“Technology . . . consists of more than structures and machines alone, more than just ‘hardware.’ It includes the uses of those structures and machine in the organization, evolution, and sometimes destruction of society” (Segal, 1994, p.2). Historian Howard Segal’s suggestion that technology developments are a mixed blessing is profound when one considers the phenomenon of cyberbullying. The plethora of affordable technologies, used by Millennials, enhances the need for exploration into how they are used to bully others. This study evaluates the currently accepted definition of cyberbullying.

College undergraduates walk a line between the immature behavior of secondary school and their emerging adulthood. While some research indicated that cyberbullying is most severe in middle school and decreased during secondary school (Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007; Wolak Mitchell, & Finkelhor, 2007; Williams & Guerra, 2007), it is also evident that the college environment is not immune to cyberbullying (Englander, Mills, & McCoy 2009; Finn, 2004; Walker, Sockman, & Koehn, 2010).

The Current Understanding of Cyberbullying

A comprehensive literature review of cyberbullying research, focused on adolescents and young adults, revealed that there is little agreement regarding the wording and incidents that qualify as a bullying event propagated via technology. Most researchers have merely expanded Olweus’ definition to include technology (Burnham et al., 2011; Leenaars & Rinalid, 2010; Wright et al., 2009). Li (2006) considered cyberbullying to be a “bullying problem occurring in new territory” (p. 166). Slonje and Smith (2008) expanded Olweus’ concept of bullying to define cyberbullying as aggression that utilized modern technology specifically the World Wide Web and cell phones.

Spears. Slee, Owens, and Johnson (2009) expressed concern regarding the definition of cyberbullying via their qualitative research with twenty students (aged 12 – 18) and six school counselors in Australia. The authors acknowledged the repetitive nature of Olweus’ definition of bullying as having “common agreement” (p. 153) amongst researchers, yet questioned what the actual concept of repetition involved in the new atmosphere of cyberspace. Students interviewed considered cyberbullying to be something via technology that was used to intimidate or put down another. They described cyberbullying based on its emotional impact with it “sounding cruel, vicious, obscene, torturous, powerful and even silent” (p. 192). Those cyberbullied stated it “felt unnerving, demeaning, inescapable, unsafe, vulnerable, and trapped within a huge power imbalance” (pp. 192 – 193). Repetition was implied via plural responses but not specifically indicated as a necessity to inflict pain.

Other researchers moved away from Olweus and conducted research based on the concepts of harmful or cruel events to provide the different conceptualizations and create a common language (Abbott, 2011; Vandebosch & Van Cleemput, 2008). Terms such as aggressive, intentional, repetitive, willful and repeated, defamatory, and hostile are frequently utilized by researchers working to understand the impact of negative communications (Englander, et al., 2009; Hoff & Mitchell, 2009; Johnson, 2011; Smith, Mahdavi, & Carvalho, 2008).

The reported extent of cyberbullying victims varies greatly in percentages, despite similarities in other demographics such as age, location, and gender. These varying results have increased the necessity for an operational definition for cyberbullying that will be universally accepted and provide more standardized reporting from victims and bullies alike (Abbott, 2011; Vandebosch & Van Cleemput, 2008).
The Emotional Toll of Cyberbullying

The same negative emotions experienced with cyberbullying by teenagers were also reported for young adults. Reports of cyberbullying victimization for college-aged individuals ranged widely from eight to fifty-six percent. The range of those who were cyberbullies was from three to twenty percent. The range of percentages reported for cyberbullying may be due to lack of consistency in data gathered due to a non-standardized definition. One goal of this research is to operationalize the event called “cyberbullying.”

The tragic suicide death of Tyler Clementi, on September 22, 2010, catapulted the discussion of college level Internet victimization and suicide into the mainstream media (Cloud, 2010). Schenk (2011) was the only research article to report on suicide attempts or thoughts. The depth of depression that some victims feel when cyberbullied indicates the necessity for more research to better understand the impact of the proliferation of social media accessibility for college aged individuals.

Cyberbullying on the College Campus

When young adults leave their homes and enter college, they do so with mixed emotions of trepidation and excitement. Venturing onto the college campus with great expectations of good things to come may leave them vulnerable to the unexpected negativity that Internet and cell phone harassment can generate. Although many may believe that cyberbullying was left behind with high school days, Chapell et al. (2006) found that over half of respondents who admitted to being bullies in high school also bullied others at college. Although there is a strong body of empirical literature addressing bullying and a growing amount of research to understand the impact of cyberbullying on teenagers, research on the college level remains limited (Coleyshaw, 2010).

Concern “prompted by shock at the Clementi suicide and the increasing reports of incidents on college campuses” motivated the research of Baldasare, Bauman, Goldman, and Robie (2012, p. 130) which provided qualitative data regarding students understanding of the phenomenon of cyberbullying. The authors analyzed information provided by 30 undergraduate college students (Mage = 20.47, SD = 2.3) to uncover major themes of student understanding of the events of cyberbullying.

Findings indicated that participants were divided in the concept of intent with cyberbullying. “Many participants” (p. 136) indicated that harm may occur unintentionally when a receiver is hurt via messages sent with technology. However, “more participants” (Baldasare et al., 2012, p. 137) replied that the receiver’s interpretation of the event was the defining factor with one student stating, “I think maybe the definition needs to capture, like, really emphasize the way the recipient feels, not necessarily the way the person intended it” (Baldasare et al., 2012, p. 137). In addition, participants considered the ability to post anonymously as a factor in cyberbullying, noting that the lack of face-to-face interaction removed the personal factor, “It’s almost like bullying a machine, so it doesn’t matter” (Baldasare et al., 2012, p. 138). Finally, the respondents consistently identified women as being more involved in cyberbullying than men.

Kenworthy, Brand, and Bartrum (2012) provided a service-learning platform to educate undergraduate college student regarding the incidents and impact of cyberbullying. From September 2010 to January 2011, undergraduate students created informative presentations for over 10,000 students in secondary schools. Utilizing the definition of cyberbullying as “a method of bullying using technology . . . to bully verbally, socially, or psychologically” (p. 86) the authors guided 77 undergraduate students as they researched, designed and performed presentations for secondary students (N=331).

Pre and post-program data from the secondary students indicated a significant difference in their knowledge accuracy regarding bullying and in behavior changes they would adopt to reduce bullying. In addition, the university students indicated a strong value gained from the program. Responses to a post-presentation questionnaire indicated that while 44% had never thought about cyberbullying issues before, 86% noted that the experience would change their online behavior.

Schenk (2011) provided an experiment analysis to determine the psychological impact of cyberbullying victimization for college students. Participants (N = 799) ranged in age from 18 – 24 (Mage=20.01, SD=2.41). This sample was further divided into group of “victims” (replied yes to having experienced cyberbullying at least four times) and a control group (n=69). No significant differences were found in the demographics between experimental and control groups.

Results indicated victims of cyberbullying were significantly higher in depression, anxiety, phobic anxiety, and paranoid subscales. In addition, 5.7% of victims (n=4) reported attempting suicide (control = 0%) and 10.1% had frequent suicidal ideations (control = 0%). Interestingly, phone calls were the most prevalent media of victimization (80%) of the five measured (text messaging, Internet, picture/video messaging, and masquerading).
The most common attack for both genders was an attack on their self-worth. The victims of cyberbullying were likely to victimize others.

An investigation of the use of technology to cyberbully was conducted by Walker, Sockman, and Koehn (2011). Students (N=131) were surveyed and results indicated that up to 54% of respondents knew someone who had been cyberbullied. One hundred percent of male participants knew someone who had been cyberbullied. Eleven percent (n=14) had been cyberbullied, with 14% of those (n=2) having been bullied over ten times.

Smith, Grimm, Lombard, and Wolfe (2012) surveyed 340 undergraduate students. Results indicated that 37% of respondents knew someone who had been cyberbullied, 3% (n=10) admitted to being a cyberbully and 16.7% were the target of cyberbullying. Statistical significance was noted in four areas. Students who self-identified as being a member of a Greek society were significantly more likely to observe someone they knew being targeted by cyberbullying. A significant relationship was also noted with college living arrangements; students living off-campus were more likely to know someone who had been cyberbullied than on-campus individuals. Though not hypothesized, the authors noted statistically significance in the response of female and non-heterosexual students in being more likely to know someone who had been cyberbullied in college.

Theoretical Perspective of Social Dominance Theory

Social Dominance Theory explains the impact of the social order of dominant attitudes based on society at large (Creswell, 2009; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). The “theoretical catholicism” of the Social Dominance theory can be utilized to understand the aspects of social actions that range from “acts of mobbing in the playground, to mild forms of prejudice and street gang violence.” (Pratto, Sidanius, & Levin, 2006, p. 57).

Human society provides an inherent group-based structure in which dominant and subordinate hierarchies reside. These hierarchies are established and maintained through legitimizing myths. In society, hierarchy-enhancing myths (HE myths) are those noted to support the inequality that is inherent to group-based hierarchical system. Often focused on individual responsibility, the Protestant work ethic, and political conservatism, individuals who support HE myths believe that position in society was earned and therefore deserved. Contrary to HE myths are the hierarchy-attenuating myths (HA myths). HA myths are noted to support equality and are based in the major themes of socialism, feminism, and universal rights of mankind (Pratto et al., 2006; Pratto et al., 1994). To determine the extent that each individual accepts or applies HE and HA myths to their daily lives, one must evaluate the concept of Social Dominance Ordinance (SDO).

SDO is the measure of an individual’s general willingness towards endorsing legitimizing myths to support or deny group-based hierarchies. The behavior of individuals is connected to the levels of social power of each group.

Social Dominance Ordinance and Gender

Research has indicated a relationship between SDO and gender. Studies have indicated a significant difference in the SDO level between genders, with men having a higher SDO than women (Caricati, 2007; Dambrun, Duarte, & Guimond, 2004; Foels & Reid, 2010; Pratto et al., 2006; Pratto, et al., 1994; Zakrisson, 2008). These findings prompt this researcher to hypothesize a higher level of victimization from men than women.

Social Dominance Ordinance and College Major

Pratto et al. (1994) provided data to better understand what academic interests individuals had and correlated those findings to SDO levels. Eleven samples, collected from the spring 1990 through April 1992, provided data from 1, 747 college students from universities in the United States. Men scored significantly higher than women in SDO levels.

In addition, the researchers queried the respondents’ post-college career preference. Using a theoretical basis, 20 career choices were provided and demarcated as hierarchy enhancing (HE) or hierarchy attenuating (HA) (p. 747). Results supported the hypothesis that participants who planned HA careers were lower in SDO levels than those interested in HE career paths, even after controlling for gender. Research results have indicated a correlation between college major, gender, and SDO. An analysis of the relationship between college major and cyberbullying is imperative.
Method

In keeping with the representative research that has addressed cyberbullying on the college campus a descriptive study was conducted utilizing a survey instrument (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .761$).

Although the term cyberbullying was not utilized for the majority of the data gathered to prevent participant self-selection bias (Akbulut & Eristi, 2011; Juvonen & Gross, 2008), it was provided for the final question in the survey when the definition of Walker et al. (2011) defined cyberbullying as:

The use of interactive technologies such as social networking sites, cell phones (text, video, voice, or picture messaging), instant messaging, or other newly developed technology-based communication tools. These tools are used to deliberately and repeatedly deliver slanderous, harassing, obsessive, or obscene messages that result in harm to the recipient (p. 37).

Sample, Population, and Participants

A random, cross-sectional sample for this research was drawn from the population of college students at a mid-size public university. Following IRB approval, data collection was facilitated via Qualtrics™ via the college email service. Seventy percent of participants ($N= 438$) were female and 30% were male. Participants were limited to individuals between the ages of 18 – 24. To assure that this study was adequately able to detect effect, a priori power analysis was conducted.

Cohen’s (1988) tables indicated the necessity for a sample of over 200 to analyze correlation data and 64 participants for each group in the independent samples $t$ test to achieve an 80% probability of detecting a real effect (20% probability of Type II error) with a medium effect size (.30). A sample of 370 respondents was determined to generalize findings to the campus population of approximately 11,000 undergraduate students (Patten, 2009). When two groups differ in terms of sample size, the harmonic mean of the two is used to determine whether the a priori per-group sample size for $t$ tests has been met. Each measure exceeded the predetermined participant size with the exception of the cyberbully variable, which was within acceptable limits ($M_H = 57.6$).

Results

Data analysis consisted of descriptive statistics, coefficient correlations, and independent samples $t$ tests. Crosstabulation data were analyzed to indicate the level of emotional response reported by respondents who had experienced the fourteen cyberbullying items only one time (See Table 1). The percentage of individuals reporting feeling moderately to extremely hurt after only one incident ranges from 25 to 89 (See Table 1).
Table 1
Crosstabulation of Respondents Moderately to Extremely Hurt, Angry, or Sad After Being Cyberbullied One Time (N=438)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Hurt/Sad</th>
<th>Angry</th>
<th>Scared</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Total n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received Unwanted, Inappropriate Messages</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Unwanted, Pornographic Images</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replied Unknowingly to Someone Posing as Someone Else</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Friend “Friended” for Information</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Harassing or Threatening Messages</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replied Unknowingly to Someone Posing as Someone Else</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Friend “Friended” for Information</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Harassing or Threatening Messages</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Unwanted, Inappropriate Messages</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Unwanted, Pornographic Images</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replied Unknowingly to Someone Posing as Someone Else</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Friend “Friended” for Information</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Harassing or Threatening Messages</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teased Due to Physical Appearance, Personality or Intelligence</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassed Due to Sexuality</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of Untrue Gossip or Humiliating Comments</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had Problems Due to Personal Information Shared w/o Consent</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Outed”</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocked Online</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private, Personal Images Shared w/o Consent</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other People Used Your Identity w/o Consent</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been Cyberbullied</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of respondents selecting occurrences of one or more times for the thirteen relational bullying questions (RBS) questions ranged from 1.1 to 29.7%. When provided with the definition of cyberbullying as: “Social media and/or cell phones, used to deliberately and repeatedly deliver slanderous, harassing, obsessive or obscene messages that result in harm to the recipient,” only 9.9% of respondents selected occurrences of one or more times.

An analysis of the correlation between the response rates of the thirteen RBS questions to the direct question “have you been cyberbullied”(CBR) is also an important aspect of determining the accuracy of the current
definition (See Table 3). If respondents answer yes to any of the thirteen questions, they should also answer yes to the “been cyberbullied” question.

Table 3

Correlation Between Being Cyberbullied Response (CBR) With Relational Cyberbullying Scales (RBS) (N=403)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson R</th>
<th>Spearman Rho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received Unwanted, Inappropriate Messages</td>
<td>.212***</td>
<td>.224***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Unwanted, Pornographic Images</td>
<td>.230***</td>
<td>.264***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replied Unknowingly to Someone Posing as Someone Else</td>
<td>.200***</td>
<td>.215***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Friend “Friended” for Information</td>
<td>.231***</td>
<td>.229***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Harassing or Threatening Messages</td>
<td>.504***</td>
<td>.429***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teased or Made Fun of Due to Physical Appearance, Personality or Intelligence</td>
<td>.414***</td>
<td>.311***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassed Due to Sexuality</td>
<td>.099*</td>
<td>.243***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of Untrue Gossip or Humiliating Comments</td>
<td>.483***</td>
<td>.329***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had Problems Due to Personal Information Shared w/o Consent</td>
<td>.191***</td>
<td>.134**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Outed”</td>
<td>.215***</td>
<td>.251***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocked by others</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private, Personal Images Shared w/o Consent</td>
<td>.157**</td>
<td>.163**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other People Used Your Identity w/o Consent</td>
<td>.249***</td>
<td>.219***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
**p < .01  
***p < .001  
Interpretation Guidelines: Small r=.10 to .29; Medium r=.30 to .49; Large r=.50 to 1.0  

Two supporting hypotheses were posed in relation to connection of the Social Dominance Theory and a person’s desire to dominate others via social media and other technologies.

H1: College-aged men will report a higher level of cyberbullying others than will college-aged women.

When responses were reviewed utilizing a crosstabs analysis 6.9% of female respondents (n = 20) had cyberbullied others one or more times compared to male respondents at 9.6% (n = 11). An independent samples t test was conducted to compare the cyberbullying occurrences for males and females. There was no significant difference in scores for males (M = 1.10, SD = .3) and females (M = 1.07, SD = .25; t (401) = .925, p = .36. These data results indicate that the concept of SDO, or the need to be dominant, is not supported for gender.
H2: College students enrolled in HE majors will report a higher level of cyberbullying others than those in HA majors.

A second method for delineating the impact of SDO on cyberbullying is presented via an analysis of SDO correlated with college major. An independent samples t test was analyzed to determine the difference of major and amount of self-reported cyberbullying behaviors. There was no significant difference in scores for HE Majors (M = 1.08, SD = .3) and HA Majors (M = 1.08, SD = .03; t (384) = -.020, p = .98. These data results signified that the concept of SDO, or the need to be dominant, was not supported.

Discussion

This chapter is approached with all of the reverence and concern necessary when one is dealing with the emotions of youth. The following discussion is viewed through the lens of the researcher, a social media and communications expert.

The research question focused on the necessity for a re-definition of cyberbullying based in empirical data. Much of past cyberbullying research on the undergraduate campus utilized the parameters created by Olweus that established traditional bullying as negative actions that are intentional and repeated to inflict harm on another person (1986, 1991, as stated in Olweus, 1993, p. 9). Researchers have called into question this definition and this author concurs (Abbott, 2011; Vandebosch & Van Cleemput, 2008).

Up to thirty percent of respondents (n = 130) had experienced cyberbullying at least once via web-based communications and hand-held technologies. The impact of cyberbullying only one time is widespread. Young adults, on the college campus need the support of administration, counselors, and educators based on the emotional impact the cyberbullying has on them – not dependent on the act being repeated.

When are negative, hurtful, threatening or mean comments hosted on the Internet or sent via hand-held technology cyberbullying? When one reviews the results noted in this study, it is impossible to overlook the 25 to 89 percent of respondents (Table 1) who experienced feeling hurt, sad, angry, or scared after being cyberbullied one time. Whether being stalked via Facebook friends or sent harassing, threatening messages participants are feeling emotional upset due to these events. Respondents who report feeling “very hurt,” “scared,” or those who have an incident that “ruined my trust . . .” must be heard and understood.

While not the desire of this author to use emotionally charged events, it seems one would be remiss in not presenting the data available from the death of Tyler Clementi. In August 2010, two young men left home to step on the college campus for the first time, to forever have their lives changed. Though we will never know the thoughts of Tyler Clementi in detail, his suicide shortly after learning that Darun Ravi used his webcam to spy on Clementi speaks volumes (Sloan, 2012).

This single incident, on September 19, 2010, changed both lives forever. Clementi asked Ravi to leave their dorm room that evening when Clementi was entertaining a male friend. Ravi remotely accessed the webcam on his computer, left in the room, to view Clementi and his guest. Ravi was interviewed on abc20/20 and expressed his thoughts regarding the incident. Following the webcam viewing, Ravi tweeted to all of his friends. Ravi’s response, when asked why he sent it is profound, “I wanted to let all my friends from back home know. In my head, that’s just how Twitter [sic] – we can still all be involved with each other’s life.” Ravi stated, “what most people type is wrapped with seven layers of sarcasm and another layer of irony.” Whether Ravi intended to be a cyberbully or not, two lives have been forever changed (Sloan, 2012).

The author acknowledges that cyberbullying may be an intentional act, deliberately conducted to hurt or scare the recipient. However, these findings indicate that the current use of the traditional bullying definition (Olweus, 1993) to understand the impact of bullying behaviors in cyberspace is not comprehensive. This researcher feels that the necessity to re-define cyberbullying is at the forefront of concern to assure that all acts of cyberbullying; whether intentional and repeated or a single, random event; are recognized. This will allow victims to advocate for themselves and receive the help necessary.

This concern is supported by qualitative research conducted by Baldasare et al. (2012) with most participants stating that the receiver’s interpretation of the event should provide the defining factor. Spears et al. (2009) utilized triangulation of qualitative data to evaluate the human dimensions of cyberbullying. Participants reported cyberbullying as looking like “ostracism, exclusion, and intimidation” (p. 192) and sounding “cruel, vicious, obscene, torturous, and powerful” (p. 192). In addition, cyberbullying felt “unnerving, demeaning, inescapable, and unsafe” (p. 193). Vandebosch and Van Cleemput (2008) also utilized qualitative research with 53 focus groups. When asked to define cyberbullying, the participants noted events such as spreading personal
conversations, gossip, manipulating and sending personal pictures, sending messages with sexual comments, or humiliating someone online.

This study garnered expressions of emotions that included embarrassment, creepy, scary, stalkerish, derogatory, racist, anger, hurt, and frustrating. Therefore, the following definition is proffered:

Cyberbullying is the use of web-based communication media or hand-held technologies by an individual or group to deliver slanderous, harassing, demeaning, obscene, racist or other offensive messages, images, or video either directly or indirectly that result in emotional harm to the target of the communication.

Conclusion

As society moves forward, it is through the education of our youth regarding these new communication challenges and how to deal with them that the future will be improved. Cyberbullying is not old wine in a new bottle. It is a new challenge that must be addressed as such with a new definition and education for Millennials.

One method proposed by this author would be through the use of college curriculum to provide a required, hybrid college communication course to address communicating with technology and doing so with decency. This course would encompass interpersonal, intercultural, and social media communication theories to provide a basis for the orientation and integration of social media ethics and etiquette in curriculum, lifestyle, and in business and career.

Research conducted by Kenworthy et al. (2102) provided the second consideration. A service-learning platform, utilized to educate undergraduate college students while working with secondary students, to advance their knowledge of how to recognize, avoid, and address cyberbullying should be considered as a vital part of the undergraduate college experience.

In closing, this author sincerely hopes that all who read this study benefit. No more powerful words can be reiterated than those of Ravi, “I just wish I had talked to him more . . .“ (Sloan, 2012).
References


