Chapter 12

Racial and ethnic diversity in the social ecology of online harassment and cybervictimization: the adolescent–school context

Gia Elise Barboza[1] **and Lawrence B. Schiamberg**[2]
[1]*School of Public Affairs, University of Colorado Colorado Springs, Colorado Springs, CO, United States,* [2]*Human Development and Family Studies, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, United States*

Introduction

An increasingly serious concern for many youth who are negotiating the normative challenges of adolescence in the school context involves the threat of cyberbullying. A full understanding of the dynamics of cyberbullying and the development of effective interventions requires an appreciation of the contributions of the multiple contexts, or the ecology of cyberbullying, including the family, peer group, school, and neighborhood/community (Barboza et al., 2009; Espelage & Swearer, 2009). Given that school experiences and peer relationships therein are central in the lives of adolescents, considerable attention has been directed at the school and peer context of cyberbullying (Barboza, 2015). Much less research attention, however, has been directed toward understanding racial and ethnic diversity and its relationship to cyberbullying and other online risk behaviors, in the school context.

With reference to the role of the school context in facilitating or inhibiting online risk, it is useful to recognize that many adolescents participate in multiple microsystems involving interpersonal contact that includes in-person interactions (e.g., school, family, or peer based), virtual contact (e.g., social media, not location specific), or some combination of both. These factors are relevant for understanding how online risks (i.e., hate speech in the cyberbullying context) link to other factors such as racial and ethnic diversity

Child and Adolescent Online Risk Exposure. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-817499-9.00012-0

in schools that target certain populations only (e.g., Black students). In turn, understanding the dimensions of both the virtual experience of adolescent participation in social media and the in-person adolescent participation in the school context is relevant to understanding and preventing cyberbullying victimization in a variety of interpersonal interactions that carry devastating long-term psychosocial consequences and reproduce structural inequality and racism in different settings.

Using the ecological perspective to bullying as a guiding framework (Barboza et al., 2009; Espelage & Swearer, 2009), this chapter will focus on the constellation of factors that characterize school environments as the immediate and focal contexts (i.e., the microsystem) for understanding the landscape of cyberbullying victimization risk among students of color (Veenstra et al., 2007). A review of research will in turn examine the critical dimensions of cyberbullying in relation to online harassment, connecting it with (1) broader school factors, including the constellation of actors and roles that involve cyberbullying incidents and which frame the adolescent–school context; (2) characteristics of the microsystem participants—adolescents and schools; (3) factors that influence the quality of the adolescent–school relationship; (4) policy contexts that influence adolescent experiences beyond the adolescent–school microsystem. The latter includes research connecting cyberbullying to the broader system of structural inequality in school policy and practice as well as the developmental assets (e.g., individual characteristics and connection to external supports, including the family and community resources), frequently associated with positive youth development (PYD; Benson, Mannes, Pittman, Ferher, 2004; Lerner et al., 2005).

This chapter presents a socioecological framework to investigate the accumulation of risk contributors and protective factors in relation to cyberbullying and online harassment at school and victimization based on the race of minority youth. More specifically, we examine the risk and protective factors occurring in the microsystem (i.e., parents, peers, school, and community), exosystem (parental stress), and macrosystem levels (gender role beliefs and stereotypes). We then discuss the implications for research and school-based practice.

A social framework for the adolescent–school context

Cyberaggression, cyberbullying, and online hate

Studies from the Pew Research Center show that almost 91% of teens use the Internet at least occasionally (Lenhart, 2009). The most common online social media spaces for adolescents include Facebook (71%), Instagram (52%), Snapchat (41%), and Twitter (33%). Youth who access social media websites are highly likely to experience bullying online. Research shows that

88% of the online populations have witnessed someone being mean or cruel to another person and 26% have been the target of online harassment (Lenhart et al., 2015).

Cyberbullying uses electronic communications such as e-mail, cell phones, text messages, and Internet sites by an individual or group of individuals to repeatedly threaten, harass, embarrass, or socially exclude someone of less power (Li, 2007; Olweus, 1993a, 1993b; Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007; Sampasa-Kanyinga, Roumeliotis, & Xu, 2014; Wang, Iannotti, & Nansel, 2009). Cyberbullying has been defined as "willful and repeated harm" (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010, p. 5) inflicted toward another. Similar to traditional face-to-face (F2F) bullying, cyberbullying involves repetition, harmful behavior, and power imbalance. With cyberbullying, however, these characteristics are qualitatively different. For example, repetition may occur because material such as e-mail, text, or pictures can be viewed by anyone with online access (Campbell, 2005; Slonje & Smith, 2008) even without the knowledge or endorsement of the original actors. As well, the same communication can be repeated a number of times through mass communication. The difficulty associated with removing unwanted or harmful communication as well as its permanency reinforces the power imbalance and repetitiveness of the cyberbully–cybervictim interaction (Wolak, Mitchell, & Finkelhor, 2007), thereby intensifying the impact of the harm caused. The anonymity of the interaction also makes online victimization qualitatively distinct from F2F bullying. Anonymity empowers perpetrators by lowering inhibitions and individual restraint (D'Ovidio & Doyle, 2003).

Not surprisingly, studies have shown that online harassment and cyberbullying motivated by racist ideology and discrimination are even more common when the perpetrator's identity is unknown. Cyberbullying may include the components of racial discrimination, in some instances rising to the level of a hate crime when victims are targeted based on their sexual orientation and/or membership in a particular racial/ethnic group (Childnet International, 2016). **Tynes, Seaton and Zuckerman** (2015) define online racial discrimination as denigrating or excluding individuals or groups on the basis of race through the use of symbols, voice, video, images, text, and graphic representations. Likewise, online hate crimes target individuals on the basis of their race and include engaging in one or more of the following activities: stalking, harassment, and/or unauthorized publishing of sexually explicit photographs among other activities. Both cyberbullying and hate crimes include the components of online discrimination. Online discrimination often resembles traditional F2F discrimination and includes being disrespected or being called race-related names (Gaylord-Harden & Cunningham, 2009; Roberts et al., 2012; Umaña-Taylor, Wong, Gonzales, & Dumka, 2012). Online discrimination may be directly experienced (also called individual experiences) by victims or may be vicariously experienced or witnessed (Tynes, Giang, Williams, & Thompson, 2008).

Research on bullying, online hate crimes, and harassment coincide with research on racial discrimination online because each measure whether and how frequently online experiences are based on the victim's personal characteristics. A recent study by the Pew Research Center found that 23% of harassment that is motivated by race includes severe behaviors such as sustained harassment, physical threats, or stalking (Duggan, 2017). Moreover, 25% of African Americans and 10% of Latino adults are harassed because of the victims' perceived race. Research has shown that the prevalence of online stalking is highest among people of color, with the highest rates occurring among teens (Baum, 2011). The relationship between online hate, harassment, and cyberbullying is illustrated by Ybarra and Mitchell (2004), in which a youth was targeted for the purpose of embarrassing and humiliating him: "They were mad at me and they made a hate page about me" (p. 1308). Recent increases in online hate coupled with the fact that 95% of adolescents between the ages of 12 and 17 have access to the Internet (Tynes et al., 2014; Lenhart et al., 2011) suggest that increasingly more youth of color will be subjected to discriminatory online treatment with significant implications for healthy developmental outcomes (Kahn, Spencer, & Glaser, 2013; Tynes et al., 2014). Therefore there is a pressing need to systematically understand and conceptualize the multiple overlapping characteristics of discriminatory online treatment among historically marginalized groups.

Prevalence of cyberbullying among youth of color

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, cyberbullying is a major public health concern among adolescents. Cyberbullying poses a significant risk for poor developmental outcomes including detrimental physical health and emotional well-being and internalizing and externalizing behaviors. Very few researchers have explored the unique experiences of online harassment and cyberbullying among the youth of color (Edwards, Kontostathis, & Fisher, 2016; Hinduja & Patchin, 2010; Juvonen, Graham, & Schuster, 2003; Low & Espelage, 2013; Wang, Iannotti, Luk, & Nansel, 2010). The few studies that do exist are inconsistent and hence little is known about racial/ethnic differences in bullying risk (Spriggs, Iannotti, Nansel, & Haynie, 2007). Some research has shown that youth of color have a lower risk of cyberbully victimization. Earlier studies, for example, found that Black and Latino youth report lower levels of cybervictimization and cyberbullying compared to their White peers. In a review of research conducted by Edwards et al. (2016), the authors estimated the prevalence of cybervictimization ranged 4%−17%, 6%−13%, and 18%−30% among Black, Latino, and White youth, respectively. Other studies have found that while the lifetime prevalence of cybervictimization is lower among the youth of color, they are more likely to experience repeat victimization

(Hanish & Guerra, 2002) and/or to experience polyvictimization from both F2F and cyberbullying (Barboza, 2015). Consistent with the general literature on victimization, more recent research demonstrates that the prevalence of victimization by cyberbullying is higher among racial and ethnic minority youth. Research conducted by Hinduja and Patchin (2018) confirms significant racial differences in cyberbullying victimization and suggests that observed racial similarities between groups belie true differences among non-Whites. In particular, multiracial females have the highest risk for experiencing cyberbullying in both high school (209.5 out of 1000) and middle school (186 out of 1000) compared to other demographic subgroups. Similarly, other studies have shown that 29% of African American adolescents and 42% of multiracial or other ethnic minority adolescents (including Latinos) have been the victims of online racial discrimination (Tynes et al., 2008) and that these experiences accumulate over time (Tynes et al., 2015).

Given the increasing amount of time that adolescents and young adults spend online, experiences of racial discrimination through the Internet have implications for developmental outcomes over the long term (Tynes et al., 2008). Children who are victimized are more likely to report increased levels of internalizing symptoms such as depression, suicidal ideation, and loneliness, not only in middle (Seals & Young, 2003) and high school (Peskin, Tortolero, Markham, Addy, & Baumler, 2007) but also for years afterward. Past research has repeatedly shown that cyberbullying and online discrimination, harassment, and victimization are associated with a number of poor psychosocial sequelae including a variety of internalizing (i.e., depressive symptoms, anxiety) and externalizing (i.e., lower academic motivation, poor school outcomes, increased problem behavior, and aggression) symptoms (Edwards et al., 2016; Tynes et al., 2008, 2014; Tynes, Hiss, Ryan, & Rose, 2015; Umaña-Taylor, Tynes, Toomey, Williams, & Mitchell, 2015). Therefore understanding the patterns of cyberbullying risks for the already vulnerable and marginalized African American youth population is critical (Cho, Lee, Peguero, & Park, 2019), especially in light of research showing that, for them, experiencing online racial discrimination contributes uniquely to adjustment outcomes over and above offline experiences (Tynes et al., 2015).

An ecological model of cyberbullying among the youth of color

Seeking to provide explanations for why individuals are targeted for victimization, studies have focused on the broader relational, cultural, and structural relationships between systems rather than narrowly conceptualized individual-level factors in isolation (Gumpel, Zioni-Koren, & Bekerman, 2014; Sokoloff & Dupont, 2005; Teräsahjo & Salmivalli, 2003; Thornberg, 2011). The socioecological perspective situates individual-level

characteristics (e.g., race, class, gender, ability) with contextual oppressive forces (e.g., racism, classism, sexism, ableism) to understand the underlying causes of victimization and oppression (Bucchianeri, Eisenberg, & Neumark-Sztainer, 2013; Gumpel et al., 2014). Few research endeavors have used a socioecological framework to explore the individual and contextual correlates of cyberbullying and cybervictimization among the youth of color specifically, however. One exception is a study conducted by Cho et al. (2019) who documented the complex set of individual and contextual factors that insulate or exacerbate the risk of cyberbullying and cybervictimization among African American youth. Nevertheless, a broad class of individual-environment youth violence theoretical models suggests that numerous characteristics of both individuals and environments contribute to the likelihood of being targeted (e.g., Kochenderfer-Ladd, Ladd, & Kochel, 2009) by cyberbullies in online contexts. The two sections below situate two critical contexts—*individual factors* and *family* in the socioecological model. The section following that discussion will address, in detail, the focus of this paper, the elements of the adolescent−school microsystem.

Individual

Studies exploring gender differences in cyberbullying have been contradictory as some studies have shown that girls are more likely to be cybervictims, some show that boys are more likely to be cybervictims, and others report no gender differences in cybervictimization. These conflicting findings may be due to the failure to disaggregate cybervictimization by subtype and or according to the race or ethnicity of the victim. Girls, for example, are more likely to report receiving unwanted messages of a sexually explicit nature compared to boys. As noted above, Patchin and Hinduja found that multiracial females and Black and multiracial males are more likely to be victims of cyberbullying compared to their White counterparts. A recent study examining students' reasons for why they were bullied reported that students' physical and nonphysical characteristics related to race (e.g., skin color and membership in an oppressed group) were significant reasons for being targeted (Gardella, Fisher, Teurbe-Tolon, Ketner, & Nation, 2019).

Unlike traditional bullying, youth who are victimized by cyberbullying tend to be older and come from more socially advantaged and/or affluent backgrounds. Time spent online has been associated with increased risk of both cyberbullying, due to increased opportunities to access the Internet (Tynes et al., 2014) and online racial discrimination, as well as poor psychosocial outcomes (Tynes et al., 2008). Studies have shown that a strong sense of racial identity and high levels of self-esteem can buffer the negative impact of online victimization based specifically on race (Tynes, Umana-Taylor, Rose, Lin, & Anderson, 2012).

Family context

Positive parent–youth relationship and parenting practices are contributing factors to cyberbully victimization (Livingstone & Smith, 2014; Mishna, Khoury-Kassabri, Gadalla, & Daciuk, 2012; Wang et al., 2009) and point to the importance of gender-specific differences in parent–adolescent relationships and their associations with cyberbullying victimization among the youth of color (Navarro, Larrañaga, & Yubero, 2016). Youth whose parents do not monitor their online activity are more likely to be victims of cyberbullying in general (Mishna et al., 2012; Rice et al., 2015). Cho and colleagues, for example, found a negative association between father's monitoring behaviors of Internet activity and cybervictimization in Black adolescents' cyberbullying involvement (Mishna et al., 2012; Rice et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2009). Similarly, African American youth who report having their father's attention and care have been shown to have very low levels of involvement in cyberbullying, as victims or bullies. Previous studies have shown that both parents' and adolescents' reports of communication, and also parents' gender, differentially influence the associations among parental communication and cyberbullying behaviors. Research has also emphasized the importance of adolescents' perceived communication problems with their mothers in accounting for differences in cyberbullying victimization among Black youth. Taken together, these studies show that lack of parental monitoring behaviors, especially among fathers, and communicative problems, particularly with mothers, interact with youth's individual characteristics (i.e., race and gender) to explain cyberbully involvement among the youth of color.

Adolescent–school microsystem

Existing research has consistently shown that the interpersonal and institutional settings in which student interactions take place play an important role in the psychosocial functioning of students. A full understanding of the complexity of bullying involves the appreciation of contexts beyond the immediate family, such as focusing on schools as places for cyberbully–victim relationships to develop and for fostering environments in which online racism and discrimination may flourish. Researchers conceptualize bullying (Craig & Pepler, 2007) and cyberbullying (Hoff & Mitchell, 2009; Mishna, Saini, & Solomon, 2009) as part of the broader context of embedded socioecological relationships. Accordingly, theorizing about bullying behaviors in children and adolescents implicates both individual and contextual factors (Barboza et al., 2009), particularly given the role that the Internet plays in addressing youth's social, relational, and academic needs (Cho et al., 2019; Hinduja & Patchin, 2012). For example, bullying, including cyberbullying, which is viewed as an activity that takes place outside of school, is related to

poor outcomes in school, alienation from school activities, and the greater likelihood of aggressive behavior *at school* (Barboza, 2015). The school environment, as well, has been described as a place where students' beliefs about violence are formed and where students learn to model the behavior of their peers and adults (Osterman, 2000). Therefore schools are key for understanding the complexity of cyberbullying and for developing sensitive and effective interventions (Barboza et al., 2009; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998; Garbarino & DeLara, 2004; Limber, 2006).

School climate

The school climate is often described by the quality and nature of the interactions between students and adults within the broader school community (Mitchell, Bradshaw, & Leaf, 2010). Dimensions of school climate in victimization studies, in particular, have included school connectedness (i.e., attachments, attitude, safety, and fair treatment), engagement (i.e., attention, interest, and investment), and school outcomes (i.e., academic achievements; Barboza & Siller, 2018). As a measure of school connectedness, discrimination refers to negative or unfair treatment based on a social identity, such as race, gender, socioeconomic status, or sexual orientation (Spears Brown & Bigler, 2005). When it occurs in the school context, discrimination affects student's unique experiences of school climate (fairness, equity in sharing of resources, student interpersonal relations, and student−teacher relations) and may facilitate the development of bullying behaviors. A number of studies have found that racial minorities, sexual minorities, and youth with disabilities are at risk for lower school engagement and academic achievement in part due to their experiences with discrimination (Byrd & Andrews, 2016). Students who perceive online discrimination at school have lower levels of school engagement and academic achievement, experience decreases in academic motivation (Tynes et al., 2015), and have worse mental health outcomes (Schmitt, Branscombe, Postmes, & Garcia, 2014; Wong, Eccles, & Sameroff, 2003). For example, Benner and Graham (2013) found that for a sample of Latino, African American, and Asian American youth, discrimination from adults was associated with poorer grades and lower levels of school engagement, whereas discrimination from peers was inversely associated with psychological well-being. Moreover, Hinduja and Patchin (2012) found that middle and high school students who experienced cybervictimization reported poorer perceptions of school climate (e.g., less school commitment, sense of belonging, and poor relationships with students and teachers) compared to students who reported no involvement in cyberbullying or victimization. As well, more positive individual and overall experiences of the school climate at the beginning of the school year translated into less cybervictimization by the end of the year controlling for experiences with F2F victimization. Moreover, students who perceived the school as being unfair or

without an unequal distribution of resources were more likely to report cybervictimization. Taken together, the research suggests that negative experiences of school climate are directly related to cybervictimization, as students are less likely to seek help to stop the experiences of cybervictimization, and indirectly as cybervictimization mediates the relationship between poor school climate and positive academic outcomes.

Social support at school

The school is a key social context where peer relationships develop in early adolescence (i.e., student interpersonal relations). Research suggests that the quality of student interpersonal relations is the strongest predictor of traditional victimization (Harel-Fisch et al., 2011). Like traditional forms of victimization, cybervictimization occurs within the context of peer groups that develop within the school environment. Peers involved in relationships that develop at school continue to communicate online outside of school hours (Subrahmanyam, Smahel, & Greenfield, 2006). Among African American youth, research has shown that spending less time with friends and/or talking about problems with friends was associated with less cybervictimization, which also shows the important role friends play in protecting them from harm occurring online.

Bullying, cyberbullying, and internalizing behavior at school

Previous research has shown that a wide variety of school characteristics are associated with the presence of both bullying and cyberbullying. These include school-related stressors (e.g., unreasonable expectations of student performance), teacher apathy and/or lack of support, school atmosphere (e.g., feelings of belonging, fair rules), the broader peer environment including both the presence of peers (Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Craig & Pepler, 2007) and the nature of peer-to-peer relationships (Barboza et al., 2009). In comparison to nonvictimized youth, cyberbullied youth report more internalizing behaviors (Beran & Li, 2008), have greater difficulty navigating social interactions (Blais, 2008; Ybarra, Mitchell, Wolak, & Finkelhor, 2006), and are more likely to experience substance use (Mishna, Cook, Gadalla, Daciuk, & Solomon, 2010) and eating disorders (DeHue, Bolman, & Völlink, 2008; Fosse & Holen, 2006). Students who are bullied in cyberspace only and students bullied both in cyberspace and at school experience difficulties at school, such as low marks, poor concentration, and absenteeism (Beran & Li, 2008). Moreover, they are less able to concentrate at school (Beran & Li, 2005; Juvonen & Gross, 2008), which may result in missing school (Ybarra, Diener-West, & Leaf, 2007) and receiving detentions and suspensions (Wolak et al., 2007; Ybarra et al., 2007) among victims. Differences in frequency and type of victimization may be the important determining factors

for predicting compromised psychosocial ability and academic performance characteristics of victimhood status. Multiple studies have found an association between experiences of online discrimination, harassment, and cybervictimization and higher internalizing (Tynes et al., 2008, 2014, 2015) behavior among the youth of color. Other research has shown that victimization experiences are related to less school integration (Barboza, 2015). In particular, Barboza (2015) demonstrated that a variety of victimhood statuses of cyberbullying and F2F bullying are associated with absenteeism, skipping classes, and avoiding school-based activities due to fear of being attacked or harmed *online*. Moreover, students who were victims of multiple cooccurring bullying behaviors were significantly at risk for avoiding school-based activities specifically due to fear of victimization.

Bullying, cyberbullying, and externalizing behavior at school

Research has shown that bully−victim relationships underlie the majority of childhood assaults, including homicides, with bully−victims at risk for perpetrating these violent and aggressive acts. Anderson et al. (2001) studied school-associated violent deaths in the United States between 1994 and 1999 and found that homicide perpetrators are more than twice as likely as homicide victims to have been victims of bullying at school. Several additional studies since this seminal piece have confirmed the relationship between weapon-carrying and bully victimization. For example, youth who reported being targeted by Internet harassment were eight times more likely than all other youth to concurrently report carrying a weapon to school (Ybarra et al., 2007). So, too, is the relationship clear between cybervictimization and subsequent aggressive and/or violent behavior. For example, Barboza found that victimization experiences resulted in an increased likelihood of getting into fights and/or carrying a weapon to school and engaging in aggressive behaviors compared to nonvictims. In addition, research shows that relational bullying, as well as physical bullying, is associated with weapon carrying and has by extension included cyberbullying as an important predictor of externalizing behavior, including carrying a gun on school grounds (Barboza, 2015). Of note, externalizing behaviors are more common among individuals experiencing racial discrimination (Umaña-Taylor, 2016).

Anticyberbullying and cyberharassment: programs, policies, and implications

The multiple contextual and interrelated reasons for why youth are targeted for cybervictimizaion are clearly reflective of the structural inequality characteristic of historically marginalized groups (Peguero, 2012). The multiple risk factors for cybervictimization (e.g., race, unfair treatment at school) and its consequences (e.g., poor school outcomes, externalizing behavior) are

reinforced by structural disadvantage and multiple systems of oppression that carry the potential to disproportionately impact the youth of color due to its associations with racism and discrimination. Therefore prevention depends on a deeper understanding of how systems interact with schools to facilitate the online hate and discrimination that is reflective of broader forms of social inequality based on race and ethnicity. The nature and quality of the adolescent–school relationship provide a critical ecological context for understanding the dynamics of cyberbullying victimization. The existing research supports the important role that school plays in minimizing and/or preventing cyberbullying both on and off campus. As noted above, this research emphasizes the significant and substantial effect that cyberbully victimization has on school attachments, connections, and outcomes.

Programs focusing on the adolescent–school microsystem

States vary in their legal definition of harassment and bullying in schools. While some states specifically address online bullying and harassment, others continue to rely on antiquated legal precedent that makes addressing the causal mechanisms of cybervictimization difficult (McNeal et al., 2018). In addition, unlike traditional school antibullying policies, school policies aimed at preventing cyberbullying are controversial. The controversy centers on whether schools should punish students involved with cyberbullying even if it takes place outside of school. Whereas, some schools have policies designed to punish any cyberbullying incident, whether on or off school property, as of 2018, only 17 states have school sanctions for acts of cyberbullying committed off campus. This runs contrary to the research presented above. It also disavows youth themselves who, according to a recent online survey, overwhelmingly believe that cyberbullying should be punishable by schools (thinkthevote.com, 2019). Nevertheless, as a result of a 1969 Supreme Court decision in *Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District*, even before the invention of the TCP/IP protocol, schools tend to punish cyberbullying behavior only if it disrupts, or has a reasonable likelihood of disrupting, the educational process or the orderly operation of the school (e.g., HB 1523, CHAPTER 155, New Hampshire's 2010 antibullying law, punishes both bullying and cyberbullying occurring off school property or outside of a school-sponsored activity or event, if the "conduct interferes with a pupil's educational opportunities or substantially disrupts the orderly operations of the school or school-sponsored activity or event."). The research in this regard conflicts with legal precedent requiring schools to provide a safe educational environment, which includes preventing and/or address harassment and discrimination that undermines a child's ability to feel safe and concentrates on learning at school. Past research reinforces that what happens at school carries over into the online environment; student outcomes are intricately intertwined with their online experiences, and that the

school's climate, including social relationships at school, are key points of intervention. On this basis, the research is clear: schools play an important role in addressing negative student behavior and activities online. Furthermore, cyberbullying has the potential to exacerbate existing differences between students based on race, gender, and/or socioeconomic status, thereby reinforcing existing school disparities. A review of research points to those aspects of the school climate that are critical correlates of cyberbullying and important components of intervention programs targeted to the youth of color.

A positive school climate characterized by supportive student interpersonal and student−teacher relationships can allow students to focus on their academic performance and promote a sense of belonging and school connectedness (Niehaus, Rudasill, & Rakes, 2012; Thapa, Cohen, Guffey, & Higgins-D'Alessandro, 2013). Schools should work to build positive relationships between students (i.e., student interpersonal relationships) and teachers (i.e., student−teacher relationships). Supportive school environments where students and teachers feel safe and teachers are both respected and trusted may create a climate where the effects of using these new technologies can be discussed to limit their negative impacts (Espelage, Polanin, & Low, 2014). To build trust among students, faculty, and administrators, schools should not only encourage reporting such incidents but also support teachers and students who do. Open lines of communication between school staff, parents, and students and clear policies about what to do if a student is victimized may help them to report their cybervictimization experiences.

Positive school climates where students are treated equally (i.e., perceptions of fairness) and have the same access to resources (i.e., equity in sharing of resources) contribute to learning opportunities for all students. This includes treating online forms of hate as bias-related cyberbullying and harassment, which may warrant criminal justice involvement. It also requires ensuring that such incidents are seen as creating a disruption of school activities and learning.

It is important for schools to continue to advocate respect and tolerance for all students and teachers as part of school-based intervention efforts to reduce cyber or traditional forms of victimization (Ryan & Smith, 2009). Intolerance for aggression and the mistreatment of others become a normalized part of the school environment (e.g., more supervision) and reduce the likelihood of peer victimization (Hanish & Guerra, 2000) that may occur inside or outside the classroom, offline or online environments. Schools must create a conversation about race that moves beyond cultural competence and diversity training to include respect for individual *differences*. This will require addressing the social norms that students have about historically marginalized groups and aggression, violence, and bullying. Peer-mentoring programs can also help to promote more positive relationships between students. Continued efforts to create a safe and supportive school

environment are critical for the healthy development of early adolescents both inside and outside of school. Finally, helping early adolescents understand the importance of digital citizenship (e.g., responsible use of technology) and cyberbullying detection strategies can be facilitated by open discussions about the safe use of technology as well as about what cyberbullying looks like and its effects on others. For example, videos and role-playing activities can be used to help students both use technology safely and recognize and respond appropriately to cyberbullying and victimization.

These insulating and risk factors related to violence could reflect the social, economic, and educational inequality and marginalization that African American and other racial and ethnic minority youth families, friends, schools, and communities historically have suffered and continue to endure (Peguero, 2009, 2012). A full understanding of the complexity of bullying involves the appreciation of contexts beyond the immediate family, such as focusing on schools as places for cyberbully–victim relationships to develop and as fostering environments in which online racism and discrimination may flourish. From a policy perspective, school policies must acknowledge schools' legitimate interest in maintaining order by allowing them to have broad authority to address cybervictimization, harassment, and online hate to maintain a productive learning environment for all youth.

Beyond the focal adolescent–school microsystem: implications for policy, intervention, and theory

While effective school-based intervention programs and policies are an important vehicle for reducing and preventing cyberbullying, school curricular programs are a powerful venue for promoting positive individual adaptive skills (Schiamberg, Barboza, Chee, & Hsieh, 2016). That said, an ecological perspective to such problems as cyberbullying requires including multiple contexts of cyberbullying beyond the school, such as family, peers, and community contexts (Lerner et al., 2005). Specifically, an emphasis on adolescent internal assets (e.g., competence, caring, connection) and external assets (e.g., family, school, community) for PYD programs is essential for preventing/reducing standard bullying and, likely for cyberbullying, as well (Theokas & Lerner, 2006).

Framing a strength-based perspective to cyberbullying

Research has identified a range of protective factors that buffer the association between racial/ethnic discrimination and negative developmental outcomes for youth (Neblett, Rivas-Drake, & Umaña-Taylor, 2012). In this regard, the inclusion of PYD in an ecological perspective to cyberbullying is particularly relevant as it underlies the internal and external assets of PYD, which are objectives of many existing and effective bullying/cyberbullying

programs (Schiamberg et al., 2016). From a PYD framework, positive individual assets or adaptive individual characteristics are frequently described as the 5Cs (Benson et al., 2004). These assets are (1) *Competence* (intellectual ability/social behavioral skills); (2) *Connection* (positive bonds with people and institutions); (3) *Character* (moral centeredness and integrity); (4) *Confidence* (positive self-regard, self-efficacy, courage); (5) *Caring/Compassion* (empathy, sense of social justice). When all 5Cs are present, *contribution to civil society* is made more likely (Lerner, Fisher, & Weinberg, 2000). These internal assets are made possible and occur in the context of external assets in the form of *support* (e.g., positive family support and/communication, other adult relationships, caring community, positive /caring school climate), *empowerment* (e.g., community value youth, youth are valued as a resource), *clear expectations and boundaries communicated, in context* (e.g., family has clear rules, schools communicate rules and expectations, positive peer influence, available adult role models), and *constructive use of time* (youth programs, creative activities) (Schiamberg et al., 2016). An important consideration for youth of color is the consideration for how culturally informed strengths serve as additional protective factors within the PYD framework. Three factors that are associated with resilience among minority youth might be considered more broadly to be an additional "C" ("Culture") and include (1) identity (i.e., youth's attitudes and behaviors that define the significance and meaning of race and ethnicity in their lives); (2) socialization experiences (i.e., messages about the significance and meaning of race/ethnicity, teaching youth what it means to be a member of a racial/ethnic group, and helping youth cope with discrimination); and (3) orientation (i.e., youth's orientation to mainstream culture; see Neblett et al., 2012). These considerations have not typically been explicitly incorporated into existing programs based on the PYD model of youth development.

While most research on bullying has focused on the negative outcomes of being an adolescent bully or victim, more recent research has taken a strength-based approach to both bullies and victims (Hilliard et al., 2014; Ma, Phelps, Lerner, & Lerner, 2009a, 2009b). A study of moral virtues—one individual PYD asset—examined the *trajectories of moral character* (e.g., doing the right thing, avoiding trouble), *performance character* (e.g., self-discipline, self-regulation, persistence) and civic character (e.g., helping, leadership, service) *by bullying status* (e.g., bully, victim, and uninvolved in bullying). Trajectories covered the time period from middle school (seventh grade) to high school—a period often characterized by high levels of bullying (Hilliard et al., 2014). Both adolescent bullies and victims had lower levels of moral and civic character while only bullies reported higher levels of performance character, compared to adolescents who were uninvolved in bullying. Study outcomes indicated as follows: (1) potential opportunities for strengthening character virtues for bullies and victims at, or even before, the seventh grade level and (2) potential opportunities for redirecting bully

performance character in positive and constructive directions. Given individual differences in trajectories involving differential experiences of adolescents, the investigators cautioned that there is no guarantee that undesirable outcomes can be entirely eliminated. This means that strength-based PYD efforts to prevent, or diminish outcomes of, cyberbullying needs to be part of an individualized comprehensive program which (1) recognizes individual differences and cultural diversity, (2) includes school-based efforts to enhance academic engagement and teaching about cybersecurity, and (3) combines with other contextual interventions in family and/or community contexts (Schiamberg et al., 2016).

Out-of-school cyberbullying interventions

Attempts to address cyberbullying have tended to focus almost entirely on the role of the school as a focal point for bullying relationships and for intervening in those relationships (Schiamberg et al., 2016). However, a more complete understanding of the complexity of cyberbullying involves the appreciation of contexts beyond the school such as community and family as places for bully−victim relationships as well as for interventions designed to prevent and reduce bullying.

Peer-perpetrated events often occur outside school environments, particularly given the presence of electronic aggression or cyberbullying behaviors (Turner, Findelhor, Hamby, Shattuck, & Ormrod, 2011). While schools represent a primary location for adolescents, and unfortunately a site for some bullying and cyberbullying experiences, it is important to recognize the potential for out-of-school time organizations and programs in reducing and preventing of F2F and cyberbullying for some adolescents. Out-of-school programs often present a significant opportunity for many youth whose family experiences may be difficult to work with trained and concerned adults to build the positive youth assets in which such organizations and programs are in an ideal position to provide (Barboza et al., 2009; Durlak, Weissberg, & Pachan, 2010; Schiamberg et al., 2016). One out-of-school, or after formal school strategy, provided in some inner city neighborhoods are school study halls and school gymnasiums, open in afternoons and evenings, to promote opportunities for connection with adults for building PYD assets and life skills.

Another exemplary out-of-school program is *Be SAFE: Addressing Bullying Across Community Settings*. It is an ecological, community-wide program based on PYD addressing the complexity of bullying and cyberbullying (Olsen and Pace, 2011; MSU Extension and Outreach, 2012). A major goal of the program is fostering and improving knowledge about healthy and unhealthy interpersonal relationships and settings as a basis for developing adolescent skills and strategies for dealing with F2F bullying and cyberbullying. *Be SAFE* involves out-of-school partnerships among adolescents,

educators, volunteers, families, and other community resources involved in a variety of opportunities through the *Be SAFE* curriculum for early adolescents, adult leadership development, parent education, and collaborations with schools and other youth-serving organizations. Evaluations of the program point to the development of (1) specific steps for reducing/preventing cyberbullying (e.g., ensuring cyber safety and awareness among participating parents and youth) and (2) specific collaborations to promote the development of PYD individual assets in collaboration with available community resources.

Given a focus of this chapter on cultural and ethnic diversity in the social ecology of cyberbullying, and the impact on students and families of color, we think our discussion has illuminated emerging definition of two relevant—and frequently highly politicized terms that sometimes appear in the discussion of school programs involving children of color—*structural inequality* and *racism.* Clarification of the meaning of these terms and the specificity to a particular context such as the adolescent−school microsystem are an essential basis for effective problem-solving. On that note, we propose two definitions of particular relevance to students of color in schools which, in our view, can best be understood using an ecological perspective of the specific adolescent−school microsystem connecting with other contexts such as family and community, as follows:

- *Structural inequality.* The application of school practices reflecting policies to students of color which are different from those applied to majority children and which may lead to reduced likelihood of success in school. For example, in situations where students of color may behave in an unacceptable fashion in school, expulsion from school may occur without attending to remedying underlying causes. Potentially available community resources need to be cultivated including adult mentors or out-of-school programs that present normative relationship experiences for addressing adjustment problems such that such programs modify exclusive reliance on expulsion. In short, structural inequality in the adolescent−school microsystem refers to structural differences that are potentially eliminated.
- *Racism.* In the adolescent−school microsystem, this term refers to failures to address structural inequality or inequalities (defined above), resulting in the persistent or continuous application of practices that minimize the likelihood of the academic success of students of color. The term applies primarily to repeated use of counterproductive practices.

While concerns about the prevalence and consequences of cyberbullying are valid, an exclusive focus on a deficit perspective, focusing on bullying as a set of problem behaviors to be eliminated and prevented, may be necessary but is not sufficient. Such efforts often frame the issue as a "youth problem" for both students of color and majority students—rather than examining the

complex issues surrounding bullying through larger institutional, cultural, and societal influences that impact young peoples' development—specifically the connection of bullying and cyberbullying programs to the internal and external assets of PYD.

References

Anderson, M., Kaufman, J., Simon, T. R., Barrios, L., Paulozzi, L., Ryan, G., ... School-Associated Violent Deaths Study Group. (2001). School-associated violent deaths in the United States, 1994–1999. *JAMA*, *286*(21), 2695–2702.

Atlas, R. S., & Pepler, D. J. (1998). Observations of bullying in the classroom. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *92*(2), 86–99.

Barboza, G., & Siller, L. A. (2018). Child maltreatment, school bonds, and adult violence: a serial mediation model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0886260518805763.

Barboza, G. E. (2015). The association between school exclusion, delinquency and subtypes of cyber-and F2F-victimizations: Identifying and predicting risk profiles and subtypes using latent class analysis. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *39*, 109–122.

Barboza, G. E., Schiamberg, L. B., Oehmke, J., Korzeniewski, S. J., Post, L. A., & Heraux, C. G. (2009). Individual characteristics and the multiple contexts of adolescent bullying: An ecological perspective. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *38*, 101–121.

Baum, K. (2011). *Stalking victimization in the United States*. Diane Publishing.

Benner, A. D., & Graham, S. (2013). The antecedents and consequences of racial/ethnic discrimination during adolescence: Does the source of discrimination matter? *Developmental Psychology*, *49*(8), 1602.

Benson, P. L., Mannes, M., Pittman, K., & Ferher, T. (2004). Youth development, developmental assets and public policy. In R. M. Lerner, & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 781–814). John Wiley & Sons Inc.

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

Beran, T., & Li, Q. (2008). The relationship between cyberbullying and school bullying. *The Journal of Student Wellbeing*, *1*(2), 16–33.

Blais, J.J. (2008). Chatting, befriending, and bullying: adolescent internet experiences and associated psychosocial outcomes. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Department of Psychology, Queen's University Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (1998). The ecology of developmental processes. In W. Damon, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (pp. 993–1028). John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Bucchianeri, M. M., Eisenberg, M. E., & Neumark-Sztainer, D. (2013). Weightism, racism, classism, and sexism: Shared forms of harassment in adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *53*(1), 47–53.

Byrd, C. M., & Andrews, D. J. C. (2016). Variations in students' perceived reasons for, sources of, and forms of in-school discrimination: A latent class analysis. *Journal of School Psychology*, *57*, 1–14.

Campbell, M. A. (2005). Cyber bullying: An old problem in a new guise? *Journal of Psychologists and Counsellors in Schools*, *15*(1), 68–76.

Childnet International. (2016). *Cyberbullying: Understand, prevent and respond*. Available online at <https://www.childnet.com/ufiles/Cyberbullying-guidance2.pdf>.

Cho, S., Lee, H., Peguero, A. A., & Park, S. M. (2019). Social-ecological correlates of cyberbullying victimization and perpetration among African American youth: Negative binomial and zero-inflated negative binomial analyses. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *101*, 50–60.

Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. J. (2007). Understanding bullying: From research to practice. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, *48*(2), 86.

DeHue, F., Bolman, C., & Vollink, T. (2008). Cyberbullying: Youngsters' experiences and parental perception. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, *11*(2), 217–223.

D'Ovidio, R., & Doyle, J. (2003). A study on cyberstalking: Understanding investigative hurdles. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, *72*, 10.

Duggan, M. (2017). *Online harassment 2017*. Pew Research Center.

Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., & Pachan, M. (2010). A meta-analysis of after-school programs that seek to promote personal and social skills in children and adolescents. *American Journal Of Community Psychology*, *45*(3-4), 294–309.

Edwards, L., Kontostathis, A. E., & Fisher, C. (2016). Cyberbullying, race/ethnicity and mental health outcomes: A review of the literature. *Media and Communication*, *4*(3), 71–78.

Espelage, D. L., Polanin, J. R., & Low, S. K. (2014). Teacher and staff perceptions of school environment as predictors of student aggression, victimization, and willingness to intervene in bullying situations. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *29*(3), 287.

Espelage, D. L., & Swearer, S. M. (2009). *A social-ecological model for bullying prevention and intervention: Understanding the impact of adults in the social ecology of youngsters. Handbook of bullying in schools* (pp. 71–82). Routledge.

Fosse, G. K., & Holen, A. (2006). Childhood maltreatment in adult female psychiatric outpatients with eating disorders. *Eating Behaviors*, *7*(4), 404–409.

Garbarino, J., & DeLara, E. (2004). *Coping with the consequences of school violence. School violence intervention: A practical handbook* (pp. 400–415). .

Gardella, J. H., Fisher, B. W., Teurbe-Tolon, A. R., Ketner, B., & Nation, M. (2019). Students' reasons for why they were targeted for in-school victimization and bullying. *International Journal of Bullying Prevention*, 1–15.

Gaylord-Harden, N. K., & Cunningham, J. A. (2009). The impact of racial discrimination and coping strategies on internalizing symptoms in African American youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *38*(4), 532–543.

Gumpel, T. P., Zioni-Koren, V., & Bekerman, Z. (2014). An ethnographic study of participant roles in school bullying. *Aggressive Behavior*, *40*(3), 214–228.

Hanish, L. D., & Guerra, N. G. (2000). Children who get victimized at school: What is known? What can be done? *Professional School Counseling*, *4*(2), 113.

Hanish, L. D., & Guerra, N. G. (2002). A longitudinal analysis of patterns of adjustment following peer victimization. *Development and Psychopathology*, *14*(1), 69–89.

Harel-Fisch, Y., Walsh, S. D., Fogel-Grinvald, H., Amitai, G., Pickett, W., Molcho, M., ... Craig, W. (2011). Negative school perceptions and involvement in school bullying: A universal relationship across 40 countries. *Journal of Adolescence*, *34*(4), 639–652.

Hilliard, L. J., Bowers, E. P., Greenman, K. N., Hershberg, R. M., Geldof, G. J., Glickman, S. A., Lerner, J. V., & Lerner, R. M. (2014). Beyond the deficit model: Bullying and trajectories of character virtues in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *43*(6), 991–1003.

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2012). *School climate 2.0: Preventing cyberbullying and sexting one classroom at a time*. Corwin Press.

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2010). Bullying, cyberbullying and suicide. *Archives of Suicide Research*, *14*(3), 206–221.

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2018). *Cyberbullying fact sheet: Identification, prevention, and response*. Cyberbullying Research Center. Retrieved from <https://cyberbullying.org/Cyberbullying-Identification-Prevention-Response-2018.pdf>.

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

Juvonen, J., Graham, S., & Schuster, M. (2003). Bullying among young adolescents: The strong, the weak and the troubled. *Pediatrics*, *112*(6), 1231–1237.

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

Kahn, K. B., Spencer, K., & Glaser, J. (2013). Online prejudice and discrimination: From dating to hating. *The social net: Understanding our online behavior*, 201–219.

Kochenderfer-Ladd, B. E. C. K. Y., Ladd, G. W., & Kochel, K. P. (2009). *A child and environment framework for studying risk for peer victimization. Bullying, rejection, and peer victimization: A social cognitive neuroscience perspective* (pp. 27–52).

Lenhart, A., Duggan, M., Perrin, A., Stepler, R., Rainie, H., & Parker, K. (2015). *Teens, social media & technology overview 2015* (pp. 4–9). Pew Research Center, [Internet & American Life Project].

Lenhart, A., Madden, M., Smith, A., Purcell, K., Zickuhr, K., & Raine, L. (2011). *Teens, kindness and cruelty on social network sites*. Pew Internet & American Life Project. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/~/media/Files/Reports/2011/PIP_teens_Kindness_Cruelty_SNS_Report_Nov_2011_FINAL_110711.pdf>.

Lerner, R. M., Fisher, C. B., & Weinberg, R. A. (2000). Toward a science for and of the people: Promoting civil society through the application of developmental science. *Child Development*, *71*, 11–20.

Lerner, R. M., Lerner, J. V., Almerigi, J., Theokas, C., Phelps, E., Gestsdottir, S., et al. (2005). Positive youth development, participation in community youth development programs, and community contributions of fifth grade adolescents: Findings from the first wave of the 4-H study of positive youth development. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *25*(1), 17–71.

Li, Q. (2007). Bullying in the new playground: Research into cyberbullying and cyber victimisation. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *23*(4).

Limber, S. P. (2006). *Peer victimization: The nature and prevalence of bullying among children and youth. Handbook of children, culture, and violence* (pp. 331–332).

Livingstone, S., & Smith, P. K. (2014). Annual research review: Harms experienced by child users of online and mobile technologies: The nature, prevalence and management of sexual and aggressive risks in the digital age. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *55*(6), 635–654.

Low, S., & Espelage, D. (2013). Differentiating cyber bullying perpetration from non-physical bullying: Commonalities across race, individual, and family predictors. *Psychology of Violence*, *3*(1), 39.

Ma, L., Phelps, E., Lerner, J. V., & Lerner, R. M. (2009a). The development of academic competence among adolescents who bully and who are bullied. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *30*, 628–644. Available from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2009.07.006.

Ma, L., Phelps, E., Lerner, J. V., & Lerner, R. M. (2009b). Longitudinal research in school bullying: Adolescents who bully and who are bullied. In D. Buchanan, C. B. Fisher, & L. Gable (Eds.), *Research with high-risk populations: Balancing science, ethics, and law* (pp. 93–108). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

McNeal, R. S., Kunkle, S. M., & Schmeida, M. (Eds.), (2018). *Cyber harassment and policy reform in the digital age: Emerging research and opportunities*. IGI Global.

Mishna, F., Cook, C., Gadalla, T., Daciuk, J., & Solomon, S. (2010). Cyber bullying behaviors among middle and high school students. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *80*(3), 362–374.

Mishna, F., Khoury-Kassabri, M., Gadalla, T., & Daciuk, J. (2012). Risk factors for involvement in cyber bullying: Victims, bullies and bully–victims. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *34*(1), 63–70.

Mishna, F., Saini, M., & Solomon, S. (2009). Ongoing and online: Children and youth's perceptions of cyber bullying. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *31*(12), 1222–1228.

Mitchell, M. M., Bradshaw, C. P., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Student and teacher perceptions of school climate: A multilevel exploration of patterns of discrepancy. *Journal of School Health*, *80*(6), 271–279.

Navarro, R., Larrañaga, E., & Yubero, S. (2016). Gender identity, gender-typed personality traits and school bullying: Victims, bullies and bully-victims. *Child Indicators Research*, *9*(1), 1–20.

Neblett, E. W., Jr, Rivas-Drake, D., & Umaña-Taylor, A. J. (2012). The promise of racial and ethnic protective factors in promoting ethnic minority youth development. *Child Development Perspectives*, *6*(3), 295–303.

Niehaus, K., Rudasill, K. M., & Rakes, C. R. (2012). A longitudinal study of school connectedness and academic outcomes across sixth grade. *Journal of School Psychology*, *50*(4), 443–460.

Olsen and Pace. (2011). *Be safe: Addressing bullying across community settings*. MSU Extension and Outreach.

Olweus, D. (1993a). Bully/victim problems among schoolchildren: Long-term consequences and an effective intervention program. In S. Hodgins (Ed.), *Mental disorder and crime* (pp. 317–349). Sage Publications, Inc.

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

Osterman, K. F. (2000). Students' need for belonging in the school community. *Review of Educational Research*, *70*(3), 323–367.

Peguero, A. A. (2009). Victimizing the children of immigrants: Latino and Asian American student victimization. *Youth & Society*, *41*(2), 186–208.

Peguero, A. A. (2012). Schools, bullying, and inequality: Intersecting factors and complexities with the stratification of youth victimization at school. *Sociology Compass*, *6*(5), 402–412.

Peskin, M. F., Tortolero, S. R., Markham, C. M., Addy, R. C., & Baumler, E. R. (2007). Bullying and victimization and internalizing symptoms among low-income Black and Hispanic students. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *40*(4), 372–375.

Raskauskas, J., & Stoltz, A. D. (2007). Involvement in traditional and electronic bullying among adolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, *43*(3), 564.

Rice, E., Petering, R., Rhoades, H., Winetrobe, H., Goldbach, J., Plant, A., & Kordic, T. (2015). Cyberbullying perpetration and victimization among middle-school students. *American Journal of Public Health*, *105*(3), e66–e72.

Roberts, M. E., Gibbons, F. X., Gerrard, M., Weng, C. Y., Murry, V. M., Simons, L. G., … Lorenz, F. O. (2012). From racial discrimination to risky sex: Prospective relations involving peers and parents. *Developmental Psychology*, *48*(1), 89.

Ryan, W., & Smith, J. D. (2009). Antibullying programs in schools: How effective are evaluation practices? *Prevention Science*, *10*(3), 248–259.

Sampasa-Kanyinga, H., Roumeliotis, P., & Xu, H. (2014). Associations between cyberbullying and school bullying victimization and suicidal ideation, plans and attempts among Canadian schoolchildren. *PLoS One*, *9*(7), e102145.

Schiamberg, L., Barboza, G., Chee, G., & Hsieh, M. (2016). The adolescent-parent context and positive youth development in the ecology of cyberbullying. In M. F. Wright (Ed.), *A social-ecological approach to cyberbullying*. New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Schmitt, M. T., Branscombe, N. R., Postmes, T., & Garcia, A. (2014). The consequences of perceived discrimination for psychological well-being: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *140*(4), 921.

Seals, D., & Young, J. (2003). Bullying and victimization: Prevalence and relationship to gender, grade level, ethnicity, self-esteem, and depression. *Adolescence*, *38*(152), 735–747.

Slonje, R., & Smith, P. K. (2008). Cyberbullying: Another main type of bullying? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *49*(2), 147–154.

Sokoloff, N. J., & Dupont, I. (2005). Domestic violence at the intersections of race, class, and gender: Challenges and contributions to understanding violence against marginalized women in diverse communities. *Violence against Women*, *11*(1), 38–64.

Spriggs, A. L., Iannotti, R. J., Nansel, T. R., & Haynie, D. L. (2007). Adolescent bullying involvement and perceived family, peer and school relations: Commonalities and differences across race/ethnicity. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *41*(3), 283–293.

Subrahmanyam, K., Smahel, D., & Greenfield, P. (2006). Connecting developmental constructions to the Internet: Identity presentation and sexual exploration in online teen chat rooms. *Developmental Psychology*, *42*(3), 395.

Teräsahjo, T., & Salmivalli, C. (2003). "She is not actually bullied." The discourse of harassment in student groups. *Aggressive Behavior*, *29*(2), 134–154.

Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*(3), 357–385.

Theokas, C., & Lerner, R. (2006). Promoting positive development in adolescence: The role of ecological assets in families, schools, and neighborhoods. *Applied Developmental Science*, *10*, 61.

thinkthevote.com. (2019). Available online at <https://www.thinkthevote.com/join-the-debate/cyberbullying-punishable-schools/>.

Thornberg, R. (2011). 'She's weird!'—The social construction of bullying in school: A review of qualitative research. *Children & Society*, *25*(4), 258–267.

Turner, H. A., Finkelhor, D., Hamby, S. L., Shattuck, A., & Ormrod, R. K. (2011). Specifying type and location of peer victimization in a national sample of children and youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *40*(8), 1052–1067.

Tynes, B. M., Giang, M. T., Williams, D. R., & Thompson, G. N. (2008). Online racial discrimination and psychological adjustment among adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *43*(6), 565–569.

Tynes, B. M., Hiss, S., Ryan, A. M., & Rose, C. A. (2015). *In-school versus online discrimination: Effects on mental health and motivation among diverse adolescents in the United States*. *Routledge international handbook of social psychology of the classroom* (p. 112) .

Tynes, B. M., Rose, C. A., Hiss, S., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Mitchell, K., & Williams, D. (2014). Virtual environments, online racial discrimination, and adjustment among a diverse, school-based sample of adolescents. *International Journal of Gaming and Computer-Mediated Simulations (IJGCMS)*, *6*(3), 1–16.

Tynes, B. M., Seaton, E., & Zuckerman, A. (2015). Online racial discrimination: A growing problem for adolescents. *Psychological Science Agenda*.

Tynes, B. M., Umana-Taylor, A. J., Rose, C. A., Lin, J., & Anderson, C. J. (2012). Online racial discrimination and the protective function of ethnic identity and self-esteem for African American adolescents. *Developmental psychology*, *48*(2), 343.

Umaña-Taylor, A. J. (2016). A post-racial society in which ethnic-racial discrimination still exists and has significant consequences for youths' adjustment. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *25*(2), 111−118.

Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Tynes, B. M., Toomey, R. B., Williams, D. R., & Mitchell, K. J. (2015). Latino adolescents' perceived discrimination in online and offline settings: An examination of cultural risk and protective factors. *Developmental Psychology*, *51*(1), 87.

Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Wong, J. J., Gonzales, N. A., & Dumka, L. E. (2012). Ethnic identity and gender as moderators of the association between discrimination and academic adjustment among Mexican-origin adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, *35*(4), 773−786.

Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Zijlstra, B. J. H., De Winter, A. F., Verhulst, F. C., & Ormel, J. (2007). The dyadic nature of bullying and victimization: Testing a dual perspective theory. *Child Development*, *78*, 1843−1854.

Wang, J., Iannotti, R. J., Luk, J. W., & Nansel, T. R. (2010). Co-occurrence of victimization from five subtypes of bullying: Physical, verbal, social exclusion, spreading rumors, and cyber. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, *35*(10), 1103−1112.

Wang, J., Iannotti, R. J., & Nansel, T. R. (2009). School bullying among adolescents in the United States: Physical, verbal, relational, and cyber. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *45*, 368−375.

Wolak, J., Mitchell, K. J., & Finkelhor, D. (2007). Does online harassment constitute bullying? An exploration of online harassment by known peers and online-only contacts. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *41*(6), S51−S58.

Wong, C. A., Eccles, J. S., & Sameroff, A. (2003). The influence of ethnic discrimination and ethnic identification on African American adolescents' school and socioemotional adjustment. *Journal of Personality*, *71*(6), 1197−1232.

Ybarra, M. L., Diener-West, M., & Leaf, P. J. (2007). Examining the overlap in internet harassment and school bullying: Implications for school intervention. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *41*(6), S42−S50.

Ybarra, M. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2004). Online aggressor/targets, aggressors and targets: A comparison of associated youth characteristics. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *45*(7), 1308−1316.

Ybarra, M. L., Mitchell, K. J., Wolak, J., & Finkelhor, D. (2006). Examining characteristics and associated distress related to Internet harassment: findings from the Second Youth Internet Safety Survey. *Pediatrics*, *118*(4), e1169−e1177.