD'/
GENDER
1 'Male'
2 'Female'/
COLLEGE
1 'CAU'
2 'Spelman'
3 'Morehouse'/
ATTEND
1 'Yes'
2 'No'/
USE
1 'Yes'
2 'No'/
OFENSIVE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
BULLYING
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
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4 'Strongly Agree'.

RECODE PROMOTE PROFILE SCHOOL DORM HOME RECEIVE COMMUNI
SENT SEEN (1 THRU 2.99=2)(3 THRU 4.99=3).
RECODE ROLE PARTICI PARENT TELEVIS WORKSHOP FEMALE MALE
INFORM WERE WAS VICTIM (1 THRU 2.99=2)(3 THRU 4.99=3).
RECODE AVOID CONTRIB COMPLAIN HELP STOP PUBLIC DEPRESS HATE
SUICIDE VIOLENCE (1 THRU 2.99=2)(3 THRU 4.99=3).
RECODE HARASS FEAR MENTAL RUMOR WOMEN MEN CYBERS FAILURE
CRIMINAL LAWS BEHAVIOR (1 THRU 2.99=2)(3 THRU 4.99=3).
RECODE AWARE FRIENDS INCREASE FUN (1 THRU 2.99=2)(3 THRU 4.99=3).
RECODE OFENSIVE BULLYING (1 THRU 2.99=2)(3 THRU 4.99=3).

MISSING VALUES
PROMOTE PROFILE SCHOOL DORM HOME RECEIVE COMMUNI SENT SEEN
ROLE PARTICI PARENT TELEVIS WORKSHOP FEMALE MALE INFORM WERE
WAS VICTIM
AVOID CONTRIB COMPLAIN HELP STOP PUBLIC DEPRESS HATE SUICIDE
VIOLENCE
HARASS FEAR MENTAL RUMOR WOMEN MEN CYBERS FAILURE CRIMINAL
LAWS BEHAVIOR
AWARE FRIENDS INCREASE FUN AGEGRP CLASS GENDER COLLEGE
ATTEND USE (0).

BEGIN DATA
0010121411232130000144000133344334433111133344000462111
020140411111440014411114444444444111144144232462111
034334434241324412442344434444444333244343261121
04042042314243324444442234444443344223433133262121
0504404141322132111334331444433334413323444462111
06014041431443204443444444444444404143141261112
070200313112202000002223223333332223223333462112
08214111112113213111133134424444411114314313452122
093143411334433433433433334132431333321433451112
01043424242314343312342234434444424444441443125112
0114441412141131343113211444442444444232114343252111
01221412122221232233234444444322232222252122
0134323421323444324321133432213333242333332332351111
0141441414132114313144444244444444444444352111
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01524434141422332323322332244443444433434333344352111
01633314111443231333223344444444433444433452122
017143141314233434321444344312342423431234252111
01814444141312214113221121112322433211222434351111
0192221413132112232133322333332322223333452111
0204444444441113324222442344444444442324344352111
02113313141111111111433323444444444443344152121
02203232321231322222232333233222233233222223233252111
0233422444111322342232322332223322233223112212434443333111333333252111
024114141111111431132113244444444444114114344152111
02524414132413211231232243433323412211232451121
0261144441111111112111112112214234443333111333333252111
02724333131234214443333234443342413344432352121
028244141311114111444441243344443333324444443352121
0292441413123144444444441344444444244251111
030133131211212231114213333333231112111333252111
031444443144443234223111444444444444444112211
0323444414142111214133444444311243434251121
033231422222323333332233333333333223322223333252122
034214131112133233333123333333311112334432352122
035234121411114211114231334444444124234243352121
036114444344444341222322322443333414234444151111
0373333141213322232223332312243142131323333151111
038144441423322243422343444444442234344444152111
039334441413132333333231444444444111333343152121
040244441411214222444411144444444444414414134251111
0411444424234233323323223333332123333333252111
0421444412142322333323123322433333333333151111
0432131413141112332323222343444443211323433152111
0441444444441223412113241422444444413413432251111
0452313231422234223333333332233332223233333251111
0462444414132332233334232133444244442312333452111
04724444324333332232232243444434323233334113111
048144441314213111333231133333132333232211233431211
049334441314131231113324433233314322321334441321
0502131311311213333311332333332411123133332141122
0512333332342233243333333344444324333242112
0521444111141311144444444444444444441114121111111
0531444414421411141112111111144141122444413121
0542434414123333234333324333232241114223333141321
APPENDIX D
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| 055 | 056 | 057 | 058 | 059 | 060 | 061 | 062 | 063 | 064 | 065 | 066 | 067 | 068 | 069 | 070 | 071 | 072 | 073 | 074 | 075 | 076 | 077 | 078 | 079 | 080 | 081 | 082 | 083 | 084 | 085 | 086 | 087 | 088 | 089 | 090 | 091 | 092 | 093 | 094 | 095 | 096 | 097 | 098 | 099 | 100 | 101 | 102 | 103 |
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13414314113233322333334114444443444333113334132121
135233323112333332333234233333333333333131111
13624444242323422333323332344443332324444131121
137333331312322311222333322233333333333131111
138343144441323423221233343332443332423232211
1393444424242444424244444333344433223233132121
1402444413124414314433311233344444344434433132111
1412444424233333222233333343443434444131121
14224444343432222222333333333333333333333132111
14334444142444321242244112444444443124444132121
144244443434144414323232234344444344431433334132111
1451444441144214411344444441444414334132111
14614444142444224122112331433331211121114443132111
1472343131411323232323333233233333132111
14814444343411232232212343124342344344443132111
1491444444441412444411144444444444444412434132111
150244333214242222223233334442323234132111
151143141132311333124444132444444444441433413211
1521444414341314112111314334434444444444444143211
1532321423242313123111222123311322134231211243132121
15434444144443432144444334444443441433124344132111
1551344414241142122111432444444444444444444412434132111
1562111111121121222112221122112444321211211132111
1572444331423243232323332332323444232222333413111
15824444141334313144223444444444444444444432434132111
1592434444313124131432134444444433333333334132111
16023333241413431132232321222222221342111311133231311
1612444424142323233243324444444322323233132221
1621444434244142331432324332444111214444121311
163244441413432244344444444444444444441243413211
164233324141322333323333333333333332423412444121121
16524434142412314444232143444444444444443242444121321
1661444432413122443222331333314422212344412121121
16733033132332323232132333333333333333331333132121
16833433132213232333311334233322233333333312111
16924444241322323232113233332324322423333132121
1704141141441114412344444444444444444444122111
1714444143242131222211241344444331114444412111
1721444434412121211222222222233333333241324123413211
173344144442424222444444444444444444444444122111
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1743444423132343233333323233233332333323233333122111
17534404141444422422322444444444342423434221121
17614441344444141143314414444444444444224444121311
177244441342313223121214343224343333134443121311
178133441312132432232231343444444312232313212111
179224443424121342333433433323344443333333212111
18023333141344432223233333122232333333233312111
18123444332412242224444444424334113333322211
182243314144223333333333333344443333333333222221
18314444441411423342124424444434334134341221121
184244432413232242224333444444423322134431421121
18534443443434331432242243344443433343334122111
18644444441424424444444444444444243434343434412111
18724444141424433232334233342342212313333122111
188244443341343334322333323223334444433433333222111
18923414142132124334224213434244444424324321221
1903144231232324333113234444434431324333122212
1912443121121322233412242444444333343433343331221
19214444141423332311333242244444442134343412111
1932444344241432223233334444444424443424413121321
19414444141441223222112442231342321123143444121321
19514444141413143243444131441444441144141321121
19644443433144344424444442332342444442433412221
1973444444111214223323243444444423313444412221
198344441432343323444443232334444444343333322111
19924443441312332232332432444444243221243441211
200344443444242442444242233334444444444444422331221
201444443214422331333133333432343332334412121
202234333421434324444333342243434444324333331211
2032444423413331143111341134334333433433134441211
204133333232323333323333333323233333232333321221
20513344134131431144224144444444244441444412121
206144443133434334343223344444434344421233431221
2071441414341334342244444444341134134244121321
2081444414144214124123224444444134433331211
2091444444142311444443444444444444441243122111
2103444434233232333332333323333333333312121
2114441414231232432233334434444221344331211
21213333111333333131232132144444444422333331111
213244342214344444444442444444443442434311111
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END DATA.

FREQUENCIES
/VARIABLES PROMOTE PROFILE SCHOOL DORM HOME RECEIVE COMMUNI-
SENT SEEN
ROLE PARTICI PARENT TELEVIS WORKSHOP FEMALE MALE INFORM WERE
WAS VICTIM
AVOID CONTRIB COMPLAIN HELP STOP PUBLIC DEPRESS HATE SUICIDE
VIOLENCE
HARASS FEAR MENTAL RUMOR WOMEN MEN CYBERS FAILURE CRIMINAL
LAWS BEHAVIOR
AWARE FRIENDS INCREASE FUN AGEGRP CLASS GENDER COLLEGE
ATTEND USE
OFFENSIVE BULLYING
/STATISTICS = DEFAULT.
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