How are Girls' Attitudes Toward Cyberbullying Affected by Drama for Social

Intervention?

Gillian L. Fournier, B.A. (Hons.), B.Ed.

Department of the Graduate and Undergraduate

Studies in Education

Submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education

Faculty of Education, Brock University

St. Catharines, Ontario

Abstract

This is a study exploring teenaged girls' understanding and experiences of cyberbullying as a contemporary social phenomenon. Participants included 4 Grade 11 and 12 girls from a medium-sized independent school in southwestern Ontario, Canada. The girls participated in 9 extracurricular study sessions from January to April 2013. During the sessions, they engaged with Drama for Social Intervention (Clark, 2009; Conrad, 2004; Lepp, 2011) activities with the intended goal of producing a collective creation. Qualitative data were collected throughout the sessions using fieldnotes, participant journals, interviews, and participant artefacts. The findings are presented as an ethnodrama (Campbell & Conrad, 2006; Denzin, 2003; Saldaña, 1999) with each thematic statement forming a title of a scene in the script (Rogers, Frellick, & Babinski, 2002). The study found that girl identity online consists of many disconnected avatars. It also suggested that distancing (Eriksson, 2011) techniques, used to engender safety in Drama for Social Intervention, might have contributed to participant disengagement with the study's content. Implications for further research included the utility of arts-based methods to promote participants' feelings of growth and reflection, and a reevaluation of cyberbullying discourses to better reflect girls' multiple avatar identities. Implications for teachers and administrators encompassed a need for preventative approaches to cyberbullying education, incorporating affective empathy-building (Ang & Goh, 2010) and addressing girls' feelings of safety in perceived anonymity online.

Acknowledgements

I want to begin by expressing my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor, Dr. Debra McLauchlan. Her patience and generosity empowered me to make discoveries, reflect, and grow from a student to a researcher, then an educator, over the course of my graduate studies. Next, thank you to Nathan Mac Donald, my bookmark, for his understanding, patience, and ceaseless encouragement. Lastly, I am grateful for the support and kindness of my family. In particular, thank you to my mother, Lori Carmichael, for her unending reassurance, teaching me the importance of education, and helping me become a life-long learner.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

This thesis is a study of the ways in which teenaged girls understand, and are affected by, cyberbullying. Using Drama for Social Intervention (DSI) techniques, the study documents a small group exploration of the cyberbullying phenomenon. Findings are presented in the form of an ethnodrama to reflect the method of data collection.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore cyberbullying as it affects girls. As a drama teacher, I was interested in using DSI to help participants reflect on their experiences with, and perceptions of, cyberbullying. Research questions included:

- How do teenaged girls define cyberbullying?

- In what ways do teenaged girls experience cyberbullying?

- How do drama activities affect teenaged girls' perceptions of cyberbullying?

Personal Interest in This Topic

I first became interested in this area of research a decade ago, in 2003, as a Grade 11 drama student attending high school in Southwestern Ontario. My school board offered unique violence prevention initiatives through its Safe Schools program, using Boal's (2008) interactive Forum Theatre (FT) techniques. My high school's drama program was responsible for creating and touring an annual FT production to other high schools in the board. The first production in which I participated addressed issues of gender-based violence, harassment, and substance abuse. I continued my involvement with the program through Grade 12, and chose to return for a fifth year of high school, partly due to the opportunity I had to write and produce the touring FT play.

As a secondary school student, I also coordinated a summer drama day camp offered by the Parks and Recreation Department of my city. Most of our drama camp participants were girls, aged 9 to 12, and I grew to understand that a unique social dynamic existed among our oldest girl participants. They required a close eye and carefully-tuned ear because of the ways they manipulated and socially ostracized each other. As I returned to this position each summer, I realized that the girls' social concerns were becoming increasingly technologically-centred (e.g., involving Facebook) as they recounted experiences from their school year. I also observed these girls build and reform friendships at camp through the use of technology outside our programming.

I entered Brock University's Senior/Intermediate Concurrent Education program in 2006, majoring in Dramatic Arts. In education courses, we often discussed the relationship between technology and learning, focusing on cyberbullying as a growing concern. In the dramatic arts, my "tool kit" of DSI techniques grew and augmented my experiences with FT. As a pre-service teacher in schools, I purposely attuned to the issue of cyberbullying. Given teenagers' fluency with technology, I found myself always making extra efforts to stay on top of their use of technology in the school building. However, as I entered classrooms and schools in my teaching practica, I recognized a lack of consistency in technology-related expectations and policies from school to school and classroom to classroom. For example, some schools required teachers to take possession of students' cell phones if they were used during class time, while others did not have any clear regulation in place. As a result of this inconsistency, I struggled with feelings of not being able to fully support my students.

For the past 8 years, I have continued to write FT and other issue-based plays that are produced annually by my former school board. I often find myself drawing from incidents I have witnessed as a secondary school educator. When I entered Brock's Master of Education program in 2011, I knew that I would have an opportunity to explore cyberbullying in ways I had previously hoped. I also recognized that I would be able to draw upon my extensive experience in the arts to conduct my research about this phenomenon.

Background of the Problem

In Ontario secondary schools, cyberbullying is a phenomenon of recent attention (Cyberbullying Research Centre, 2013; Kauffman & Landrum, 2013, p. 204; Mas, 2013; Teitel, 2012). In the pervasive presence of cybertechnologies, students communicate in ways that are often difficult to monitor, complicating the bullying that occurs in schools. Cyberbullying has, thus, been identified as a growing issue with no single solution (Chisholm, 2004, p. 29).

In 2012, former Ontario Education Minister, Lauren Broten, amended the Education Act with Bill 13, the Accepting Schools Act (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2012a). Bill 13 acknowledges cyberbullying as an emergent technological phenomenon (Collins & Patterson, 2004) and addresses a need for prevention and intervention of bullying in schools. It also recognizes the interconnectedness of online and offline adolescent identities (Wilson, 2006) and the impact that online activity may have on students' well-being. Bill 13 echoes current research by suggesting that positive social change is enhanced by the fostering of critical consciousness in youth (Freire, 2011; Garber, 2010; O'Farrell 2010; Österlind, 2011; Taft, 2011).

Statement of the Problem Context

This study engaged Grades 11 and 12 girl participants in DSI activities to explore cyberbullying. I chose to work with girls exclusively because research suggests that girls and boys may experience bullying differently (Ang & Goh, 2010; Kessel Schneider, O'Donnell, Stueve, and Coulter, 2012; Ringrose & Renold, 2010). I chose to involve Grade 11 and 12 students because they might have more experience with cyberbullying (Sbarbaro & Enyeart Smith, 2011). Lastly, I presumed that senior-level students might be able to better express themselves, and, thus, better engage with DSI activities.

 DSI is an effective technique to support critical thinking and social justice among adolescents (Clark, 2009; Conrad, 2004; Hatton, 2004; Heap & Simpson, 2005; Lepp, 2011). By applying DSI techniques to foster critical reflection, I hoped to address cyberbullying in a way that would not only generate equity and inclusivity but also foster meaningful learning for student participants.

Researcher Assumptions

The first assumption that underpins this study is that drama techniques can effectively engage teenaged girls in a discussion of their attitudes and opinions toward cyberbullying as a phenomenon. Secondly, this study assumes that teenaged girls who volunteered as participants are willing and able to discuss their understanding of cyberbullying as a social phenomenon particular to their culture. Thirdly, this study assumes that the use of DSI might create a change in knowledge and/or attitude identifiable in the short term. The final assumption is that ethnodrama can effectively encapsulate and report the findings of the study.

Outline of Remainder of the Document

The remainder of this document includes a review of related literature, methodology and research design, presentation of results, and discussion. In Chapter Two, the review of related literature addresses current research related to cyberbullying and DSI. The chapter concludes by examining ways in which DSI is currently used to address cyberbullying. Chapter Three introduces arts-based research methodologies and outlines the procedures taken to collect and analyze data throughout the study. In Chapter Four, the presentation of results appears in the form of an ethnodrama, with each scene elucidating a theme that emerged from the data. In Chapter Five, the discussion addresses findings related to the three research questions and those that were unexpected. Furthermore, Chapter Five suggests implications for researchers as well as teachers and administrators.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Two major bodies of literature are pertinent to this study; the first addresses cyberbullying, the second, DSI. Literature exploring cyberbullying reinterprets existing definitions of traditional bullying, connecting the phenomenon to schools, age, and gender. This chapter proceeds from an introduction to cyberbullying to an examination of DSI, outlining empirical studies conducted in communities, prisons, and schools. The chapter concludes by examining ways in which DSI has been used to address bullying among adolescents as a social justice issue.

Introduction to Cyberbullying

Hinduja and Patchin (2009) defined bullying as "repeated and deliberate harassment directed by one in a position of power toward one or more," involving "physical threats or behaviours … or indirect and subtle forms of aggression" (p. 185). Cyberbullying, as a more contemporary social phenomenon (Kauffman & Landrum, 2013; Pelfrey & Weber, 2013), tends to resist more traditionally "typical" definitions of bullying (Bauman, Toomey, & Walker, 2013; Erdur-Baker, 2010). Collins and Patterson (2004) identified electronic email, instant messaging (IM), small text-messages (SMS), message boards, voting/polling booths, and flaming as common cyberbullying techniques (p. 33). Cyberbullying behaviours may include "sending text or voice messages, pictures, or videos directly to victims, or simply posting such material on publicly available websites" (Kauffman & Landrum, 2013, p. 204).

Sbarbaro and Enyeart Smith (2011) recognized that the anonymity of cyberspace differentiates cyberbullying from traditional bullying. "[The] inability of the perpetrator to observe the target's immediate reaction … [creates] the absence of time and space

constraints," (Bauman, 2010, p. 805), and, thus, may lead perpetrators to have "greater feelings of disinhibition" (Underwood & Rosen, 2011, p. 17). "[A]lthough cyberbullying begins anonymously in the virtual environment … it creates a hostile physical school environment where students feel unwelcome and unsafe … [reducing] equal opportunities to learn" (Shariff, 2005, p. 460). Given the rapidly developing nature of cyber-technologies, cyberbullying requires special attention as a new vehicle for social violence among school-aged youth, especially as it functions differently from traditional bullying (Pelfrey & Weber, 2013).

Cyberbullying pervades schools regardless of Internet accessibility in the home. In a rural American study, Bauman (2010) found that availability of Internet access, speed, consistency, and technology sharing in a household were factors contributing to the "digital divide" or gap in accessibility of cyber-technologies for young people. Despite this "divide," most students still self-identified as avid cyber-technology users. Furthermore, Bauman discovered a direct relationship between age and likeliness to engage with cyber-technologies, with cyber engagement increasing from Grades 5 through 8 across genders.

A significant relationship exists between the frequency of cyber-technology use and cyberbullying (Erdur-Baker, 2010). Sbarbaro and Enyeart Smith (2011) discovered that as grade level increased, so did incidents of "seeing others cyberbullied, being cyberbullied while [playing online video games] … and posting mean or hurtful comments about someone" (p. 148). In their summary, Sbarbaro and Enyeart Smith recognized a need for further research to examine grade-specific cyberbullying behaviours.

In addition to grade level, gender is a proposed factor affecting individual engagement with cyberbullying, despite discrepancies in existing research addressing the topic (Ang & Goh, 2010; Beckman, Hagquist, & Hellström, 2013). Bauman (2010) suggested that, like race or ethnicity, gender is an influential factor in cyberbullying, one that is "essentially unexamined" (p. 807). Similarly, Schoffstall and Cohen (2011) noted a scarcity of research identifying the relationship between gender and cyberbullying, and stated that studies claiming to show a relationship exhibit mixed results.

Smith and Slonje (2010) suggested that because cyberbullying exhibits characteristics of indirect bullying, for example, "not done face-to-face" (p. 256), researchers might look to cyberbullying as a site of increased female involvement. This suggestion draws on traditional bullying literature that assumes female passivity (i.e., not engaging in overt displays of aggression), projecting these ideologies onto online engagement (Ringrose & Renold, 2010). Hinduja and Patchin (2009) problematized this argument by proposing that girls behave passively as a result of shaping by hegemonic ideologies of gender. They suggested that girls find freedom from "[social] constraints in cyberspace," (p. 52) and called for a reexamination of girl engagement online.

In an ethnographic study of two United Kingdom schools, Ringrose and Renold (2010) examined girls and boys separately to identify the ways in which bullying discourses involve "complex gendered/classed/sexualized/racialized power relations embedded in children's school-based cultures" (p. 573). Their findings suggested that bullying incidents transgress "normative performances of young masculinity and femininity" (p. 577). However, "'normative cruelties' of doing gender" (p. 577) are reinforced through the differentiation of gender expectations and the legitimization of

gendered behaviours. Boy and girl participants performed social "cruelties" (p. 577) differently, in ways that were "'intersected' by … axes of identity and power" (p. 591), such as race and sexuality. In interviews, teenaged girls viewed "meanness" as "part of the normative cruelties of 'doing' girl" (p. 585). Asserting that the "just be friends" (p. 587) approach to girl conflict resolution trivializes and normalizes their experiences of conflict, Ringrose and Renold demanded a "critical overhaul" (p. 501) of bullying research to better address individual gendered experiences and attitudes toward bullying.

Recent literature calls for new approaches to address cyberbullying with young people. Cassidy and Jackson (2005) proposed a holistic approach, including policies governing: (a) respect and caring behaviours bi-directionally in student/student and student/teacher interactions, and (b) school environments that promote healthy embodied and online identity development. Froese-Germain (2008) supported this suggestion, asserting that holistic methods are necessary to create "safe, healthy and caring schools" (p. 51).

Taft's (2011) discussion of girl-activists emphasized the importance of building critical consciousness in young women, in order to address social justice issues. Girl activism assists in the construction of identities "that are alternative to the dominant forms of girlhood but still 'fit' somewhere within peer and school cultures" (p. 80). In Singapore, Ang and Goh (2010) found that both girls and boys with low cognitive and affective empathy were more likely to cyberbully, and, thus, argued for "empathy training and education … in cyberbullying intervention programs" (p. 395).

In summary, cyberbullying is a phenomenon pervading adolescent culture. Literature acknowledges the impact of cyberbullying on school environments; however,

existing research is limited. Present data are inconclusive regarding the relationship between cyberbullying and variables of age and gender. Furthermore, adolescent girls have been identified as a unique population requiring further examination, especially with regard to the effects of cyberbullying. Given the omnipresence of cyber-technologies in secondary schools in Southwestern Ontario, the issue of cyberbullying deserves further exploration (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2012b).

Drama as Social Intervention (DSI)

The following will outline how DSI has been used internationally and locally to address issues of social justice, including bullying.

Contextual Overview

In 2010, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) held the Second World Conference on Arts Education in Seoul, South Korea. The principal outcome of this conference was the Seoul Agenda: Goals for the development of arts education (UNESCO, 2010). This document maintains that:

> arts education has an important role to play in the constructive transformation of educational systems that are struggling to meet the needs of learners in a rapidly changing world characterized by remarkable advances in technology … and intractable social and cultural injustices. (p. 2)

The Seoul Agenda affirms the importance of the arts by setting three goals for arts education. The third goal is of greatest relevance to this study: to "apply arts education principles and practices to contribute to resolving the social and cultural challenges facing today's world" (UNESCO, 2010, p. 8). O'Farrell (2010) emphasized the importance of this goal in "its commitment to applying arts education to the resolution of

social and cultural challenges" (p. xiii). Subgoals identified the importance of

"cultivating … creative citizens" (UNESCO, 2010, p. 8), supporting critical thinking,

recognizing the power of the arts in restorative and conservative measures, and

responding to "major global challenges" such as "peace" and "democracy" (p. 10). The

Seoul Agenda also recognized "remarkable advances in technology" (p. 2) as a social

issue, addressing the context of cyberbullying in North America.

In the same year as the Seoul Agenda, Garber (2010) encouraged educators to use

art to seek social justice in their communities, with sensitivity toward globalization.

Garber emphasized the importance of critical reflection and questioning in order to

achieve social justice, and claimed that DSI specifically facilitates social critiques, as it

"allows the [participant] to put him or herself in a different role than they [*sic*] usually see

themselves [*sic*]" (p. 124).

Much earlier, Winston (1996) discussed DSI as a tool for moral development. He

explored the relationship between cognition and emotion, stating that the cathartic

possibilities of drama "stre[ss] the cognitive aspect of emotion and sugges[t] that drama's

educational potential centres around its capacity for illumination" (p. 194). Winston

argued that emotional knowledge is intertwined with moral knowledge, and proposed that

it is the moral responsibility of teachers and dramatists to "harness [drama's] energy to

[*sic*] explore or explain or create [*sic*] particular cathartic experiences" (p. 195) that

effectively enhance moral education. Like Garber (2010), Winston suggested that what

matters is "the *wisdom* [author's italics] and appropriateness of what is learned" (p. 195).

Supporting Winston (1996), Rabin (2009) explored moral development through

the lens of an "ethic of care" (p. 129). "[C]are ethics recognizes the moral relevance of

caring relationships as both the site of and the motivation for moral learning" (p. 129).

Rabin echoed the sentiments of the Seoul Agenda (UNESCO, 2010), asserting that "when

students face violence in schools and global, environmental, and political crises,

[educators and practitioners] must consider how the arts offer unique opportunities for

students to learn to relate across differences, to care for one another, and discuss ideas"

(p. 127). Rabin argued that critical engagement allows students to connect through

caring relationships in order to interrogate topical and historical issues.

    In addition to its suitability for moral education in an ethic of care, DSI's use in

education may also be linked to Gardner's (2003) theory of multiple intelligences. Roper

and Davis (2000) situated process drama in the context of Gardner's theory, suggesting

that art and cognition are connected in a way that "involve[s] various human

intelligences" (p. 220). Process drama is "a combination of forms of drama activity

where the central purpose is for the experience and learning of those participating rather

than working towards a performance" (p. 230). Process drama, a major component of

DSI, has the ability to engage students in activities related to UNESCO's (2010) third

goal and subgoals, specifically through moral education, an ethic of care, and

accessibility to multiple intelligences.

DSI in the Community

    Literature reveals that DSI has been used effectively in many communities

internationally. One example is DRACON (Drama for Conflict Management)

International. Lepp (2011) described the unique ways in which DRACON has

implemented DSI strategies in four countries and offered international workshops to

address conflict on a global scale. With the goal of "promoting conflict literacy" (p.

102), DRACON's adolescent participants "gained new knowledge and understanding on several levels; a social level, an aesthetic level and a cognitive level" (p. 101).

Another example of DSI in the community is CANU (Child Advocacy for Norway and Uganda). In this program, Mangeni (2006) employed Theatre for Development (TfD) techniques with young adult students from Norway and Uganda, who collaborated to engage a Ugandan village in TfD. In his discussion of the program, Mangeni referenced Mlama's (2002) stages of the TfD process: "community identification, access and mobilisation, core and peer-group formation, problem identification and prioritisation, playmaking, rehearsal, facilitation of performance through community festival, deconstruction and evaluation, and follow-up" (Mangeni, 2006, p. 234). Mangeni suggested that the most important element of his work with CANU was in community-building, especially as the project involved two groups of individuals from distinctly different cultures. Participants' needs were at the forefront of his project as Mangeni prefaced the TfD work by questioning, "What factors constitute a community?" (p. 235).

Also in Africa, Sutherland (2006) discussed her use of DSI with street children in Grahamstown, South Africa's "Art of the Street Project." To create their performance, Sutherland encouraged participants to use forms of expression in which they were fluent (like "play"). Her greatest challenge was helping participants find their individual voices in a context that rejected their abilities for self-expression. This challenge was addressed through trust-building. The resulting performance highlighted "victim roles and perceptions" (p. 339), demanding that audiences view the perspective of all characters. DSI allowed young and marginalized participants "to represent and re-enact their past

and present, and the audience's witnessing of this … can create a dialogic tension in which both parties perceive alternative futures in the moment of performance" (p. 343).

In a third African study, Heap and Simpson (2005) used DSI in a Drama in Aids Education (DramaAIDE) program, promoting HIV/AIDS awareness among young Zambian participants and their communities. As facilitators, Heap and Simpson placed focus on participants' experience and knowledge, suggesting that "in contrast to top-down approaches, [DSI] creates an arena for participants to bring their own concerns to bear in the dramas they actively create" (p. 99). Like Winston (1996) and Rabin (2009), Heap and Simpson argued that the power of drama lies in its ability to engage "human dimensions of situations … to promote compassion and work against stigma" (p. 99).

Additionally, Heap and Simpson (2005) recognized the intermediary nature of drama participation as an example of Turner's (1987) concept of liminality. Conrad (2004) echoed this idea, suggesting that drama is "a type of ritual passage" (p. 91). Although it manifests as a transitional state, Heap and Simpson argued that DSI creates a "safe space" (p. 100) for participants. Like Winston (1996) and Rabin (2009), Heap and Simpson explained drama's value in "the possibility of increasing awareness … promoting empathy and compassion, and of moving towards the creation of personal solutions" (p. 100). However, they also proposed that, in some cultures, classrooms do not provide a suitable environment for genuine, uninhibited discussions, and might not be the best venues for students to explore sensitive issues. Thus, in their African study, the researchers went beyond the classroom, using culturally-relevant art forms to mix "performance, theatre-in-education, forum theatre, and arts workshops" (p. 90). Forum Theatre (FT), a technique under Boal's (2008) umbrella of *Theatre of the Oppressed*,

stages participants' experiences of oppression for an audience of their peers. As the action reaches its climax, the performance stops and audience members are invited onstage as "spect/actors" (p. xxi) to problem-solve incidents in what Boal calls a "rehearsal of revolution" (p. 119)).

Echoing Heap and Simpson (2005), Nogueira (2006) drew ties between her community theatre initiatives in Southern Brazil and the writings of Freire (2011) and Boal (2008). She emphasized the importance of participant ownership and individual development in her DSI work, and explained that the first principle of DSI is "connecting community theatre practices with other activities in the community" (p. 275).

DSI in Prisons

Similar to the worldwide use of DSI in communities, drama as social intervention has been employed globally in prisons. In the United Kingdom, Balfour (2000) implemented the Theatre in Prisons/Probation (TIPP) program, involving violent offenders as participants in a "drama-based approach to anger management work" (p. 10). Recognizing the importance of perspective-taking with this population, Balfour commented that "what is needed is an exploration of the continued desire and *need* [author's italics] for violence" (p. 17). He reaffirmed that the process of normalizing violence is what creates a "subculture of violence" (p. 18). Moreover, he proposed that individual change and social change are not binaries; rather, their relationship is intertwined and needing further investigation. Balfour found that resisting hegemonic ideologies of gender was a constant struggle for TIPP participants, as many had been perpetrators of violence against women. By using role-play and drama techniques like

the "slow-motion rehearsal" (p. 13), he was able to generate and sustain dialogue about gender ideologies as sources of conflict.

In India, Ramamoorthi (2006) engaged Madurai prisoners in drama-therapy experiences with the intention of improving their sense of "freedom [as] as state of mind" (p. 367) during incarceration. His methods included arts-based techniques such as storytelling, improvisation, drama games, using mixed media, and performance. Ramamoorthi found that drama therapy "infu[sed] prisoners with self-confidence and self-esteem," (p. 372). He described his approach to the intervention, asserting that "[he] never asked [prisoner participants] about the nature of their crimes and tried to treat them as friends" (p. 372). By fostering trust in this way, Ramamoorthi encouraged participants to become comfortable confiding in him, as well as engaging in, and reflecting on, arts-based activities. Drama enabled participants to "work toward an understanding" (p. 368) of their individual challenges during imprisonment.

As a form of DSI, Campbell and Conrad (2006) used a Popular Theatre (PT) approach in a prison for young offenders in Alberta, Canada. In the spirit of process drama, PT "focuses on accessing honest responses to given situations through improvised drama rather than the 'quality' of the performance" (Conrad, 2004, p. 90). In this study, the authors used drama activities to "explore alternate realities within various scenarios" (Campbell & Conrad, 2006, p. 376), inviting participants to engage in problem-solving strategies. Through the PT approach, participants gradually exhibited ownership of their work. "Using human behaviour as subject matter, drama creat[ed] opportunities for self-knowledge as individuals gain[ed] heightened awareness of motivations behind their behaviour" (p. 376).

DSI in Schools

As in community and prison projects, DSI has been used worldwide in schools to address social issues. In the United Kingdom, Edward Bond's *The Children* (2006) engaged high school students in a 1-week program culminating in a final performance that toured in various schools. Both Nicholson (2003) and Bryanston (2001) reflected on their involvement in this project. Bryanston asserted that an important element was the highly participatory nature of Bond's script. In the play, only adult roles were scripted and all the "children's" parts were landmarked for prepared improvisation, (i.e., teenaged students improvised dialogue within the framing offered by events in the plot.) Because of this generative requirement, responsibility was placed on the adolescents in a way that effectively and supportively fostered critical growth.

Nicholson (2003) found that the creative process of developing *The Children* (Bond, 2006) allowed participants: (a) to "interro[gate] the moral seriousness of [the play's] content," and (b) to give teenagers "a very public voice in a city where they felt ignored and undermined" (2003, p. 11). Participants achieved a sense of agency as they constructed the play's "children" in a way that resisted the "passive victims" (p. 15) stereotype. "Bond's children cannot accept injustice, and as they grow up they have to learn how to be human in a corrupt and corrupting world," (p. 13). The production accessed issues of social justice while allowing student participants to reflect critically on their own experiences.

In a similar play-building project, students from an all-boys secondary drama classroom in Bournemouth, UK, (Horitz, 2001) participated in a community theatre project about their town. The boys were responsible for creating and performing two

scenes, with the intention of "giv[ing] the [boys] as much ownership … as possible" (p. 76). Horitz asserted that the value of community plays lies in "community development … cross-curricular learning … [and] empowerment through co-ownership" (p. 71).

In Alberta, Canada, Conrad (2004) used Forum Theatre (FT) with "at-risk" youth, inviting them to explore what "Life in the Sticks" (p. 93), living in a rural environment, meant to them. Conrad guided students to initially express themselves through visual arts and gradually moved to engage them in PT and FT techniques. The distancing properties of FT allowed participants to engage objectively with the risk-taking behaviour being questioned, and feel more comfortable exploring multiple perspectives on this issue. Conrad found that "[participants] learned about the issues [their] work raised … [which] also appealed to students' sense of enjoyment of an activity involving risk-taking from within a safe environment" (p. 103).

In an urban Canadian setting, Zatzman (2005) worked with adolescents aged 12 to 16 in a Holocaust Memorial drama titled *Wrapped in Grief*. Zatzman prefaced her writing by proposing that "drama education offers an aesthetic frame that allows us the possibility [of] playing out that which cannot be represented" (p. 96). She viewed *Wrapped in Grief* as an "identity project" (p. 102) due to its extensive use of participants' artistic reflections in response to Holocaust subject matter. Like Bryanston (2001), Nicholson (2003), and Horitz (2001), Zatzman emphasized the importance of participants' ownership of their work to fortify their engagement with the material. As a result of participants' meaningful engagement, Zatzman considered the performance of *Wrapped in Grief* "a powerful act of memory and memorial" (p. 102).

In the United States, Nelson, Colby, and McIlrath (2000) applied mantle of the expert (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995) as a drama technique with "high-risk" students in an urban middle school classroom. This technique demands that students become imaginary experts, allowing them to explore content in role. The study concluded that learning was maximized as drama "situate[d] critical thinking and problem solving in real-life contexts" (p. 67). Participants reported that having their voices heard was crucial to their engagement in the drama activities.

Also in the United States, Coates (2001) used DSI in her drama classroom to help students understand a phenomenon she called "pouring paint." With this metaphor she acknowledged that "prejudice and intolerance block initiative and risk-taking" (p. 27) in the classroom. Pouring paint is the process of a person "ruining" the creative work of her peers and/or herself. Through instruction via drama activities and establishing both group goals and a group reward, a sense of team was created in the classroom. This deliberate process fostered feelings of equality among students and decreased the likeliness of students to "pour paint" or criticize their peers.

Gonzalez (2002) used plays about social issues as DSI to address concerns among her American high school students through their club, "Teens Acting for Community Awareness." Gonzalez discovered that "the content of a particular play is less important to the growth of individual students than is the process of communicating about that play as students' lives unfold even after the 'final curtain'" (p. 20). However, a transformative or liminal process (Turner, 1987) does not exist without challenges. "Part of a self-actualization process includes … resistance, succumbing to temptation and denial" (Gonzalez, 2002, p. 19).

In an international study, Hatton (2004) used script devising as DSI with adolescent girls in one all-girls school in Sydney, Australia, and another in London, UK. Hatton explained that the educator's greatest question is "how to resurrect agency *for* and *with* [author's italics and emphasis] their female students" (p. 92). She found that "using [dramatic literature] to teach critical and cultural literacy" was insufficient; instead, "girls needed ways to be in charge of the drama as authors and actors" (p. 92). Hatton discussed ways in which girls are systematically suppressed by hegemonic gender norms throughout adolescence. Using girls' own voices and narratives "tapped into girls' need for and knowledge of relationships" (p. 96). However, Hatton also noted that dynamics of girl agency are reflected in the unique power relationships among the particular group of participants. It remains the facilitator's responsibility to traverse these dynamics in ways that best support girl participants in the performance devising process.

In a more recent all-girl study, Edell (2013) used DSI with urban teenagers to explore their understanding of gendered stereotypes through performance. By inviting girls to devise and perform their own stories, Edell found that "girls subconsciously repeat[ed] and re-embod[ied] stories of oppression." (p. 53). However, DSI techniques encouraged the girls to "describe their experiences with language no researcher could construct for them" (p. 61). DSI uniquely enabled the girls to express their perceptions and understandings of oppression.

DSI and Bullying Among Young People

Boal's (2008) Forum Theatre (FT) is a DSI technique that many drama practitioners and educators employ to address social issues pertaining to young people, including bullying and gender-based violence. Belliveau (2006), for example, used FT in

elementary schools in Prince Edward Island, Canada, to address bullying. Data from program facilitators, teachers, and elementary student participants revealed that all parties acknowledged the benefits of FT to address bullying in the elementary setting. Teachers recognized that DSI facilitated team-building in their classes and believed that the program "sen[t] the message that dealing with bullying issues should be a part of teaching and not only seen as a punishment" (p. 331). Belliveau concluded that DSI holds "power … as a way of learning and knowing" (p. 333).

In Sweden, Österlind (2011) outlined her use of FT with young people in "forum play": a drama process that combines socioanalytical role-play, values clarification, and FT. In her work, Österlind used "'prediscussion'" (p. 248) to facilitate critical reflection about how participants know what they know. In the process of creating group goals, she interrogated individual values. Österlind concluded that this project allowed students to engage critically with both individual and collective values, thus, better accessing means of social change.

In South Africa, Clark (2009) used both Boal's (2008) Theatre of the Oppressed techniques and Haug's (2008) collective memory work to engage Grade 11 girls in an interrogation of gender-based violence. Haug's memory work "involves stories written by the group members, often with photos and pictures … [which] are analysed within the group … and rewritten" (p. 62). Clark proposed that collective memory work connects girls and women's experiences to drama work through the sharing of personal narratives and reflection on common experiences. In conjunction with memory work, Theatre of the Oppressed techniques invited participants to reflect upon their own experiences and share as they were comfortable. These combined strategies "highlight[ed] ways of

'sharing' and encouraging alternative accounts within the pervasive dominant discourses around gender violence" (p. 50).

Clark (2009) explained that the dynamism inherent in drama allowed participants to "identify, interrogate and explore solutions to relevant social issues affecting them" (p. 53), especially experiences of gender-based oppression. She argued that a "reduction in censoring … by girls often yields performances that more accurately portray the everyday reality of their lives," creating "the space and relative freedom to express opinions or show scenarios that they might be hesitant or unable to show in a group discussion" (pp. 58-59). Clarke asserted that this process accessed Friere's (2011) "critical consciousness."

In southwestern Ontario, Canada, two professional theatre companies presently use Boal's (2008) Forum Theatre (FT) to address bullying issues among adolescents; the first is Joan Chandler's PT company "Sheatre" (Sheatre Educational Alternative Theatre, 2012). Since 2006, Sheatre has toured an FT production titled *Far from the Heart* in Ontario and Saskatchewan. Originally developed in 2006 by Chandler and youth from the Bruce Peninsula, the play addresses date rape and violence against young women. The play's website includes an interactive film to which youth can submit filmed responses, as "spect-actors" would onstage (www.farfromtheheart.com). In an action research study about the play, Kloeble (2012) explained that "Forum Theatre utilizes a skills-building component … facilitat[ing] a unique opportunity to engage youth to enact and discuss difficult subject matter" (p. 4).

Mixed Company Theatre (n.d.) also offers touring FT programming in southwestern Ontario. Echoing the Seoul Agenda (UNESCO, 2010), Mixed Company

boasts the catch phrase "engage – educate – empower" and mandates a commitment to "innovative, socially relevant drama as a tool for positive change" (para. 1). In their most recent 2012/2013 season, Mixed Company toured a play about cyberbullying titled *Showdown 2.0* to Ontario high schools. On their website, former Ontario Premiere, Dalton McGuinty, described their work as "socially relevant … [U]sing theatre as a vehicle for meaningful change, [Mixed Company] makes a real difference in the lives of Ontarians" (para. 4).

Summary of Literature Review

Limited research exists about cyberbullying as a relatively new field of study. Existing literature emphasizes a need for further exploration of this issue, especially when discussing cyberbullying and adolescent girls. However, extensive literature supports the use of DSI dealing with issues of social justice, including bullying. From international organizations, such as UNESCO (2010), to provincial DSI initiatives, drama techniques have proven to be effective in addressing current issues of social justice. Chapter Three outlines the methodology and research design of the present DSI investigation of girls' experiences and understanding of cyberbullying.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

"[G]ood qualitative research" not only explores new or evocative phenomena, but also employs "methodologically significant approaches" (Tracy, 2010, p. 846). Authenticity is achieved through researcher transparency, promoting verisimilitude in findings (Tracy, 2010, p. 842). Using qualitative arts-based methods, the researcher in this study acted as a participant observer (Creswell, 2012, p. 214). A small group of teenaged girls from a medium-sized independent school in southwestern Ontario engaged in nine 1 to 1.5-hour study sessions. Each session employed DSI techniques to explore how participants understand cyberbullying as a social phenomenon. Data were collected using researcher fieldnotes and participant journals, interviews, and artefacts. Research questions included:

- How do teenaged girls define cyberbullying?

- In what ways do teenaged girls experience cyberbullying?

- How do drama activities affect teenaged girls' perceptions of cyberbullying?

This chapter outlines details of the study including: research methodology; selection of site and participants; data collection, recording, and analysis procedures; the establishment of credibility; ethical considerations; and study limitations.

Research Methodology

This study employed qualitative arts-based procedures as central components of its activities, artefacts generated therein, and reporting of findings through ethnodrama. Creswell (2012) described arts-based research as a unique "alternative" (p. 274) form of qualitative research. Saldaña (2011) discussed drama, dance, visual art, and music as artistic processes that express meaning beyond the scientific language of typical research

methods and findings. Barone and Eisner (2012) acknowledged arts-based methods in both "inquiry and represent[ation]" (p. 13) as uniquely addressing aesthetic qualities that make content accessible through variation of form.

Siegesmund and Cahnmann-Taylor (2008) specifically advocated for arts-based research in education, as it encourages new ways of exploring students' knowledge construction. Eisner (2008b) emphasized that because arts-based methods are participant-focused, they encourage educational research to truly make a difference in the lives of young participants. For the same reasons, Saldaña (2011) argued that arts-based research is appropriate for both child and adult participants.

Arts-based research generates discourse that is different from typical qualitative methods (Eisner, 2008a; Finley, 2008). Eisner (2008a) suggested that some knowledge is "not expressible in ordinary discourse" (p. 7). Arts-based methods allow for some forms of knowing to be more appropriately expressed, especially those relating to empathy and affective elements of research. "Diversity of worldview, of media, [and] of levels of preparation" (Finley, 2008, p. 76) in arts-based research contribute to this alternative discourse.

Barone and Eisner (2012) recognized arts-based approaches as important tools for accessing multiple perspectives and challenging hegemonic ideologies, offering multiple means of expression instead of "arriv[ing] at a singular and unchallengeable slice of knowledge" (p. 52-53). Similarly, Sanders (2006) argued that through arts-based methods, "the participant-performer enters into, and disrupts, the traditionally privileged space of the education researcher" (pp. 93-94). Arts-based research has the capacity to subvert "master narrative[s]" (Barone, 2008, p. 38), allowing the transfer of power over

knowledge construction back to participants. As a contemporary approach to "intellectual authority" (Siegesmund & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2008, p. 235), arts-based research shifts power from the researcher to the participants, demanding researchers to become "scholARTis[t]"; applying "their own hybrid backgrounds … combining the arts and the social sciences" (p. 243). Finley (2008) acknowledged the political nature of redefining discourses through arts-based research in its intention to "revolutionize institutionalized classist, racist, and colonializing ways of experiencing and discoursing about human experience" (p. 73). Specifically exploring young people and social media, Wilson (2006) stressed the importance of methodologies that are sensitive to the unique nature of the "flows" of online and offline adolescent relationships (p. 316) in considering young people's "struggle[s] in relation to notions of hegemony and ideology" (pp. 323-324).

Greene (1995) argued that arts-based research allows all parties involved to become "makers of meaning" (para. 26) in a way that acknowledges the fluidity of both individual and group identities. In acknowledging the interplay between individuals involved, arts-based research creates rich connections between self and other (Bresler, 2006, p. 61).

Barone (2008) addressed arts-based methods as "catalyst[s] for the changing of minds" (p. 35), while Finley (2008) acknowledged that arts-based research "provid[es] opportunities for self-expression" (p. 79). Literature reveals the capacity of arts-based research to pose questions that incite both social change and self-expression (Barone, 2008; Creswell, 2012; Siegesmund & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2008). For example, Marin (2007) used Boal's (2008) Theatre of the Oppressed techniques to explore Latina identity. She described her approach as a process that fostered praxis in accessing

Freire's (2011) critical consciousness and provoking social change. Also focusing on

critical consciousness and social change, Campbell and Conrad (2006) employed

ethnodrama in their study of young offenders in Alberta. Staging findings from

fieldnotes and participant narratives, the researchers allowed their findings to inform their

expression. Ethnodrama accurately expressed questions arising from their DSI based

research.

Selection of Site and Participants

In my study on cyberbullying, I originally anticipated that participants would be 8

to 12 female volunteers in Grades 11 and 12 from a medium-sized public high school in

southwestern Ontario. I had access to the site and the principal because I had been an

occasional teacher and classroom volunteer at the proposed school from January to June

2012.

Following Brock Research Ethics Board and school board approval to conduct the

research, I contacted the school principal by letter, and received permission to use the

school as a research site. During the first week of September (September 3-6, 2012), I

initiated morning announcements inviting volunteer participants to take part in the study

(see Appendix A for the announcement script).

These invitations did not successfully recruit participants. The primary reason for

this lack of success is unclear. In recruiting meetings, a number of girls expressed

interest in the study, but indicated that they either had time-conflicting commitments

(e.g., co-curricular activities or evening employment), or lacked transportation after

school. At the same time, the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation work-to-

rule and labour disruption resisted the study as an extracurricular activity.

On October 10, 2012, I approached an alternative research site, a medium-sized independent school in southwestern Ontario with an international and domestic population of 460 students, a large portion of whom are boarding students. I had begun teaching at the school in September 2012. I first provided the principal with a letter asking to use the school as a research site. In our subsequent meeting, the principal granted consent for the study to be offered as a school activity. We agreed on a research session location, dates, and times. I provided the principal with a consent letter to sign and informed Brock University's Research Ethics Board of the change in proposed location of the study. In the first week of November, I initiated recruitment announcements through the school's internal email system, posting the announcement on a community forum (see Appendix B).

On November 6 and 8, I met with interested participants over the lunch hour. During these meetings, I answered questions about the study and explained the commitment it would require, emphasizing the voluntary and confidential nature of participation (see Appendix C for the recruitment meeting script). Five students in total attended the meetings. This included Salvatore, Andy, Rin, and Emilia. One other student attended who decided not to participate in the study due to her experiences with cyberbullying. Students had the opportunity to submit signed participant consent and parent/guardian consent forms at the recruitment meetings. Electronic announcements continued until Thursday, November 15, 2012. A final after-school recruitment meeting was arranged for Thursday, November 15; however, no students attended. I sent participant consent forms electronically to those who contacted me, saying they were unable to attend the meeting, and encouraged them to respond with further questions.

In mid-November, the school Activities Coordinator announced that the study would have to begin in January 2013 rather than November as was intended. I spoke again with the principal who gave verbal consent for the alternative dates. I contacted participant volunteers via email and informed them of the change in dates for the study. Participants received new consent forms to sign, with correct session dates. The first session of the study occurred on Thursday, January 22, 2013.

<p style="text-align: center;">Participants</p>

Participants formed a convenience sample of five girls "willing and able" to partake in the research (Creswell, 2012, p. 145). All participant volunteers assumed a self-selected pseudonym before participating in the study. The girls are discussed in this thesis only by the pseudonyms they selected.

Salvatore was 16 years old and in Grade 11 at the time of the study. Salvatore was a Canadian boarding student from outside of southwestern Ontario. She volunteered for the study because she wanted to learn more about cyberbullying and wanted to be involved with the research process. Salvatore attended all of the sessions.

Andy was 16 years old and in Grade 11 at the time of the study. Andy was a day student who grew up in the city where the school is located. She volunteered for the study after Salvatore suggested it to her. Andy said that the study sounded interesting and she trusted Salvatore's opinion of it. Andy attended Sessions I to IV, part of Session VII, and Sessions VIII and IX.

Rin was 18 years old and in Grade 12 at the time of the study. Rin was a boarding student from Russia who volunteered because she thought the study's activities and topic sounded interesting. Rin attended all sessions except for Session III.

Robin was 17 years old and in Grade 11 at the time of the study. Robin was a boarding student from Mexico. She volunteered because of her previous experiences of cyberbullying and her desire to help others who struggle as victims. The focus on drama also attracted her as a theatre student. She attended Sessions II, III, V to VII, and IX.

Emilia was 18 years old and in Grade 12 at the time of the study. Emilia was a boarding student from Venezuela. She volunteered to participate in the study, but was unable to attend the first three sessions for longer than 10 minutes due to conflicts with other school activities. By Session IV, she withdrew from the study.

Data Collection and Recording

This study collected and interpreted information about senior high school girls' perceptions of cyberbullying. Data were collected using researcher fieldnotes, participant journal entries (see Appendix D for journal prompts), interviews (see Appendix E for interview questions), and participant artefacts. All paper copies of data were kept in a researcher data binder that was organized chronologically and included: data analysis reflections, the session schedule, session materials, meeting schedules, recruiting documents, consent forms, and data pertaining to the research site. Within each session tab, data were sorted by: (a) lesson plan, (b) handwritten fieldnotes, (c) transcribed fieldnotes, (d) participant artefacts, (e) interview transcripts, and (f) journal entries. Similarly, study-related email correspondences were printed and included in the data binder as they occurred chronologically. Electronic data were kept chronologically in a folder on my personal computer and backed up on a USB flash drive.

Fieldnotes

Descriptive and reflective point-form fieldnotes (Creswell, 2012, p. 217) were handwritten on a researcher notepad throughout each session. Fieldnotes for Sessions VIII and IX were written electronically due to time constraints. All fieldnotes were kept with the session lesson plan and supplemented with notes written directly on the lesson plan throughout each session, tracking changes in the order of events.

Before each session began, fieldnotes documented participant attendance, as well as reflections about activities for future sessions. During sessions, descriptive notes included the physical setting, perceived participant engagement with session activities and core questions, social dynamics, attitudes expressed verbally and nonverbally, and descriptions of participant artefacts (Creswell, 2012,p. 217). After each session, observations and notes pertinent to the following session were added.

At the conclusion of the study, fieldnotes were transcribed and expanded upon, incorporating notes from the lesson plans, clarifying point-form language, and adding reflective comments. Fieldnotes for Sessions VIII and IX were amended electronically and printed.

Participant Journal Entries

Journaling "enable[s] engagement in reflection … [and is] a useful tool for formative, developmental learning" (Harris, 2005, p. 59). In this study, journals offered a communication tool for participants who might not have been comfortable truly expressing their ideas in either the whole group or one-on-one interviews. In order to encourage honesty and openness in reflection, I emphasized in Sessions I and II that journals were confidential between the researcher and participant.

Each journal consisted of a yellow duo-tang with lined paper, on which the participant wrote her pseudonym. Participants were allotted 5 to 10 minutes at the end of each session to complete their journal entries. These handwritten responses were usually between one third and three quarters of a page in length. Journals were stored in a locked office between study sessions.

All journal prompt questions were open-ended to allow for a multiplicity of potential responses (Creswell, 2012, p. 218), and asked participants to comment on such topics as: their online appearance, changes in understanding of cyberbullying, ideas for cyberbullying intervention, connection to focus activities, and cautions they have for their peers about cyberbullying (see Appendix D). In Sessions I through VI, two to four participants responded to a written journal prompt while others engaged in one-on-one interviews. Journal prompts for Sessions I to II, and IV to VI were generated inductively from the review of literature and session lesson plans completed before the start of the study.

Interviews

Interviews are an established method in educational research (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009) allowing researchers to "sho[w] an interest in, [be] sensitive toward, and see[k] to understand" (p. 32) their participants. "Interviews are particularly well suited for studying people's understanding of the meanings in their lived world, describing their experiences and self-understanding, and clarifying and elaborating their own perspective on their lived world" (p. 116). One-on-one interviews are particularly "ideal for interviewing participants … who are articulate, and who can share ideas comfortably" (Creswell, 2012, p. 218).

In this study, both individual and group interviews occurred. Before the study began, I generated two sets of open-ended individual interview questions (Creswell, 2012, p. 218), based on the review of literature and prepared session activities (see Appendix E for interview questions). The first set of questions (for Sessions I to IV) addressed the following topics: reasons to participate in the study, definition of cyberbullying, experiences with cyberbullying, change in understanding of cyberbullying, and reaction to session activities. The second set, for Sessions V to IX, addressed: changes in attitude, learning from the study and specific activities, effects of the study, and contrasts between the study and school curriculum. In all interviews, probes sought clarification and encouraged participants to expand their ideas (Creswell, 2012, p. 221).

To maintain confidentiality and privacy, individual interviews occurred in a room separate from other participants. To best capture the data, each interview was recorded using the "Voice Memos" application on my personal iPhone. I transferred the recordings to my personal computer and transcribed them verbatim, including pauses and non-linguistic utterances (e.g., laughter) in square brackets. Tilley (2003) argued for researchers to transcribe their own interviews in order to increase the "trustworthiness of data" (p. 771) and better connect data to findings (p. 750) as "understandings that develop as tapes are transcribed" (p. 770) enrich the data analysis process.

In Sessions I, II, IV, VI, VIII, and IX, I conducted one-on-one interviews with one or two participants for 5 to 10 minutes each at the end of the study session. The goal was for each girl to participate in at least two interviews across 9 weeks. In Sessions I and

VIII, a single one-on-one interview occurred at the beginning of the session due to issues of other participants' tardiness.

In Sessions VIII and IX, group interviews gathered information about participants' discomfort with the originally agreed upon collective creation performance. Questions in the group interviews were inductively formulated, addressing such topics as: alternative ideas for finishing the study, opinions about the change in the group goal, reasons for discomfort with performing the collective creation, participant desires from the study, final thoughts about the study, and interest in the dissemination of findings. At the end of the study, I emailed all interview transcripts to participants for member checking (Creswell, 2012, p. 259). Member-checking only led to changes in Salvatore's transcripts, in instances where I had indicated that her comments were inaudible.

Participant Artefacts

Session activities produced various participant artefacts in the form of visual material and handwritten documents. Creswell (2012) praised the use of visual materials as "rich data" that are easily relatable and "provide an opportunity for the participants to share directly their perceptions of reality" (p. 224). Handwritten documents are also beneficial resources, being "in [the participants'] language and words … [and] usually given thoughtful attention" (p. 223). Participant artefacts, generated in Sessions I to VII, included: group goals and rules, avatar images, post-it notes from a "secrets wall," choral reading script, pictures of cyberbullying tableaux and captions, cyberbullying stories and solutions, a song playlist, and "Dear Someone Like Me" letters.

I kept each handwritten and transcribed artefact in my research data binder in chronological order throughout the study. The group goals and rules were kept with the

avatar images in a locked office, as they were too large to include in the data binder.

Descriptive notes about the avatar images were coded and sorted as data segments.

Group goals, rules, and the secrets wall were transcribed and coded, while the

cyberbullying stories and choral reading script were transcribed between sessions and

then coded. Cyberbullying story solutions, the song playlist, and "Dear Someone Like

Me" letters were coded as handwritten documents.

<div align="center">

Research Procedures

</div>

Nine after-school research sessions began January 22, 2013 and continued until

April 18. Each session included a focus question and a set of arts-based activities related

to the focus question. The core activities from Sessions I to VI were intended to generate

content for a final collective creation performance. Sessions VII to IX were intended to

prepare participants for the final performance; instead, they offered final thoughts on the

study and participants' creative work as a whole.

Session Content

The following outlines session content in each of the 9 study sessions.

Session I. The focus question for Session I was: How do participants perceive

their online identities? Session I occurred on Thursday, January 24, 2013, after school

from 4:15 until 6:20 p.m. By 4:20, Rin was the only participant to arrive. She chose her

pseudonym and wrote it on the cover of the duo-tang provided as her journal for the

study.

Next, I interviewed Rin, using the first three interview questions (see Appendix

E). After the interview, I introduced the concept of "avatar" (de Zwart & Lindsay, 2012;

Stermitz, 2008) to Rin and invited her to create an image of her online identity using the

mixed media I had spread out on a group of desks in the classroom (Garber, 2010). These items included markers, pencils, magazine clippings, newspaper, glue, letter stamps, and coloured paper. As Rin collected media to create her avatar, I verbally communicated the avatar-building prompts (see Appendix F). I asked inductive questions about Rin's avatar and took fieldnotes as she worked.

Salvatore and Andy arrived at 5:05 from another school activity and sat with Rin. They chose their pseudonyms and recorded these names on their duo-tang journals. I introduced the concept of the avatar to Salvatore and Andy and repeated the avatar-building prompts.

At 5:10, Emilia arrived and explained that she could not attend the whole session because of another school activity. Emilia chose her pseudonym and engaged with the mixed media alongside the other participants. She placed her magazine clippings and other items in a folder and left at 5:22.

When Rin and Andy had finished their avatar images, I asked them to record participant-generated group rules and goals (Coates, 2001; Österlind, 2011) on a poster-board, using group goal and rule-setting prompts (see Appendix F). Salvatore continued to create her avatar image, actively contributing to the discussion as she worked.

Next, I wrote the Session I journal prompt (see Appendix D) on the white-board at the front of the classroom. Andy and Rin responded to the journal question as Salvatore finished her avatar image. I emphasized that journals were confidential between the participant and the researcher. I concluded the session by interviewing Salvatore, using the questions outlined in the interview questions for Session I (see Appendix E).

Session II. The focus question for Session II was: How do participants understand cyberbullying? Session II occurred on Thursday, January 31, 2013, after school from 5:15 to 6:30 p.m. Emilia arrived before the session, saying that she could not attend due to her other school activity.

Robin arrived at the beginning of the session with Andy and Rin. Robin chose her pseudonym and wrote it on her journal duo-tang. We reviewed the meaning of an avatar as a group (de Zwart & Lindsay, 2012; Stermitz, 2008). Rin and Andy shared their avatar images with Robin. Next, I asked the girls to describe their avatar image in their journals. I encouraged Robin to think about what her image might be and reflect on it in her entry. On the side of the white-board at the front of the room I wrote the following prompts to scaffold their responses: "My avatar is…," "My avatar is made of…," and "My avatar looks like…" Girls worked on their entries for 10 minutes using these sentence-starters.

While participants wrote in their journals, I wrote "Cyberbullying is…" in the middle of the white-board. Salvatore arrived at 5:45 in time for this cyberbullying "secrets wall" activity (Johnson, 2012). After providing each girl a pile of 10 to 15 post-it notes, I invited participants to think of as many statements defining cyberbullying as they could and to write one statement finishing the "Cyberbullying is…" prompt on each post-it.

As the girls wrote, I encouraged them to think divergently, reminding them that their statements did not have to be literal. When they had five to eight statements completed, I suggested that participants put their post-it notes on the white-board around the "Cyberbullying is…" phrase to create a "secrets wall" resembling a mind-map

(Bennett & Rolheisser, 2001, p. 289-291). Salvatore began using images instead of words to express some of her statements. At this time, I suggested that the girls think about cyberbullying using the five senses, posing guiding questions such as: What does cyberbullying look or taste like? Finally, I encouraged participants to think about cyberbullying in their own lives. Once participants had created 10 to 20 statements each, I asked them to put all of their post-it notes on the white-board. Participants completed a gallery tour (Bennett & Rolheisser, 2001; Conrad, 2004) to read all of the statements.

Next, the girls grouped similar statements and created categories for their definition of cyberbullying. Salvatore created headings for each subcategory using feedback from other participants. All participants collaborated to sort the post-it notes into what they deemed the most appropriate categories.

Each participant chose a category of interest and brought those post-it notes back to her desk. I introduced the concept of found poetry (Jonker, 2012) and asked each girl to organize her post-its into a stanza. Using this technique, each stanza would comprise text from the post-it notes, new conjunctions, and adapted pronouns or verb tenses. As participants created their stanzas, I posted the Session II journal prompt (see Appendix D) on the white-board. At the end of Session II, I interviewed Andy and Robin individually, while Salvatore wrote a journal entry.

Session III. The focus question for Session III was: How do participants experience cyberbullying? This session occurred on Thursday, February 7, 2013, after school from 5:15 to 6:30 p.m. Rin contacted me by email at 5:10 indicating that she would not be attending the session. At 5:15, Robin and Andy were present. Andy volunteered to get Salvatore from her other activity and left the classroom. At 5:20,

Emilia arrived to say that she could not stay for the session. Andy and Salvatore returned at 5:30. Once three participants were present, they received their interview transcripts from Sessions I and II to read and approve.

Next, participants colour-coded their stanzas from Session II to indicate which portions would be read: (a) on their own, (b) by two participants, and (c) by the whole group. As Robin finished coding her stanza, Salvatore and Andy shared their poems aloud. Robin felt ill and asked Salvatore to read hers when she was finished coding. To create a choral reading piece (Belliveau, 2006; Trousdale, Bach, & Willis, 2010), the girls first decided on an order for their pieces. Participants stood and read the poem as a group, progressing through all three stanzas without stopping. The girls asked me to read for Rin in her absence. We read through the poem twice and participants gave consent for me to transcribe their stanzas into a script for Session III.

For the next activity, I wrote "Stories About Cyberbullying" in the middle of the white-board. I placed a selection of coloured markers on a desk at the front of the room and invited participants to each take one to the board. I prompted them to record, in point-form, as many "stories" about cyberbullying as they could imagine (Ramamoorthi, 2006). I explained that the girls were not obliged to share personal stories about themselves or their peers. I recorded the girls' point-form stories in an electronic text document, categorizing the stories by student.

At the end of the session, all three participants wrote a journal response. Instead of the intended journal prompt, girls answered two inductive questions taken directly from the Session I to IV interview questions (see Appendix E) about their understanding of cyberbullying and reaction to the activities. (The intended question was inappropriate,

as we did not complete the activities planned for this session.) No interviews were conducted.

Session IV. The focus question for Session IV was: How might participants positively change experiences of cyberbullying? This session occurred on Thursday, February 21, 2013 after school from 5:15 to 6:30 p.m. Robin was not present. Emilia met me in the hallway earlier in the day to say that she could no longer attend the study sessions. Each participant received a copy of the choral reading script I had transcribed. I encouraged the girls to review the script to make sure it was correct and to highlight their parts. As Salvatore and Andy highlighted their parts, I explained the activity to Rin. She was included as a reader in the script, although her found poem was not included because she was absent during the coding session.

Once girls were finished highlighting, they expressed that they wanted to read aloud at their desks. Participants asked me to read Robin's part in her absence and we read the script aloud. For the second reading, I encouraged participants to stand, as they would in a performance. At the end of the session, the girls took the scripts home with them to become more familiar with the text for Session V.

We returned to the Stories About Cyberbullying activity from Session III. I projected my electronic notes onto the SMART Board for participants to review. Each participant chose one story to explore in a drama activity. Salvatore volunteered to explore her story first. I explained the technique of tableau (Balfour, 2000; Henderson, 2013; Zatzman, 2005) and asked the girls to use this method to illustrate the "worst part" of Salvatore's cyberbullying story. I prompted the girls to consider which other characters might be present in the tableau aside from those named in the point-form story.

Salvatore explained her cyberbullying story to the group and set up desks in the classroom to facilitate her tableau. This process was repeated for Andy and Rin's stories.

Next, participants created titles for their tableaux and recorded them on the white-board. Under each title, the girls listed the characters involved and starred the name of the character whose perspective was taken in their tableaux (Balfour, 2000; Conrad, 2004; Henderson, 2013). I asked participants to rank the stories from #1 to #3; #1 representing the story they wanted to explore first using role-play, and #3 being the story they would explore last.

Participants chose to explore Salvatore's story first. They recreated a tableau of the "worst moment," and then created a tableau of the "moment where things went wrong." Next, I asked participants to role-play the steps between the first and second tableau to observe how different decisions could be made to resolve conflict (Nelson et al., 2000; Roper & Davis, 2000; Zatzman, 2005). Participants spoke in and out of role to tell the cyberbullying story. Once the girls reached the climax, I stopped them and asked them to consider what needed to change in order to resolve the conflict.

Next, participants drew pictures to record the "worst moment" tableaux from their individual stories. One also drew a picture for the first tableau in the story chosen by Salvatore. At the end of the session, I asked Salvatore and Andy to respond to the Session IV journal prompt (see Appendix D). I interviewed Rin in the classroom across the hallway and interviewed Salvatore once the other girls had left.

Session V. The focus question for Session V was: What are participants' attitudes toward cyberbullying? The focus question for Session IV ("How might participants

positively change experiences of cyberbullying?") was also considered as we completed Session IV activities.

Participants looked at their tableaux drawings to refresh the Session IV activity and Salvatore retold her cyberbullying story. The girls assumed roles from the story, using the drawing of the first tableau to start their role-play (Nelson et al., 2000; Roper & Davis, 2000; Zatzman, 2005). I reminded participants to pay attention to moments when characters made poor choices as they dramatized the story, ending with the climax.

As the activity progressed, I prompted the girls to use dialogue and speak continuously in-role (Garber, 2010; Nelson et al., 2000). When participants needed assistance, they spoke out of role and offered each other next steps in the story. Participants role-played the story from first to last tableaux three times. I asked the girls what they learned about their "roles" in the story.

Next, I introduced the remote control as a problem-solving tool (Boal, 2008). I placed an old remote control on a desk to the side of the performance space and explained that, at any moment, any participant could step out of the dialogue and take the remote. With this tool, she could pause, rewind, or fast-forward the role-play to a place where she thought she could solve conflict. Participants did not use the tool the first time they re-enacted the role-play. I relocated the remote to the middle of the playing space and reviewed its properties before they played through the scene again.

The second time the role-play was enacted, I prompted Rin to intervene in the scene about a victimized female and oppressive male love interest. Rin used the remote to replay a part of the role-play she thought was humorous. After prompting, she fast-

forwarded the role-play to the moment where Robin's oppressive male character chose his reaction to a malicious Facebook post about Salvatore's character.

In the first intervention (Boal, 2008; Österlind, 2011), Robin chose to react in a way that was inconsistent with her character. I reminded the girls to intervene in a way that was true to character (Garber, 2010). Next, I asked participants to start the role-play from the beginning for a third time, and I took the remote control. I fast-forwarded to a moment when Salvatore's character was on a date with Robin's character. I paused the scene and encouraged participants to speak out of role to decide how the situation could be changed in a positive way. Next, I rewound the scene to just before the first tableau, when Rin's character posted malicious content about Salvatore's character on Facebook. Robin played a new character, a friend of Rin's character. As Robin made suggestions in role, the conflict escalated. The girls played through this exchange again from the beginning. They collaborated out of role to create a list of possible solutions for conflict in the story.

Next, I posed the question: What object is cyberbullying? (Ramamoorthi, 2006). Salvatore suggested that participants write their responses on the white-board. As the girls wrote, they drew pictures accompanying their objects. For Session VI, I asked participants to bring one object that is "most like cyberbullying." Rin, Salvatore, and Robin answered the Session V journal prompt (see Appendix D). No interviews were conducted this week.

Session VI. The focus question for Session VI was: What do participants want to tell someone *like* them about cyberbullying? The focus question from Session V ("What are participants' attitudes toward cyberbullying?") was also considered as we concluded

activities from Session V. Session VI occurred on Thursday, March 7, 2013 after school from 5:15 to 6:30 p.m.

At 5:20, Rin was the only participant present. At 5:36, Robin arrived from an appointment related to a school March Break event. I invited Rin and Robin to share their cyberbullying objects (Ramamoorthi, 2006) and to explain their choices. Rin volunteered to begin and explained the diary she had brought. Robin followed, describing the "nazar" (evil eye amulet) bracelet she wears. Salvatore arrived from her spring term sport after Robin's explanation and announced that Andy would not be attending the session due to academic commitments. Rin and Robin repeated their object descriptions with less detail. Salvatore shared the blindfold she brought in as her cyberbullying object.

Next, participants recorded in their journals the top 5 to 10 details they needed to remember if they were to explain their cyberbullying object to a new listener. Concurrently I wrote, "Dear Someone Like Me" on the white-board at the front of the room. Underneath this title, I provided formatting for a personal letter addressed to "Someone Like Me."

When participants finished writing about their objects, I collected their journals and gave them loose lined paper. I asked the girls to use their imaginations to write a personal letter to someone *like* them; a person the same age, in the same grade, in a similar school, and in a similar social situation (Eriksson, 2011; Garber, 2010). I prompted participants to use the letter to offer advice about cyberbullying, telling "someone" everything the girls thought "someone" should know. When participants

finished writing, I asked who was comfortable sharing her letter. All three girls volunteered. They chose to pass their letters to each other and read them silently.

After reading, Salvatore left for another school commitment. Rin and Robin stayed and continued reading each other's letters. When they finished, I collected the letters and placed them with my fieldnotes. I returned Robin's journal to her, and she responded to the Session VI question, which I wrote on the white-board (see Appendix D). I interviewed Rin in the classroom across the hall.

Session VII. The focus question for Session VII was: How do the pieces fit together? The focus question from Session VI (What do participants want to tell someone *like* them about cyberbullying?) was also considered as we concluded activities from Session VI. Session VII occurred on Thursday, April 4, 2013, after school from 6:00 to 6:45 p.m. (in the first week of Term 3). One month had passed between Session VI and VII as a result of the school's extended March break and Easter long weekend. On this day I supervised a group of students after school as a requirement of my teaching duties. This unanticipated situation required me to move back and forth between the room with participants and the room across the hall with other students.

Participants arrived after a school-mandated co-curricular activity. Andy arrived shortly after the session began and said that she could only stay for a few minutes. She had forgotten about the session and her parents were waiting to pick her up. At this time, I reminded participants of the goals they set at the beginning of the study, including the collective creation they intended to perform (Österlind, 2011).

I gave the girls six pieces of paper, each with the title of an activity we had completed: titles included "avatar images," "choral poem," "stories of cyberbullying

tableaux," "remote-control scene," "cyberbullying objects," and "letters to Dear Someone Like Me." I asked them to consider the activities as scenes and find an order that would best suit an overall presentation of the study's collective creation.

Next, participants considered techniques they could use as transitions between scenes. The girls brainstormed ideas verbally, discussing specific songs and ways to use the avatar images for transitions. Robin created a playlist of transition songs, and Rin offered to type her avatar image description to use as transitional text. I returned participants' "Dear Someone Like Me" letters from Session VI. The girls revised and edited their letters for use as part of the performance.

When participants finished editing their letters, they confirmed that they were comfortable performing their collective creation for their residential house meeting. I returned their avatar images from Session I and their journals, asking them to add details to the description of their avatar images. As they worked, I moved across the hallway to check on the other students.

When I returned, the girls were discussing relationships, reflecting their understanding of each other's avatar images. We discussed options for a Session VIII meeting time that would not conflict with the Term 3 activity schedule. We agreed to meet on Friday the following week, at lunch in our typical classroom. Robin read her song playlist aloud, emphasizing the importance of the song titles in the context of the play. I collected participants' journals, letters, and avatar images. No interviews or journal entries were completed this week.

Session VIII. The focus question for Session VIII was: How do we want this study to conclude? Session VIII occurred on Friday, April 12, 2013, from 11:45 a.m. to

12:30 p.m. The day after Session VII, Andy indicated by email that she was uncomfortable with the performance aspect of the study. On the same day, Salvatore asked to meet me. She and I met at lunch on Monday, April 9, and I took electronic fieldnotes as she explained that she was also uncomfortable with a final performance.

In Session VIII, Andy arrived at 11:45 and, in the absence of other participants, gave an interview using the interview questions for Session VIII (see Appendix E). Shortly thereafter, Rin and Salvatore arrived. Robin was absent for this session. I clarified that the study did not need to culminate in a performance.

I asked the girls to give a group interview, responding to inductive questions about the change in their initial goal of performing a collective creation (Coates, 2001; Österlind, 2011). Questions included: How do you view the end of this project?, How are you feeling?, What are you specifically interested in looking at in Session IX?, What factors are involved in not wanting to finish with a performance for an audience?, and Had our activity occurred in a different term, would time still be a problem?

Participants decided not to perform their creative work, and generated a new plan for Session IX. We agreed to meet for Session IX on the following Thursday at lunch, and Andy offered to collect money and order pizza. She suggested an improvisation game she wanted to teach the other participants and use to talk about cyberbullying. Rin and Andy left and Salvatore stayed for an interview. No journals were completed this week.

Session IX. The focus activity for Session IX was: "Celebrating collectively and individually created drama pieces about cyberbullying." Session IX occurred on Thursday, April 18, 2013 at lunch from 11:45 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. All participants arrived

before the beginning of the session, but Andy had not organized the pizza lunch. I suggested participants go directly to the dining hall and return with food so that they could eat before the end of the lunch hour. Meanwhile, I wrote the agenda they had created for Session IX on the white-board.

Participants returned promptly and we sat in desks facing each other. I explained that I would email interview transcripts from previous sessions as soon as they were transcribed, again inviting participants to indicate any content they wanted to exclude or clarify. I drew participants' attention to the list agenda on the white-board and reviewed what they had suggested doing this session. Robin asked to include listening to the playlist she had generated for the collective creation.

Sitting in the desks, participants read the choral reading script. Robin clarified her stage directions as the girls struggled with her portion of the script. I encouraged them to read the script a second time. This time, Robin suggested using "creepy music" to underscore the piece. Robin found an instrumental song on her cell phone, and the girls read the script. I asked the girls how it felt to perform the choral reading with music. We discussed their observations.

Next, I asked Andy if she wanted to lead the improvisation game she had suggested last week. She declined. The other girls wanted to review their Dear Someone Like Me letters. As I distributed their journals, they asked what I would be writing about in my findings. I replied that I was unable to provide an answer until I analyzed the data. I reminded them that they would receive a summary of findings once my research was completed.

Robin volunteered to read her letter aloud, followed by Salvatore, and then Rin. Andy listened as the girls read. I asked participants how it felt to write to someone *like* them. We discussed their answers. Similarly, we discussed which parts of their letters they considered most important. Despite the list of activities participants had hoped to include in Session IX, they indicated that they were content having accomplished only two.

The girls granted me permission to conduct a group interview to document their final thoughts about the study. Questions included: What are your final thoughts on the project?, Why are you interested in the study's findings?, and Why does my opinion matter? I thanked the girls for their participation, reminded them to check their school email for their transcripts, and reconfirmed that I would contact each of them with a summary of findings once my research was completed. Rin, Salvatore, and Andy left the classroom and Robin responded to the Session IX interview questions (see Appendix E). No journals were completed this week.

Data Analysis Procedures

Data were analyzed according to sound qualitative procedures of coding, identifying themes, and interpreting (Creswell, 2012, pp. 243-274). Procedures are categorized by: (a) organizing data, (b) coding data, and (c) identifying themes.

Organizing Data

The process of organizing the data at the conclusion of the study involved the following procedures:

1. At the completion of study sessions, I transcribed my handwritten field notes.

2. Interviews were downloaded to my personal computer, transcribed verbatim, and member checked by email.

3. I checked all electronic data for accurate dates and appropriate pseudonyms.

4. All electronic data, including emails, transcripts, session lesson plans, and calendars, were printed and organized chronologically. (Creswell, 2012, p. 238)

Coding Data

Data that were coded included such documents as: fieldnotes, journal entries, transcripts, and artefacts resulting from session activities. The process of coding data entailed the following procedures:

1. I initially coded data by hand using 17 *a priori* codes (Creswell, 2012, p. 239) generated by lesson activities, journal prompts, and interview questions (see Appendix D and E for journal prompts and interview questions respectively).

2. Simultaneously, I highlighted *in vivo* codes to include direct quotations from participants (Saldaña, 2009, p. 74).

3. After coding data from each session by hand, I collated instances of similar codes electronically.

4. A priori codes that generated no data were eliminated, leaving a total of 13 deductive codes (see Appendix G for a list of codes generated).

5. I coded hand-written artefacts electronically, directly under the appropriate code category. Hand-written artefacts included: journal entries, group goals and rules, post-it notes from a secrets wall, pictures of cyberbullying tableaux

and captions, cyberbullying story solutions, a song playlist, cyberbullying

object descriptions, and Dear Someone Like Me letters.

6. After categorizing all data under the 13 deductive codes, I also sorted data

segments by participant in a separate document.

7. Throughout the coding process, I wrote analytic memos to note instances of

inductive codes that emerged from the data. Saldaña (2009) described "the

coding process's ongoing interrelationship with analytic memo writing" (p.

42).

8. When the initial coding process was complete I focused specifically on

emergent inductive codes and generated a list of 19.

9. I recoded the data, using the inductive codes as organizers. Collapsing

information from various codes resulted in 16 final inductive codes (see

Appendix G for a list of inductive codes generated).

10. I sorted inductive codes by participant in a separate document.

Identifying Themes

The coding process organized data under 13 a priori or deductive codes and 19

inductive codes. I used the following procedures to formulate themes:

1. Codes were mind-mapped (Bennett & Rolheisser, 2001) into cluster groups of

similar concepts and findings

2. I merged cluster groups into five broad categories.

3. I reviewed data segments to ensure true fit in their appropriate categories.

4. I labeled each of the five categories (see Appendix H for category labels).

5. I generated thematic statements from each category label.

6. Each thematic statement became the title of a scene in the ethnodrama

    presented in Chapter Four.

Communicating Results

The findings of this study are reported in the form of an ethnodrama. Ethnodrama is a recent method of presenting research findings (McCall, 2000) by "dramatiz[ing], significant selections of narrative through interviews, participant observation fieldnotes, [and] journal entries" (Saldaña, 2006, p. 3). Creswell (2012) acknowledged ethnodrama as a reliable form of reporting, suggesting that researchers consider "an experimental, alternative, or performance approach [to writing] … qualitative research in the form of [drama]" (p. 274). Ethnodrama "performance[s] becom[e] a form of public pedagogy" (Denzin, 2003, p. 7).

Bresler (2006) argued that qualitative research should have a "living presence," engaging researchers "in a dynamic, intimate dialogue that the research's audience can consequently also experience" (p. 61). Communicating the findings of arts-based inquiry, ethnodrama provides "participatory reception, noting connections (similarities and differences) among apparently diverse items, drawing on imagination to bridge the concrete … and the abstract" (p. 63). Denzin (2003) highlighted ethnodrama's ability to "[put] culture into motion" (p. 8); bringing to life social phenomena existing within social performances. Furthermore, Sanders (2006) suggested that "[performing a text] may transform the researcher's own understandings while discovering new ways to create data" (p. 93).

Ethnodrama uses the "language and words of 'the other' … to 'explain' the worlds of 'the other'" (Mienczakowski, Smith, & Morgan, 2002, p. 38). Denzin (1997) identified five forms of performance texts that may emerge from arts-based research:

1) dramatic texts such as rituals, poems, and plays … 2) natural texts, transcriptions of everyday conversations … 3) performance science texts, fieldwork notes, and interviews … 4) improvisational, critical ethnodramas that merge natural script dialogues with dramatized scenes and the use of composite characters … [and] 5) 'staged readings,' where one or more persons holds a script, the text, and reads from it. (p. 93)

In ethnodrama, the researcher/playwright creates an overall structure to frame her findings (Saldaña, 1999). As transcripts are reduced to what is "essential and salient" (Saldaña, 1999, p. 62), participant voices are interwoven for the purposes of triangulation, highlighting specific evidence, and offering multiple perspectives. "The number of participants whose stories emerge as noteworthy composes the cast of characters" (p. 62).

Paget (1995) proposed that ethnodrama allows audiences to feel the presence of participants (p. 231), and to express both the "why" and "how" of the data. Thus, ethnodrama authentically communicates research findings (Denzin, 2003; McCall, 2000; Saldaña, 1999). Saldaña (1999) acknowledged that, because "research analyzes participants *in action*, there are things to *show* [author's italics] on stage" (p. 67). By enacting social exchanges, ethnodramas "open up institutions and their practices for critical inspection" (Denzin, 2003, p. 83). Furthermore, "performance art pedagogy reflexively critiques those cultural practices that reproduce oppression … creating

discourses that make the struggles of democracy more visible" (p. 22). By generating

praxis between data and inquiry, ethnodrama allows audiences to "bear witness" (p. 19)

and interrogate social phenomena through alternative discourses.

Ethnodrama is inherently politicized (Paget, 1995; Rogers et al., 2002). Thus,

researchers bear the responsibility of objectively "re-presenting" (Rogers et al., p. 56) or

"*re*tell[ing]" (Saldaña, 1999, p. 63) participants' narratives. Sanders (2006) argued that

"the arts-based education researcher's aim is … teasing out, and inciting multiple

readings and responses to the given data – not developing definitive claims regarding a

singular final truth" (p. 94).

Rogers, Frellick, & Babinski (2002) explained that the researcher's "ability to

make propaganda of [his or her] data" (p. 58) is limited by ensuring that the ethnodrama

reflects themes most prevalent in the data. Thus, the centrality of themes from the data

best maintains the original opinions and experiences of the participants. The ethnodrama

that appears in Chapter 4 of this thesis is structured to reflect Rogers et al.'s emphasis on

prevalent themes in the data. Each theme that emerged became the title of a scene in my

ethnodrama, to best reflect participant experiences.

Establishing Credibility

Findings in this study were validated using triangulation (Creswell, 2012, p. 259).

Thus, evidence from researcher fieldnotes, participant journals, interviews, and

participant artefacts were cross-referenced to ensure accuracy. Member checking (p.

259) was conducted with all participants to ensure further accuracy. Engagement with

participants over nine sessions heightened the credibility of the data and provided a thick,

rich description of girls' perceptions of cyberbullying as a social phenomenon (Creswell & Miller, 2000, p. 128; Hennink, Hutter, & Bailey, 2011, p. 238).

Ethical Considerations

Ethical clearance was granted by Brock University's Research Ethics Board (file # 11-312 McLauchlan). At all stages of the study, it was made clear to participants that their involvement was entirely voluntary and that no penalty existed for choosing to withdraw or not participate in specific activities. Similarly, it was made clear that this study was not curriculum-based and that participant involvement would have no impact on academic grades. To control privacy and confidentiality, participants were identified by pseudonym only on all transcripts and artefacts. One email address was used at a time and one-on-one interview transcripts were not sent en masse.

Study sessions were structured in a way that used distancing as a drama tool to protect student well-being during the exploration of cyberbullying as a social phenomenon (Edell, 2013; Eriksson, 2011, p. 65). Sessions were scaffolded to increase participant comfort engaging with this phenomenon throughout the study.

If students were to experience stress while participating in the study, resources were available for student support. The first contact was the school health centre. The next contact was the student's housemaster. The third contact was the school's learning centre coordinator. These professionals were each qualified to address student concerns that might have risen from the study. I had constant access to these supports throughout the research sessions through the school's internal telephone and email system.

At the completion of the data analysis process, students received feedback regarding the study's findings. The feedback to students and their parents was in the

form of a research summary, written in accessible language, which was distributed to all research participants, their parents/guardians, and the school administration.

My qualifications as a researcher and a teacher also fostered an emotionally and cognitively safe environment for study participants. I hold a Bachelor of Education certification at the Intermediate/Senior level majoring in Dramatic Arts with English as a second teachable subject. I also hold a Special Education Part 1 additional qualification wherein I gained further understanding of adolescent mental health. Finally, I have 7 years' experience with DSI through Safe Schools programming in southwestern Ontario, and 9 years' experience instructing drama with young people. This experience and accreditation has allowed me to best maintain ethical standards throughout the research study sessions, data analysis, and dissemination of findings.

Limitations

One limitation of this study is the small number of participants who may not accurately represent a larger population of teenaged girls. Secondly, convenience sampling may have engaged girls who were (a) already critical of cyberbullying as a social phenomenon, and (b) comfortable creatively expressing themselves. Girls who might have benefitted most from the study sessions may not have volunteered or been comfortable expressing themselves, depending on existing social relationships among participants. Additionally, girls may have been trying to please me, giving responses throughout the sessions that they assumed I desired. Finally, the girls were all of an upper-middle-class socioeconomic status. Girls who were from less privileged families may have contributed different perspectives.

Restatement of the Area of Study

In Chapter One of this study, I introduced the area of research, proposing three topical research questions:

1. How do teenaged girls define cyberbullying?

2. In what ways do teenaged girls experience cyberbullying?

3. How do drama activities affect teenaged girls' perceptions of cyberbullying?

I identified that my experience as a teacher and theatre practitioner, using Drama for Social Intervention (DSI) and witnessing the development of cyberbullying since my time as an adolescent girl, have all served as factors to both motivate my research and qualify my work as a researcher.

In Chapter Two, I examined the existing literature in both the fields of cyberbullying and DSI. Current cyberbullying research affirms the prevalence of cyberbullying in schools (Bauman, 2010; Cyberbullying Research Centre, 2013; Ontario Ministry of Education, 2012b) and problematizes the relationship between cyberbullying and gender (Ang & Goh, 2010; Hinduja & Patchin, 2009; Ringrose & Renold, 2010). It is clear that the research is limited and requires further exploration (Chisholm, 2004, p. 29). As a method engendering holistic and critical consciousness desired by cyberbullying researchers (Cassidy & Jackson, 2005), DSI techniques have the ability to challenge hegemonic ideologies and better explore issues of social justice in research (Barone & Eisner, 2012; Finley, 2008; Saldaña, 2011).

In Chapter Three, I outlined the methodology and research design. I discussed the qualitative arts-based procedures central to my research methods, the selection of site and participants, data collection and recording, the procedures for each of the nine study

sessions, data analysis procedures, and the use of ethnodrama (Denzin, 2003; Saldaña,

1999) to communicate results. Furthermore, I examined the ways in which credibility

was established throughout the study, outlining ethical considerations and limitations of

the study. Chapter Four will present the findings of the study in the form of an

ethnodrama titled "Cyberbullying: An Invisible Web."

CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

Chapter Four is communicated in the form of an ethnodrama script that presents

the results of the research. Characters in the script represent each of the participants and

the researcher. Stage directions are identified in italics, while spoken text is written in

plain text format.

Cyberbullying: An Invisible Web

Characters

ROBIN: Grade 11 girl with dark hair, wearing clothing with pockets
SALVATORE: Grade 11 girl, wearing clothing with pockets
ANDY: Grade 11 girl with hair long enough to put in a pony-tail; she wears a
    hair-elastic on her wrist, and clothing with pockets
RIN: Grade 12 girl who is shorter than the others with blonde hair
MISS F: Researcher who carries a clipboard and a pen at all times; she wears
    clothing that will allow her to move on and offstage, into the audience

Scene Titles (Themes and Subthemes)

Scene 1: I Can't Share That
    Subtheme 1: Our ideas are too personal to share with friends and
        acquaintances.
    Subtheme 2: Girls fear their audience will not take their work seriously.

Scene 2: Cyberbullying Is
    Subtheme 1: Cyberbullying in the abstract.
    Subtheme 2: Experiences with cyberbullying.
    Subtheme 3: Reactions to cyberbullying.
    Subtheme 4: Images of cyberbullying.
    Subtheme 5: A story about cyberbullying.

Scene 3: One Girl is Many Avatars
    Subtheme 1: Girl avatars.
    Subtheme 2: Online identities are different from real life.

Scene 4: Danger Zone

Scene 5: I Know It; I Don't Want to Feel It
    Subtheme 1: Improved understanding of self rather than cyberbullying.
    Subtheme 2: Concern with researcher findings.
    Subtheme 3: Hopes for others.

Preshow

[Four chairs are pre-set off-stage. A baseball cap and pair of large sunglasses are pre-set upstage. The laundry basket for Scene 3 is pre-set off-stage, off the lip of the stage, beside the projector. It contains: elf ears, a long blonde wig, a long cape, a pirate hat, a sword, a pistol, a ballerina tutu, a clown nose, a fake cigarette, a pair of Doc Martens, a can of spray-paint, and an upside-down cross on a chain. A projector and laptop are pre-set in the audience downstage, centre. The projector remote is pre-set downstage centre on the stage floor. Three broad-tipped coloured markers are pre-set, fastened to the sides of a flat upstage centre, not visible by the audience.]

Robin's Soundtrack

1. "Numb" by Linkin Park
2. "The Middle" by Jimmy Eat World
3. "Perfect" by Simple Plan
4. "I'm Just a Kid" by Simple Plan
5. "Crawling" by Linkin Park

<div align="center">

Scene 1: I Can't Share That

</div>

["Numb" by Linkin Park plays. SALVATORE, ANDY, ROBIN, and RIN enter one at a time, each carrying a 22'' by 22'' yellow post-it note. Taking turns, they place their post-its on a flat upstage centre. Once each girl's post-it note has adhered to the flat, she exits and takes another, repeating the process. This continues until a four by four square has been created using the post-it notes. SALVATORE, ROBIN, and RIN each exit after placing her last post-it note. ANDY crosses to the remote control downstage centre. She takes the cap off the projector, and clicks a button on the remote control. An image appears, projected onto the post-it notes, "Scene 1: I Can't Share That." ANDY stands out of the light of the projector and reads the scene title. SALVATORE, ROBIN, RIN, and MISS F enter, each with a chair. MISS F holds a clipboard with a pen tucked inside. SALVATORE, ROBIN, RIN, and MISS F place the chairs in a semi-circle downstage centre. ANDY crosses to sit in the chair brought onstage by ROBIN, then gives ROBIN the remote control. ROBIN presses a button on the remote control and the sentence, "Our ideas are too personal to share with friends and acquaintances" is projected on the flat. After a moment, ROBIN turns off the projection and exits upstage. MISS F holds the clipboard, nods, and takes notes as she listens to the girls. Music fades out once all are seated: music ends once ROBIN has exited.]

Subtheme 1: Our ideas are too personal to share with friends and acquaintances.

ANDY: Why are we doing this?

SALVATORE: When I signed up for this, I thought it was just a study. I thought we would talk about the effects of cyberbullying, things that could change the school. I didn't realize we would be talking about ourselves.

RIN: Miss F, can we read our lines instead of memorizing them?

MISS F: That will be up to you, Rin. It's *your* creative work.

ANDY: *[Adamant]* But they're not our poems; they were from the post-it notes that we *all* wrote on.

MISS F: *[Looking at her clip board, redirecting the girls]* Salvatore, how does that performance date work for you?

SALVATORE: I have to check my schedule to see.

ANDY: Can I *not* act? I can't act.

SALVATORE: I just don't want the whole school to be there.

MISS F: Andy, last week, when you were away, the girls decided to perform for your residence.

ANDY: I honestly don't know if I can do that.

RIN: These are just your friends.

SALVATORE: *[Taking her time]* I'm really busy and I realize we didn't start the study on time… but I didn't realize it would go into third term.

ANDY: I have to be, like, studying for SATs.

SALVATORE: I don't mind you sharing my work under my hidden name but I don't want to read it out to people.

ANDY: I agree with Salvatore. I don't wanna perform anything, or, like, read anything. But I don't mind if anyone else uses what I wrote. Like, you can present my things, if that's what someone wants to do, but just not have me be, like, "I wrote this."

SALVATORE: I thought the study would be about ourselves, but I thought the presentation wouldn't be about us**.**

ANDY: I thought we had code-names for this project for confidentiality, like it kind of doesn't have a purpose if we, like, present everything in front of our residence. I don't wanna perform anything... I have stage fright.

RIN: Hold on, you're just like, "Okay, we can perform this and that", but how can you explain … for example, we did, like, this play and all these kinds of activities… how can a different person explain it? What we include in that presentation is, like, our displays, our collage, which *we* did. Right? How are we going- how can someone else explain what you did?

SALVATORE: *[To MISS F]* I felt I learned a lot about myself… I just don't want to present it.

MISS F: *[To SALVATORE, RIN, and ANDY]* Well, what are you wanting to do?

RIN: *[Disappointed]* I think we just decided we're not going to perform. *[To SALVATORE and ANDY]* Right?

MISS F: Okay. I will email Robin and let her know about your decision.

RIN: *[Carefully]* I think Robin will be a little bit mad. She, like, looked for the music for the performance.

[ALL freeze in tableau. MISS F freezes writing her fieldnotes. From offstage, ROBIN presses a button on the remote control to project "Girls fear their audience will not take their work seriously" upstage.]

Subtheme 2: Girls fear their audience will not take their work seriously.

[As SALVATORE and ANDY speak to the audience, they do not register each other's comments. They each pause while their peers speak, without listening. Before they begin speaking, ROBIN turns off the projection.]

SALVATORE: *[Rises and crosses to stand downstage right. She speaks to the audience as though she were speaking to MISS F in an interview.]* I like doing the activities, but I feel like publicizing it would kind of not- I dunno… it would kind of ruin it for me… I think, a little bit. And, like, I'm not really comfortable sharing, like, my feelings with a bunch of people. I didn't know when I was writing it that I would be sharing it… I thought it was just between, like between us.

ANDY: *[Like SALVATORE, crossing to stand downstage left]* I think the girls in our residence would just be like… bored. Or they would, like, laugh at their friends. Like… you know what I mean?

RIN: *[Crosses to stand centre stage, and speaks directly to the girls, even though they do not listen.]* They don't understand. People will not care about what you are going to say to them. *[She sits and listens as they speak.]*

ANDY: I can't do that.

SALVATORE: I'd rather have, like, an internal performance, like, for the end to be like, within our group, not like, performing for others. 'Cause like, this might mean a lot to us, but it might not mean that much to the people that we are performing for. Like they're so… I've seen so many, like motivational speeches and stuff, but so few actually, like, resonate with me.

ANDY: Saying "we wrote this letter," is kind of, personal, and you don't want to share it, the personal information with people who you- … like, they know you.

SALVATORE: I could do it… I would do it if I was *forced* to do it. But, I dunno … I don't see how this could benefit anyone else. But I, like, see how it's affected us, you know? So I think that our ending should be about us, not other people.

ANDY: I am just uncomfortable performing something so serious in front of other people. People wouldn't take the performance seriously, and they'd, like, probably, like not out loud, but they'd probably, like, judge you and make fun of you, kind of, for like, taking something so seriously… It should be taken seriously, just, like, if people are watching something funny, they enjoy it, because they're like laughing and stuff. But, if it's like, *cyberbullying*, like with teenagers… it's like, weird, and they'd be like, "Why do we have to stay here?" And so, I'd feel bad because, it's my fault that they have to, like, stay and watch this. They'd be forced to watch it. And if I had to stay and watch them do that, I wouldn't want to do that either.

SALVATORE: They wouldn't take it seriously at all. All my friends would like sit there... and be like, "Look at Salvatore." Not like in a mean way. The girls would be like, "Yeah, good job! …Salvatore!"

ANDY: And you write things differently depending on… who's going to hear it.

RIN: *[To the audience]* Andy and Salvatore are actually right, but… I don't care…

[All begin to hear each other again. MISS F unfreezes.]

RIN: If you don't want to perform, can we like… maybe we perform to each other? Making like a small performance in a group and film it? Or… or perform for each other, just for a memory? Why not?

[ALL nod in agreement.]

Scene 2: Cyberbullying Is

["The Middle" by Jimmy Eat World plays. RIN, SALVATORE and ANDY cross to the chairs and move them offstage. MISS F crosses to sit in the audience with her clipboard. ROBIN enters, listening to a song on her iPhone with headphones on. As she enters, she "rocks out" to the music, playfully singing along and dancing to the song. ROBIN emphasises "It just takes some time little girl" as she sings along with the music.

Looking upstage to the post-it notes, she pulls the projector remote control out of her pocket and presses a button to project an image that reads "Scene 2: Cyberbullying is" in handwritten font. ANDY, SALVATORE, and RIN enter, joining ROBIN. ROBIN takes off her headphones, placing them around her neck, with her iPhone in her pocket. The music fades out. MISS F observes from the audience, watching the performance and taking notes.]

Subtheme 1: Cyberbullying in the abstract.

[ROBIN passes the remote control to SALVATORE. SALVATORE presses a button on the remote control and "Cyberbullying in the abstract" is projected upstage. ANDY, RIN, ROBIN and SALVATORE stand around the flat, out of the light of the projector, as if standing around a white-board. For each of the following lines, there is a handwritten projection of the girl's text. SALVATORE uses the remote control to switch each individually spoken line of text. ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN and RIN deliver their lines as though they are brainstorming. Each idea is introduced as if for the first time. The song fades out. SALVATORE presses a button on the remote control and "Cyberbullying is…" is projected upstage.]

ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN, & RIN: Cyberbullying is…

ANDY: Coming from *everywhere*

SALVATORE: Something common in the modern world.

RIN: Computers, phones, Skype, and social web sites.

ROBIN: Cyberbullying is something that should send chills down your spine.

RIN: Wasting time.

ANDY: Being a POOP. *[Laughs]*

SALVATORE: Sometimes *worse* than normal bullying.

RIN: More deadly than normal bullying.

ROBIN: Embarrassing and public… HURTS AND LASTS … it's there forever to be repeated over and over in the mind.

SALVATORE: Something that can be screen-shotted and saved, and viewed over and over again.

ANDY: Anything in writing is there forever

RIN: Cyberbullying takes words and turns them against you

SALVATORE: Unlike normal bullying, the cyberbully can't see the pain she has caused her victim. She forgets there is a REAL person on the other side getting hurt.

ROBIN: It's an act of cowardice on the side of the offender. They can't tell it to you face-to-face. They really must have some serious problems.

SALVATORE: Cyberbullying could be anything. It could be that you were writing a blog about your feelings and then someone read it. Or, maybe you didn't directly mean to hurt somebody, but it's still…

RIN: Hiding behind your computer

SALVATORE: Cowardly.

ANDY: Cowardly people hurting other people while hiding

ROBIN: An act of cowardice

ANDY: Being a keyboard warrior

ROBIN: *[Laughs, mimicking a bully]* "I'm too scared of anybody finding out, so I'm just going to stick here… hiding behind the keyboard, and see if somebody can find out who I am". *[An "evil" laugh]* Muahahah!

ANDY: Cyberbullying is BAD!!!!

[SALVATORE turns off the projection, putting the remote control in her pocket.]

ROBIN & ANDY: Cyberbullying is…

SALVATORE: an anonymous person

ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN, & RIN: Judging

SALVATORE: People by covering themselves with

ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN, & RIN: Lies

ROBIN & ANDY: And

ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN, & RIN: Fake names

SALVATORE: In a big, invisible web of hurt *[crossing downstage, away from the others]* it is something that the

ROBIN & ANDY: Victim

SALVATORE: *[Continues, to the audience; looking back at the girls now and then]* Feels

ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN, & RIN: Guilty and humiliated

SALVATORE: About and the

ROBIN & ANDY: Offender

SALVATORE: Feels

ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN, & RIN: No guilt

SALVATORE: Cyberbullying should be treated

SALVATORE & RIN: The same as regular bullying

SALVATORE: But it is harder to get caught or punished when it is online. When they

SALVATORE & RIN: Forget there is a

ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN, & RIN: REAL

SALVATORE & RIN: Person

SALVATORE: On the

SALVTORE & RIN: Other side

SALVATORE: They become that

SALVTORE & RIN: Phone call at night

SALVATORE: From a

ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN, & RIN: Perfect "stranger" determined to make your life a living hell. Cyberbullying is easy to do.

RIN: *[Crossing to SALVATORE]* And almost a joke

ANDY: *[Slowly]* But not really

ROBIN: *[Moving from RIN and SALVATORE, crossing downstage]* It is a virtual reality

RIN: That feels way too real

ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN, & RIN: People can interpret it in different ways

ANDY & ROBIN: *[Looking at each other]* Even if it is unintentional

SALVATORE & RIN: It is still there because

ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN, & RIN: People get carried away

ANDY: *[Sarcastically, with some honesty]* Cyberbullying is BAD

ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN, & RIN: It is suicide

ANDY & ROBIN: It is the cuts on my wrists.

ROBIN: Cyberbullying is

ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN, & RIN: *[All crossing to meet centre]* Like a crime scene

ANDY & ROBIN: A murderer with no face

ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN, & RIN: *[Cannon]* Feels | like | no | escape

ANDY & ROBIN: A demonic clown out of place

ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN, & RIN: *[Sitting together]* Like a never-ending nightmare

SALVATORE & RIN: An infinite hallway full of laughter

ROBIN: *[Whisper]* the empty silence of unspoken words

ANDY & ROBIN: A child crying

SALVATORE & RIN: 'Cause it *hurts*

ROBIN: *[Whispers in RIN's ear]* a horrible secret

RIN: *[Whispers in SALVATORE's ear]* a *locked* door

SALVATORE: *[With increasing volume]* A constant, nagging voice saying

ANDY: *[Whispers in SALVATORE's ear]* you're not good enough

ROBIN: *[Loud and "creepy"]* It smells like a starry night glazed with the eerie sigh of mist

ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN, & RIN: Tastes like metal, old pennies in your mouth

ROBIN: Like dried tears

ALL: *[SALVATORE, RIN, and ANDY rise, slowly]* inescapable, inerasable… It causes everything to go

ROBIN: *[Whispering]* Silent

ANDY & ROBIN: *[ROBIN remains seated, ANDY backs away from SALVATORE and RIN, upstage; shouting]* Your whole world crumples down.

ROBIN: *[Clutching her stomach]* A sinking feeling in your stomach… Left alone

ANDY, SALVATORE, & RIN: Forever. Angered by other people *[taunting]* like a room of teens cursing at you feels.

SALVATORE & RIN: *[With emphasis, stopping themselves and ANDY]* very unfair

ANDY & ROBIN: The story of a journey

ALL: *[Slow and taunting]* a nightmare… *[ROBIN rises. All shout, crossing to the audience, pointing]* and you're the victim!

SALVTORE & RIN: *[Taunting]* and no one will save you – you're

ANDY, SALVATORE, ROBIN, & RIN: *[With emphasis, still taunting]* completely and utterly

ROBIN: *[Broken]* Alone.

ANDY: *[Backing up and crossing upstage. She appears to be avoiding the content because she is uncomfortable with it.]* Cyberbullying is like…

[RIN, ROBIN, and SALVATORE continue, to each other, without ANDY]

RIN: A vacuum

ROBIN: Tears

SALVATORE: Teeth

ROBIN: A razorblade

RIN: Rope

SALVATORE: Money

RIN: *[Taking the remote control from SALVATORE; she presses a button on the remote control and the image of a diary appears]* Cyberbullying is like a diary. A diary is a place for thoughts, ideas, and beliefs. A diary could become blackmail, like cyberbullying content. It takes words and turns them against you. It plays with your feelings.

[ROBIN presses a button on the remote control and an image of a nazar appears]

ROBIN: Cyberbullying is like a nazar: an "evil eye." It represents the bravery of Horus, whose eye was cut out, and protection in Muslim and Jewish faiths. If the eyes are the windows of the soul, a person's life and memories can be seen through their eyes. Online, a person cannot physically see through words like they can see in real life. Online you can tell a lot about a person by what they say instead of what they look like. Eyes also represent spectators who protect the bully and witness what occurs. The eyes of society prefer not to see these incidents. Like a nazar, the computer screen protects cyberbullies. *[ROBIN ends downstage right.]*

[ROBIN presses a button on the remote control and an image of a sleep mask appears]

SALVATORE: Cyberbullying is like a blind-fold. The victim is blind to the source of the bullying and who sees it. The bully is blind to the victim's reaction and the pain she has caused her victim. The victim is blind to how witnesses react. Are they laughing? Are they angry with the person who wrote it? Do they even care? It is dangerous. Not seeing the damage they are causing, allows them to be even more destructive.

[RIN presses a button on the remote control, and "Experiences with cyberbullying" is projected upstage. She gives the remote control to ANDY, and then crosses to sit downstage right, facing upstage.]

Subtheme 2: Experiences with cyberbullying.

[ANDY sits on a chair upstage left, SALVATORE stands centre, and ROBIN stands downstage right, next to RIN. ANDY presses a button on the remote control to turn off the projection. RIN listens to the others while they speak. SALVATORE, ROBIN, and ANDY are isolated with top-lights. ALL speak directly to the audience, as if speaking in an interview with MISS F.]

ANDY: In elementary school I was bullied a bit – over the Internet.

ROBIN: I've been cyberbullied before and I know how it feels.

SALVATORE: I've never experienced cyberbullying.

ANDY: It wasn't really… anything huge, just, I dunno, on pictures or something on Facebook, my classmates wouldn't write nice comments.

ROBIN: I wrote a story on the Internet about my life and friends, and I described everything as realistically as I could. Somebody found the story and didn't like their description.

SALVATORE: Like… I think I've heard of people saying that they've got like, rude messages from people.

ROBIN: They figured out that I wrote the story. It was a big mistake. All my friends were mad at me because, to them, I was the mean one.

ANDY: I don't remember what they said… exactly. Just… *[shrugs]* yeah.

SALVATORE: The rude messages people got were never like- really, really bad. They're normally just… mean. *[Crosses to stand with ROBIN and RIN downstage right.]*

ROBIN: *[To SALVATORE]* When it happened to me, it was horrible because it was cyberbullying, plus physical bullying, plus psychological bullying. It was like, everything all at the same time.

ANDY: *[Standing]* It just really hurt my self-confidence. I kind of… locked everything out… and I became a lot quieter. *[Pauses]* I don't really use Facebook anymore. *[ANDY stands, looking down at her feet. ANDY presses a button on the remote control and "Reactions to cyberbullying" is projected upstage.]*

Subtheme 3: Reactions to cyberbullying.

[ANDY remains upstage, but is not included in the following dialogue]

RIN: *[To SALVATORE and ROBIN]* Cyberbullies just want to make themselves cooler … or do not understand what they are doing. I think it's stupid. Maybe they have been bullied at school. But, when they're alone, next to their computer and typing, it's slightly different. They feel they can do whatever they want.

[ANDY presses a button on the remote control and the projection turns off.]

ROBIN: If it's hatred they have for you, they just can't hide it.

RIN: People cyberbully because they think the Internet is more private than it is.

SALVATORE: I don't want to make the Internet seem bad. It can be good. It is so helpful sometimes.

ROBIN: It's, like, a misunderstanding, sometimes… it can be. Somebody misunderstands something you said, and then a whole fight starts out of nothing… sometimes. Sometimes it is… *[Laughs; breathy]* what it is! Like, sometimes it just happens.

SALVATORE: If someone were to message you something rude, you could just show it to your friends. And most people at this school are pretty nice. So, like, if someone were to show me a really rude message from someone, I wouldn't like the person anymore who wrote the message. And most people would do that. Or they might even, like, call them out on it. So, not very many people do it. Like, I don't see very much cyberbullying here.

RIN: For me, cyberbullying wasn't so real. Yeah, it's happening to some people, yeah because they're stupid, actually, to do this stuff… Like when you hear that someone put pictures of themself somewhere, you're like, "Oh my God, you guys are so stupid!" Really! But now… you try to understand why they actually did that. Maybe something happened to them and they need attention. Because of this, they're getting bullied.

SALVATORE: But, say person A says something to person B, like, "Oh, you're so ugly," or something, over messaging. Person B could screen-shot it and send or show it to anybody. Most people that person B showed it to would, like… if you were really good friends with someone, you might just… see person A, and be like, "I can't believe you said that about this person. That's so rude, like why would you?" You know? That happens all the time.

ROBIN: Cyberbullying has always been bad, but knowing what other people think about it, I guess my understanding kinda changes.

Subtheme 4: Images of cyberbullying.

MISS F: *[From the audience]* What does cyberbullying look like?

[ANDY, ROBIN, RIN, and SALVATORE's heads sharply turn to where MISS F sits in the audience, then they look at each other with mutual consent. ANDY presses a button on the remote control and "Images of cyberbullying" is projected upstage. Simultaneously, ROBIN pulls her iPhone out of her pocket and scrolls through her music. When she appears to have found a song, ROBIN unplugs her headphones from the device, placing the iPhone downstage on the stage floor. As the headphones are unplugged, "Perfect" plays by Simple Plan. ROBIN takes the headphones off her neck and wraps the chord around the headpiece, placing them beside her iPhone. The girls nod their heads to the song, preparing to perform their tableaux. In the following tableaux, the girls use chairs as required; they do not use props.

SALVATORE: The big reveal.

[ANDY presses a button on the remote control and "Tableau 1: The Big Reveal" is projected upstage. SALVATORE, RIN, ROBIN, and ANDY assume Tableaux 1, in which SALVATORE takes a chair, moves it centre stage and sits down, as in a desk, frowning. ROBIN appears to be laughing, turning a laptop screen to SALVATORE to show her a photograph. ANDY and RIN appear to laugh as bystanders.]

RIN: This is her fault.

[ANDY presses a button on the remote control and "Tableau 2: This Is Her Fault" is projected upstage. SALVATORE, RIN, ROBIN, and ANDY assume Tableau 2, in which RIN sits in a chair, as though at a desk with a laptop in front of her, crying. ROBIN sits apart from her, on the floor, upset. ANDY and SALVATORE point at a laptop screen in front of them and laugh.]

ANDY: He leaves her to protect his social status.

[ANDY presses a button on the remote control and "Tableau 3: He Leaves Her to Protect His Social Status" is projected upstage. SALVATORE, RIN, ROBIN, and ANDY assume Tableau 3 in which ANDY sits on the floor and cries with her arms around her knees. RIN puts her hand on ANDY's shoulder to console her. SALVATORE and ROBIN hold hands, walking away from the others. ROBIN looks back, smiling with cruelty.]

ANDY: *[Rises from the tableau as though she were about to say something of seriousness. The music fades out. ANDY begins to laugh at herself. ANDY sings the chorus from Eric Carmen's "All By Myself," loudly, slowly, and drawn out]* All by myself… *[Laughs]*

[SALVATORE, RIN, and ROBIN laugh at ANDY]

Subtheme 5: A story about cyberbullying.

MISS F: Tell us more about your story, Salvatore. *[MISS F assumes a position downstage left.]*

[ANDY presses a button on the remote control and "A Story About Cyberbullying" is projected upstage. As this happens, ROBIN picks up her headphones and iPhone, then retrieves the baseball cap from upstage, placing the iPhone and headphones upstage on the floor. RIN retrieves the sunglasses from upstage. ANDY gives the remote control to SALVATORE.]

SALVATORE: We have Tasha.

[RIN waves and puts on the pair of sunglasses]

SALVATORE: Jeff.

[ROBIN waves and puts on the baseball cap]

SALVATORE: And Andy can play Ashley for me.

[ANDY waves and puts her hair up in a ponytail with the hair-elastic on her wrist]

RIN: Tasha is mean! *[She playfully makes a "mean" face]*

ANDY: Ashley's a tomboy. *[ANDY awkwardly adjusts her clothes, then laughs under her breath]*

ROBIN: And Jeff's a meathead. *[She crosses her arms, as though she were a boy trying to show off his arms.]*

SALVATORE: Tasha and Jeff are dating, but they don't really get along.

[Dialogue in the role-play among Tasha, Jeff, and Ashley, occurs centre stage. Other action occurs downstage right and left.]

RIN: *[As Tasha]* I really think we should go shopping; all of the new clothes are out for the summer. There's this dress I really want. So-and-so wore it in a magazine I read, and–

ROBIN: *[As Jeff. Not paying attention to Tasha. ROBIN exaggerates her masculinized gestures.]* There's a soccer game on tonight. My favourite team is playing and they're up against some crazy competition.

RIN: *[As Tasha, exaggerating her feminized gestures.]* But you're not listening. So-and-so wore it and–

ROBIN: *[As Jeff]* So this game tonight–

SALVATORE: This is really getting too sexist. Okay. *[To MISS F]* Then Jeff meets Ashley, who also really likes soccer.

ANDY: *[As Ashley, she mimes dribbling a soccer ball. She stops to look at ROBIN.]* Hey.

ROBIN: *[As Jeff, looking at ANDY]* I'd tap that.

SALVATORE: So they go out to a café and watch the game.

ANDY & ROBIN: *[As Ashley and Jeff, standing, arms stretched in the air, as if watching a TV screen.]* GOAL!

SALVATORE: Tasha gets upset and posts an unflattering photo of Ashley on Facebook.

RIN: *[As Tasha]* Jeff, have you seen this photo? What a loser!

ROBIN: *[As Jeff]* She is totally ruining my rep! I'm done with her.

RIN: *[As herself]* Hold on, Tasha was so upset she started sharing photos? I don't get it.

ROBIN: *[As herself]* I think Jeff needs to be more boyish. *[She tucks her hair up under her ball-cap]*

MISS F: Let's stop for a second. What do you think Ashley should do?

SALVATORE: If someone posted a photo of me, I wouldn't ignore it.

RIN: Something needs to happen for Ashley to protect herself.

SALVATORE: A cat-fight?

ROBIN: *[As Jeff]* I'm a meathead. I'd enjoy that.

SALVATORE: *[Nearly laughing]* I'll fight you!

ROBIN: *[As Jeff]* Oh yeah? *[Laughs]*

MISS F: Let's freeze here. How can we fix the problem?

SALVATORE: Ashley could stand up and risk becoming the victim. Well… Ashley wouldn't fix the problem. She could stop doing things online so there is less of an audience for the bully.

ROBIN: How about this: Jeff doesn't care about the post. *[As Jeff, miming looking at a photo on Tasha's computer screen]* If I find her too ugly or too annoying tonight, then I'll get rid of her and go back to Tasha.

ANDY: Wow, I feel really judged!

SALVATORE: Ashley is a different kind of victim; she's not "girly." Ashley should call a friend for advice.

ANDY: *[Nodding, as Ashley]* We're the only ones who can work this out.

ROBIN: I'll play Ashley's friend… Erica. *[ROBIN takes off the ball-cap. As Erica]* Did you see the photo on Facebook?

ANDY: *[As Ashley]* Yeah. I don't know what I'm going to do.

ROBIN: *[As Erica]* You know it was Tasha who posted it right?

ANDY: *[As Ashley]* What?

ROBIN: *[As Erica]* You should really do something about it.

ANDY: *[As Ashley]* I'm going to tell Jeff that she is the one who posted it!

ROBIN: Okay, and Jeff can give her one more chance and see that he loves her.

SALVATORE: Or Tasha could feel bad and take the photo off Facebook.

RIN: Erica could tell the principal!

[ANDY, SALVATORE, RIN, and ROBIN pause, searching for a solution.]

SALVATORE: We didn't come up with a solution. Not a good one.

RIN: Most stories about cyberbullying end badly.

MISS F: *[Holds her hand out to SALVATORE. SALVATORE crosses to MISS F and gives her the remote control. MISS F presses a button on the remote control and "Scene 3: One Girl is Many Avatars" is projected upstage.]*

Scene 3: One Girl is Many Avatars

["I'm Just a Kid" by Simple Plan plays quietly to underscore MISS F's speech and the girls' process of picking out their avatar objects. As she retrieves the laundry basket from off-stage and brings it downstage centre, MISS F speaks to the audience and the girls.]

MISS F: An avatar is a word used to refer to a person's online identity. In role-playing games, a person can customize her avatar using a set of options determined by the game, or her achievements and investment in that game. The same term is used to refer to the person she appears to be through her other online interactions. *[To SALVATORE, RIN, ROBIN, and ANDY]* What does your avatar look like?

[MISS F places the basket on the floor downstage centre, then presses a button on the remote control and turns off the projection. SALVATORE, ANDY, RIN, and ROBIN think briefly, and then run toward the basket. Laughing, they playfully dig through the props as if they were searching for the avatar items that best suit them. The volume of the music increases as the girls rifle through the laundry basket. SALVATORE, RIN, ROBIN, and ANDY all pull out the objects relevant to her avatar from the basket. RIN takes the elf ears, blonde wig, and cape. ROBIN takes the pirate hat, sword, and pistol. SALVATORE takes the tutu, clown nose, and cigarette. ANDY takes the Doc Martens, spray-paint, and cross. For the most part, the girls take their appropriate props, while

some are handed to each other. Their actions are high-spirited. SALVATORE, RIN, ANDY, and ROBIN step back from the laundry basket, standing staggered centre-stage.]

Subtheme 1: Girl avatars.

[MISS F presses a button on the remote control and "Girl avatars" is projected upstage. MISS F stands upstage left and continues to take notes. The following monologues are delivered directly to the audience. Upstage is unlit to de-emphasize MISS F. The song fades out.]

RIN: I have an avatar in an online game called "Allods." She looks similar to me; however, in this game you can pick a different race, so I picked elf. *[Puts on the elf ears]* She has long, blonde hair *[puts on the wig]* and a lot of clothes, which are mostly dresses. *[Puts on the cape]* I don't like to wear them in real life, except when I have to wear a skirt at school. Also she has a different name and is much taller then I am *[laughs]*.

ROBIN: On IMVU my avatar is a pirate named Mika *[puts on the hat]*. She has long black hair, emerald green eyes, full red lips, and she usually wears corsets, swords *[holds up her sword]*, guns *[holds up her pistol]*, tight black pants and thigh high boots. I guess that's the basic appearance of my character. She's the pirate captain of a steampunk ship who goes on adventures with her friends. Surprisingly Mika looks like me, except for the colors of her hair and eyes. I try to stay as close as myself as possible.

SALVATORE: My avatar is half Tumblr and half Facebook. On Facebook I am "pure" *[puts on the tutu]* because it's a space where you creep people, judge others, and are expected to conform. On Tumblr I'm more… weird *[puts on the clown nose]*. Tumblr shows the inside of your head. You can include images and ideas that you like but don't have to know what it means *[she takes an awkward drag on the fake cigarette, shrugs, and laughs]*. On Tumblr you reblog content based on your instincts. You can tell a lot about who a person is by looking at what they "like" or reblog.

ANDY: *[Sits on the floor and puts on the Doc Martens]* My avatar probably seems more rebellious and more confident than I am. I portray a much darker side of me on Tumblr. *[Puts the cross around her neck]* It's a little crazy and confusing, which not a lot of people will understand *[shakes the can of spray-paint, takes off the lid and mimes spray-painting a wall downstage, making the "psss" sound of the paint]*, but that is how people online see me because that is how I have allowed them to see me.

RIN: The game world is totally different from the world I have on VK… *[realising that she has to explain the acronym]* the Russian Facebook. On this social media page, the avatar is basically my picture, or me with someone else. *[Shrugs]* Sometimes I use Photoshop to correct the photo.

ROBIN: On Facebook I usually make profile pictures out of my drawings, but Beaker from the Muppets is my current profile pic. I rarely post statuses. Facebook is only a way of talking to my friends and family in Mexico.

ANDY: On Tumblr, people mainly post pictures: I use the upside down cross symbol a lot. You pick your own URL and customize the theme and colours. I think my theme is set as "soft grunge." Tumblr content is reposted and not original, although users have the ability to include new content. It is ultimately a way of collecting emblems of your interests, not ideas or items you are necessarily committed to.

SALVATORE: There's so many, like different… parts of me online. Like, you could Google me and you'd find… things that I do for sports, or whatever, and then you'd think I'm, like, a sporty person, rather than being, like, oh, that person also likes art and schoolwork. And then, you could find out about my parents and, like, find information about them.

ANDY: Things my parents do also show up on Google, and some of them have included my name, like newspaper articles. That affects my online identity.

RIN: Online elements of me would include my participation in competitions from music school, competitions from this school, or my old school… basketball and other sports.

ANDY: My online profile would include school competitions too.

SALVATORE: On Tumblr I'm a lot different than I am on Facebook. I just think that it's, like, different – parts, like sides of me. There's so many different… places where I'm different aspects of me.

Subtheme 2: Online identities are different from real life.

SALVATORE, ANDY, RIN, and ROBIN: Online identities are different from real life.

[MISS F presses a button on the remote control and "Online identities are different from real life" is projected upstage.]

Andy: Because Tumblr is like the inside of your head it's scary to let someone see it. It is more personal and the pictures you choose say more than comments and posts on Facebook. It is uncomfortable to have people you know follow you on Tumblr because it is so personal and you are worried to share these "inner workings" of your brain with people you know. When you tell a friend your Tumblr link, you freak because it's so personal. It's frightening to think about what they will think. So most followers on Tumblr are strangers. It's easier to be personal and intimate with strangers or very, very close friends online.

RIN: If your online friends don't know you personally, you can create a lot of images of who you are.

ANDY: My avatar online is not like I am in reality. It's a smarter and more mature version of myself, or the self that I portray in person. Online I am more creative, deeper

and more artsy through the images I choose to show on the Internet. That's because, on the Internet, you *choose* how you want people to see you by monitoring and controlling what you show them. Whereas in person, they see you as they want to see you, and make their own judgments.

RIN: Your online image fluctuates through the ways in which you communicate, including how quickly you respond to messages, how appropriate your response is, and the tone of your written words.

ANDY: Online, people always feel more comfortable, including myself, because, really, you could be anyone or anything you want. Everyone makes themselves appear a certain way that, pretty much, always isn't true to themselves.

ROBIN: When I go online I try to stay as true to my real self as I can. I feel like I'd be cheating on myself if I didn't.

[RIN, ANDY, and SALVATORE turn to look at her sideways, acknowledging that she is in a pirate costume. ROBIN smiles and shrugs.]

RIN: *[Gesturing to what she is wearing]* Online, I am not my true self. It's like a black and white photo.

ROBIN: Not your true colours?

[RIN removes her avatar items and returns them to the basket.]

ANDY: *[Sitting to remove her Doc Martens]* We all have that in common, that our avatars aren't really true to who we are.

[ROBIN and SALVATORE remove their avatar items and return them to the basket with ANDY.]

ANDY: After I was cyberbullied, I became more careful about what I put online.

SALVATORE: I think there's a connection between growing up, and maturing through high school, and getting better at monitoring your online presence.

RIN: Growing up means not sharing as much personal information online.

Scene 4: Danger Zone

[MISS F presses a button on the remote control and "Scene 4: Danger Zone" is projected upstage. She crosses upstage and takes the laundry basket off-stage as SALVATORE, RIN, ROBIN, and ANDY talk to each other]

SALVATORE: We've all heard of people who break up with their girlfriends or boyfriends over Skype, or Facebook. But people go further than that. They use the Internet to hurt people. *[MISS F re-enters]* They can't see how much damage they have caused this way.

ROBIN: You log onto your computer and you see the world around you filled with venomous people ready to pounce, like snakes, on any defenseless human being in sight.

MISS F: *[Standing upstage]* Okay, then what advice would you have for someone *like* you about cyberbullying?

[SALVATORE, RIN, ROBIN, and ANDY share their answers with each other.]

SALVATORE: The Internet can be detrimental. It can suck you in and give you problems with your social skills.

RIN: These days most people have Internet friends.

SALVATORE: And sometimes people use the Internet to say things they wouldn't usually say in person.

ROBIN: Although handy, these people can be deceiving. Don't get me wrong; there's also nice people roaming the Internet but not all of them are all that innocent. Beware of cyber friends.

RIN: These Internet friends live far away from you, and maybe you will never even see each other. If you and he do not really know each other… it can be very dangerous to have one of these friends.

ROBIN: Stay clear from random cyber strangers! You don't want to be like Little Red Riding Hood now do you?

SALVATORE: People who cyberbully do not have the courage to speak their thoughts face-to-face.

ROBIN: Sometimes online is better than face-to-face and fist-to-fist.

ANDY: A major part of human communication is body language and by having a screen in front of you rather than the actual person, it allows you to hide a lot. If you so choose… When I talk to people online, even my friends, I become more confident and say more witty things. It also makes it easier to lie… because, as I said before, body language is a huge factor in communication. When a person is lying, there are signs you pick up on, that you can physically see.

RIN: Online, communication is different, from how it is in real life. I thought about it… before, how like we try to chat with each other… like even with our friends. It's slightly

different if we were talking by Skype, or if we're like, talking like, natural, like we are talking right now. So it's slightly different. Online you have the time to think about what you want to write, or what you want to say.

ROBIN: You can tell a person by what they say instead of what they look like online. You see who they truly are through what they say.

RIN: And people put their whole lives online, their feelings and ideas, the bad and sad moments of life are now public. But they do not receive sympathy from their audience.

SALVATORE: The cyberbully forgets there is a *real* person on the other side getting hurt. The Internet is a sort of barrier between human communication, like a wall where you can't see the other person's reactions to what you are saying. You can't even hear the emotions in their voice.

Scene 5: I Know It; I Don't Want to Feel It

[MISS F presses a button on the remote control and "Scene 5: I Know It; I Don't Want to Feel It" is projected upstage. MISS F takes a chair and invites the others to join her centre stage. Once MISS F is seated, she presses a button on the remote control and "Improved understanding of self rather than cyberbullying" is projected upstage.]

Subtheme 1: Improved understanding of self rather than cyberbullying.

MISS F: Okay… what have you each learned since the beginning of this study?

[SALVATORE, RIN, ROBIN, and ANDY all take a chair and bring it centre stage to talk with MISS F. Each girl sits differently in her chair. They all appear to be very comfortable.]

ROBIN: From this study, I've learned that cyberbullying is bad, obviously, um, and… that… well I dunno… I guess… I kind of learned that what other people think about it, like the people who I am working with. I got to meet them better, that's for sure. I got to know them as better as people, um… I dunno… I guess that's what I learned.

SALVATORE: It wasn't like learning facts or anything, but it was kinda like, um… expanding myself, I guess.

RIN: When I came to you first, I didn't even know what the word meant. So, I… learned a new term: cyberbullying. I knew that it's actually happening, and I knew I kind of get, understand, why it's happening. So like, people are jealous, as usual bullying, but in the Internet… I don't think I get a sense of how it *feels*… but I don't want to *feel* this at all.

SALVATORE: I thought originally that cyberbullying was like *"someone… says something mean to someone else online."* I didn't really think about cyberbullying too much. Like I kinda was like, "It's there." Like it doesn't really happen too badly, like,

around the people that I know… But the study made me more aware and made me kinda judge what I do online.

ANDY: In the study there was a lot of stuff I hadn't thought of, but that I agreed with. For example, looking at what cyberbullying looks like, or smells like, or whatever, it just, like, the imagery helps you understand it more and understand it in a different way.

SALVATORE: The tableaux made me realize there are a lot of different scenarios that are considered cyberbullying. Even with one story, there's a bunch of different scenarios that could happen, like different snapshots. So then, cyberbullying is kind of a more broad topic than I thought it would have originally been.

RIN: Looking at the variants that could happen in the cyberbullying stories helped me understand it a lot better.

ANDY: I've learned that there are different perspectives on cyberbullying. And, just… that there are different ways that people can be cyberbullies for different reasons.

RIN: We actually didn't learn about *someone* … using these activities, like, we try to work together and like organize everything everyone thought and try to become um… of one opinion with each other. So I think it's helpful. We try to agree with each other.

ROBIN: I like expressing my feelings through writing, acting, and art, like we used in the study. I felt like I told a bit of my past. Maybe some of these girls haven't gone through what I have, but I still feel like it helps them understand me.

RIN: The role-play was helpful because I could actually think about why the people made the choices they did.

ROBIN: What I learned most was about my thoughts about cyberbullying and how I can explain it in words. And I found out how we thought similarly and how we thought differently about it. I learned from the other girls' opinions. For example, I think of cyberbullying as very dark and, like, mysterious, and like something, like evil crawling, and, well, the other girls kind of think of it as something more, like, I dunno, cybernetic and cowardly, or some of them think of it as mean.

RIN: I learned that all my… friends from this study have a slightly different, not a slightly different opinion, but… we're all thinking differently… I keep learning from them.

ANDY: Other people's perspectives helped my understanding of cyberbullying, because everyone sees things differently.

RIN: In school, at the beginning of the year we were shown, um, movies that talked about cyberbullying. For me, it was not so real… and now… you try to understand why they

actually did that. So, this kind of stuff, it's coming closer… and you actually start to care about it.

SALVATORE: It was weird to talk so much about how we felt and focus on one topic for so long. But I realized that cyberbullying can come in many different instances or forms. I found this out from the stories.

ANDY: I've just become more aware. Kind of– just… talking about cyberbullying with other people makes you think about it more and… um, I don't know, just makes it… more real.

ROBIN: I guess my attitude kinda has changed to some point. Well, cyberbullying has always been bad, but knowing what other people think about it, I guess it kinda changes. It makes it seem more present than you think it really is.

RIN: I think this will be a good experience to like, actually know about cyberbullying. You know it is happening, and you know you actually try to protect yourself… to not be– that this will not happen to you, and would not happen to your friends. If you see someone you can, like, give them advice about what can actually happen.

ROBIN: After the study you think about it more. You think about what could happen, like, if you are on your computer, for example, and you are texting someone. Like, before the study, I wouldn't think about what I say half as much as now. 'Cause, I mean, I've never been a cyberbullying type of person, but, still, sometimes you can hurt with words, even if you don't think you do, which is my case because I'm very sarcastic on the Internet and people don't get sarcasm when it's written in words.

SALVATORE: It made me, not worried, but, like, it kinda made me more *aware* of what I'm doing online. Like when I'm talking to people, or if I call them something on Facebook. Now I'm kinda… thinking I should be more aware of what they're thinking when they read that comment. Not that I *meant* to call them anything mean, but it could be taken in a bad way.

[RIN takes the remote control from MISS F.]

Subtheme 2: Concern with researcher findings.

[ROBIN, RIN, ANDY, and SALVATORE cross to sit downstage, on the stage floor, facing upstage. MISS F is left alone, centre, with her clipboard. RIN presses a button on the remote control and "Concern with researcher findings" is projected upstage. MISS F is uncomfortable centre stage.]

RIN: So… we want to know your opinion about our work. So like, you're going to write about it, right? And you'll be putting the analysis of that and how… what your opinion is of all of this, what we've done. We just, we've just been analyzing it, but we haven't seen your opinion about it.

ANDY: We wanna know what all this is for.

RIN: I want to know what's going to happen after all this, I mean we worked– we spent some time on it and… well, we want to know what all this is going to, like, end up being.

SALVATORE: It's interesting how you look at us for this whole time. And like, what actually *you* learned from it. And you said before, you're like "Oh," like, "You guys say so many profound things." Well, I wonder what those things are.

ROBIN: I hope that the study helps someone. Like, you know, you're doing a play about it, so hopefully… some people will watch it and it changes their mind about things… trying to make the world a better place or something. I mean… we did investigate a little bit about cyberbullying so I guess we, I dunno, there has to be something good from all this right?

SALVATORE: Yeah, I hope it helps someone, like I hope what we did and what we wrote does something good for something else.

RIN: You are just… doing this project. Like, it's interesting how you look at it for this whole time. And like, what actually you learned from it.

Subtheme 3: Hopes for others.

MISS F: Well…before we finish… How do you think you could make a change to incidents of cyberbullying?

ANDY: *[Presses a button on the remote control and "Hopes for others" is projected upstage.]* Stop being a bystander and stand up for the victims of cyberbullying if you see they can't stand up for themselves.

SALVATORE: I can stop being the bystander. When I see others being mean to people online, I could report it, or comment back saying that what they are saying is wrong. I could stand up and risk becoming a victim too, or I could just stop doing things online so there is less of an audience for the bully.

RIN: I think the victim needs to stop being shy and stand up for themselves.

[MISS F nods, and takes a note on her clipboard. She continues, crossing to stand upstage right. ANDY, SALVATORE, RIN, and ROBIN stand and turn out to face the audience. RIN gives the remote control to ANDY. ANDY presses a button on the remote control and "Dear Someone Like Me…" is projected upstage. The lights fade out upstage. Only ANDY, SALVATORE, RIN, and ROBIN are lit downstage.]

ANDY: Dear Someone Like Me

SALVATORE: The Internet is great. It is awesome for talking to your friends or finding inspiration.

RIN: I hope you are not spending all day long on the Internet. If so, go out and find a hobby. *[Laughs.]*

SALVATORE: The Internet connects almost the entire world.

ROBIN: But although the world can be cold and misleading, there is also a bright side to it all. *[Crosses to the post-it-notes on the flat upstage. A top-light illuminates the stage in front of the flat. ROBIN takes a marker from the side of the flat. She writes and speaks the last part of her line, recording the line in large font on one of the post-it-notes.]* Don't worry. You'll be fine.

RIN: I know life is much better than you think. *[Crosses upstage, takes a marker, like ROBIN, and records her line on a different post-it note.]*

SALVATORE: People like cyberbullies are not worth your time. *[Crosses upstage, takes a marker and records her line on another post-it note.]*

ROBIN: I know it can be tough but you'll see that light shines even in the darkest of places. *[Writes "even in the darkest of places" on another post-it note. To ANDY]* With a little help from your friends anything is possible.

SALVATORE: *[Drawing a heart on an empty post-it note]* With love

RIN: *[Drawing a heart, like SALVATORE]* With love

ROBIN: *[Drawing a heart]* Love

SALVATORE: *[Putting the cap on her marker and turning to the audience]* Salvatore.

RIN: *[Turning to the audience]* Rin

ROBIN: *[Turning]* Robin

ANDY: *[Looking back to the other girls]* and Andy *[presses a button on the remote control and "Love, Someone Like You" is projected on all of the post-it notes that do not have writing.]*

ALL: Someone Like You.
[The instrumental introduction to "Crawling" by Linkin Park plays on loop. Lights fade to black. The projected image remains, then fades out. The music continues for a beat in the dark, then fades out. End scene.]

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Through this study, I hoped to illuminate how teenaged girls understand and experience cyberbullying as a contemporary social phenomenon. The following questions were at the heart of the research:

- How do teenaged girls define cyberbullying?

- In what ways do teenaged girls experience cyberbullying?

- How do drama activities affect teenaged girls' perceptions of cyberbullying?

This chapter summarizes major findings and proposes implications for future researchers, as well as teachers and administrators.

Summary of the Study

In Ontario, Bill 13, the Accepting Schools Act (Province of Ontario, 2012) has brought recent attention to cyberbullying in schools. This attention reflects the concerns of current cyberbullying and social justice research (Cyberbullying Research Centre, 2013; Kauffman & Landrum, 2013, p. 204; Taft, 2011). Cassidy and Jackson (2005) proposed that holistic school-wide methods of addressing cyberbullying might be more effective than more traditional methods of dealing with bullying as a discrete behavioural problem.

Current research separates cyberbullying from traditional bullying by examining the unique ways in which cyberbullying engages Internet technologies to oppress victims (Bauman et al., 2013; Erdur-Baker, 2010; Kauffman & Landrum, 2013). As a pervasive phenomenon in schools (Bauman, 2010), cyberbullying appears to increase as students progress through each grade level (Sbarbaro & Enyeart Smith, 2011). Along with age, gender is another factor that may influence the dynamics of cyberbullying; however, the

research examining links between gender and cyberbullying is inconclusive (Ang & Goh, 2010; Hinduja & Patchin, 2009; Ringrose & Renold, 2010; Smith & Slonje, 2010).

Current research demands new methods of addressing cyberbullying that are holistic and build critical consciousness in adolescents (Ang & Goh, 2010; Cassidy & Jackson, 2005; Taft, 2011). As a qualitative researcher, Saldaña (2011) argued that the arts can surpass the expressive limitations of typical research methods. Creswell (2012) also suggested that arts-based research offers a unique approach to qualitative investigations (p. 274). The arts may allow for the broader expression of research findings and, thus, the production of knowledge (Eisner, 2008a; Greene, 1995; Saldaña, 2011; Siegesmund & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2008), challenging hegemonic ideologies (Barone & Eisner, 2012; Finley, 2008; Sanders, 2006).

The arts are effective in addressing issues of social justice (Garber, 2010; O'Farrell, 2010; UNESCO, 2010, p. 8). For many years, drama has been implemented as a means of fostering moral development in youth (Rabin, 2009; Winston, 1996). In particular, DSI has been used to address global social conflict (Lepp, 2011) in countries such as Africa (Heap & Simpson, 2005; Mangeni, 2006, p. 234; Sutherland, 2006) and Brazil (Freire, 2011; Nogueira, 2006). In prisons worldwide, DSI has been used with convicts to explore forms of institutionalized violence (Balfour, 2000), to facilitate self-exploration and reflection (Ramamoorthi, 2006), and to teach problem-solving skills (Conrad, 2004).

In schools internationally, DSI has given young people a voice in their exploration of social issues (Bryanston, 2001; Conrad, 2004; Nelson et al., 2000; Nicholson, 2003). DSI allows students to further engage with curriculum (Hatton, 2004;

Zatzman, 2005) and generates a unique ownership of language and expression (Edell, 2013). In both cognitive and affective domains, it focuses on the student's individual growth throughout and beyond DSI activities (Gonzalez, 2002). Boal's (2008) Forum Theatre has been used as a DSI technique, locally and internationally, with children and youth to address bullying, gender violence, and other issues of social change (Belliveau, 2006; Clark, 2009; Kloeble, 2012; Mixed Company Theatre, n.d.; Österlind, 2011).

My study employed DSI to address cyberbullying as a phenomenon affecting teenaged girls. Participants included a convenience sample of four girls in Grades 11 and 12 in a medium-sized independent school in southwestern Ontario. The girls were aged 16 to 18 years old at the time of the study. Two of the girls, Salvatore and Andy, were residents of Ontario, while Robin and Rin were international students from Mexico and Russia, respectively. A fifth participant, Emilia chose to withdraw from the study due to conflicts with other school-mandated activities.

The four girls participated in nine extracurricular study sessions from January to April 2013. During these sessions, they engaged in Drama for Social Intervention (DSI) activities with the intention of producing a collective creation. This goal did not come to fruition as the girls decided not to perform their work. Throughout the sessions, I collected data through fieldnotes, participant journals, interviews, and participant artefacts, achieving triangulation (Creswell, 2012, p. 259).

At the conclusion of the study, I organized all data chronologically and coded by hand using a priori codes (see Appendix G) generated from interview questions, weekly journal prompts, and activity prompts. I then sorted data segments by a priori code and participant. Next, I hand-coded the data using inductive codes (see Appendix G) and

similarly sorted by inductive code and participant. To identify themes, I mind-mapped (Bennett & Rolheisser, 2001) a priori and inductive codes into five cluster groups of similar concepts and findings, and labelled these category groups (see Appendix H for category group labels). I then created thematic statements from these category labels, each of which became the title of a scene in the ethnodrama presented in Chapter Four (Rogers et al., 2002).

The ethnodrama, titled Cyberbullying: An Invisible Web, reduced data to what was "essential and salient" (Saldaña, 1999, p. 62), in order to highlight five themes and offer multiple perspectives (Creswell, 2012, p. 259). The emergent themes were: (a) I Can't Share That, (b) Cyberbullying Is, (c) One Girl is Many Avatars, (d) Danger Zone, and (e) I Know It; I Don't Want to Feel It. Characters represented five voices in the data: Salvatore, Andy, Rin, Robin, and Miss F as the researcher. Emilia's voice was not included in the ethnodrama as she withdrew from the study before she had made a noteworthy contribution to the data.

Each of the girls' scripted lines was either taken verbatim from transcripts and handwritten artefacts, or represents a quotation recorded in my fieldnotes; however, in Scene Two when the girls brainstorm what "Cyberbullying is," and whenever text required clarifying, the girls' language was modified with sensitivity toward maintaining their true voices as much as possible.

Campbell and Conrad (2006) suggested that, in ethnodrama, "characters and incidents [are] shaped by the researcher['s] perspec[tive], sympathetic to the predicament of the youth and optimistic for positive change," (p. 377). As the researcher, I remained aware of my omnipresent voice in the ethnodrama; thus, the Miss F character speaks

primarily in questions derived directly from the inductive interview questions, weekly journal prompts, and researcher fieldnotes. In this way, her character's voice is meant to merely facilitate the journey of the other characters.

Throughout the ethnodrama, each of the five emergent themes is made explicit using projection technology to identify scene titles. The girls take turns manipulating the projector with a remote control to visually represent their ownership of the research findings. In the same vein, Robin generated the soundtrack that is used throughout the ethnodrama. It seems most appropriate to include these pieces here as they were originally intended for the girls' collective creation.

Discussion

Campbell and Conrad (2006) proposed that ethnodrama "raises more questions than it provides answers" (p. 377)," put[ting] culture into motion" (Denzin, 2003, p. 8). In many ways, the findings of this study went above and beyond the expectations of the research questions. As a result, this discussion will attempt to address the plausible "answers" that I have derived from the ethnodrama. I have structured the discussion below by examining the findings as they respond to each of the research questions, then engaging with the unexpected findings: (a) not all girls were comfortable sharing, (b) distancing techniques contributed to participant disengagement, and (c) girl identity manifests as multiple avatars online.

Responding to Research Questions

The subsequent findings address each of the research questions.

Defining cyberbullying. The girls revealed a multifaceted definition that fundamentally views cyberbullying as an inherently "bad" behaviour that resultantly

"others" the perpetrator (JanMohamed, 1985, p. 59). The ostracizing of the cyberbully was evident in the girls' language throughout the study, namely in comments referring to the cyberbully explicitly as "bad," "cowardly," and even "being a poop." To the girls, cyberbullies were intangible, faceless "keyboard warriors." This perception arises despite the fact that three of the four girls revealed that they had experienced cyberbullying as either a victim or indirect bystander. Furthermore, Salvatore, Andy, and Robin all connected their experiences of cyberbullying to peers they knew offline. Bauman (2010) problematizes their self-identified roles, suggesting that, "of students who were involved in cyberbullying, the vast majority were involved as both bullies and victims" (p. 827).

The girls in this study may have found comfort in discussing cyberbullying on the level of abstraction, rather than real-life contexts (this is clear in Scene Two of the ethnodrama). Abstraction may have permitted the girls to explore this potentially controversial topic with ease, with cyberbullying being expressed as, "like metal, old pennies in your mouth," "cuts on my wrists," and "a locked door."

Girls' experiences of cyberbullying. I was surprised to find the girls so hesitant to share personal experiences with cyberbullying. Only Andy identified herself as a victim of cyberbullying, briefly and broadly outlining her experiences of classmates' negative comments on her now closed Facebook page. Inversely, Salvatore shared that she was unaware of schoolmates being cyberbullied and explained that her peer group would act against cyberbullying behaviours by speaking back to the cyberbully online. Alternatively, Robin outlined an experience in which she felt she had been bullied after

she was accused of cyberbullying her peer. In any of this data, none of the participants identified themselves as a "bystander" or "cyberbully" in their experiences.

It seems that there is a lack of clarity in the language the girls used to discuss their experiences. This might connect to the concept of the cyberbully as the "other" (JanMohamed, 1985, p. 59). In the context of this study, the girls may have been hesitant to use traditional language that might implicate themselves as either a perpetrator of this type of violence, or as a bystander.

The ways in which the girls ostracized the cyberbully throughout the study flowed into their descriptions of the Internet and specific online spaces. The Internet became a dangerous, wilderness-type space that housed "keyboard warriors"; Rin suggested that "internet friends" became dangerous oppressors and Robin compared her "Someone Like Me" to Little Red Riding Hood. In these descriptions, it seems that the Internet is a space wherein the girls expect to find oppressors; however, the facelessness of cyberbullies is complicated by the way in which the girls emphasized their perceptions of off-line consequences. There is a divide between the way in which the girls understood cyberbullying and the way their real-life experiences fit into this definition.

Drama's effect on girls' perceptions of cyberbullying. The use of DSI in this study facilitated the girls' engagement in self-reflection beyond the scope of the study. For example, Robin and Salvatore felt they were more aware of their online behaviours because of their participation in the study. Salvatore commented that the study allowed her to "expand" and "learn a lot about [her]self." The DSI activities seemed to improve the girls' self-reported reflection about their actions online beyond the study sessions. Although the girls commented that they learned about themselves as individuals

throughout the study, they also commented that they did not learn about cyberbullying. This is not surprising, as they did not receive any direct instruction about this phenomenon within the study.

In Salvatore's explanation of not wanting to participate in a collective creation, she commented that she "did not realize that the presentation would be about [her]." In reality, the majority of the performance devised using DSI techniques did not reveal personal details or identifiers. Salvatore further commented that she did not understand how sharing the performance content could "benefit anyone else" as she "see[s] how it's affected [the girls]" and that the end of the study should be about them, "not other people." DSI is arguably the factor that gave Salvatore a true sense of ownership of her exploration of this phenomenon.

Rin, Salvatore, and Andy suggested that DSI allowed them to better understand and learn from each other because of the opportunities they had to take others' perspectives. Robin felt that the activities helped other girls understand her and that the study brought her closer to the other girls. Similarly, Rin commented that she learned most from collaborating with the other girls and sharing ideas. Rin connected her perspective-taking to her experiences in school-mandated cyberbullying programming that explored the cases of Amanda Todd (Teitel, 2012) and Julia Kiroauc (W5 Staff, 2012). Rin explained that these school-mandated programs were her only experience with cyberbullying and that she originally dismissed Todd and Kiroauc's decisions as "stupid." Rin felt that, after this study, she better understood their perspectives.

Unanticipated Findings

The following examines the unanticipated findings in the research.

Not all girls were comfortable sharing. The first theme "I Can't Share That" illustrated that girls' understanding of cyberbullying was too personal to share directly with schoolmates. In Session VIII, Rin was disappointed that Andy and Salvatore did not want to follow through with the collective creation, especially as Robin was not present when the group decision was made to change the outcome of the study. Both Andy and Salvatore welcomed other participants to present their work, but did not want to engage in the collective creation.

I suspect that their reluctance had to do with a fear of not being taken seriously by their peers. Andy and Salvatore both predicted a collective creation in which their peers would make fun of their pseudonyms and express boredom throughout the performance. It also seems that there is a feeling of intimacy when sharing thoughts about a sensitive topic for an audience. This idea aligns with both Andy's and Salvatore's description of Twitter; it is too personal to present intimate ideas and interests with acquaintances and friends (as they would in performance); it is easier to present the information to strangers (as they do through this study).

Distancing techniques contributed to participant disengagement. I believe that distancing is the factor that changed the course of the study from what was intended to what occurred, ultimately resulting in Andy's and Salvatore's withdrawal from the collective creation. To support ethical practices when exploring this sensitive subject matter, DSI techniques employing distancing devices (Edell, 2013; Eriksson, 2011) that were intentionally incorporated into the study sessions to serve as a buffer between the girls' creative work and the cyberbullying content. Eriksson defines distancing as "the awareness of fiction… to function as protection" (p. 66). Providing "distance" is meant

to allow participants to engage in a way that saves them from any unwanted vulnerability, while genuinely interacting with the research topic. Unfortunately, the distancing devices (e.g., choral reading, tableaux, and role play) seemed to cause a significant disengagement from the content of activities as the girls focused on the DSI technique (context) rather than the topic (content) being explored.

Distancing was also apparent in the girls' demonstration of empathy throughout the study. Ang and Goh (2010) separate empathy as "(affective empathy), which is the ability to experience and share the emotions of others," and "(cognitive empathy), which is the ability to understand the emotions of others" (p. 388). The girls demonstrated cognitive empathy, understanding the feelings of others, especially when exploring perspectives; however, they did not demonstrate significant evidence of affective empathy. This was made explicit in Rin's comment: "I don't think I get a sense of how [cyberbullying] feels… but I don't want to feel this at all." However, for Salvatore, who claimed she thought "the presentation wouldn't be about [the participants]" and that she was not comfortable "sharing [her] feelings," the activities may not have provided sufficient distancing.

The distancing devices used throughout the study may have prevented the girls from engaging effectively. This situation is problematic given what Ang and Goh (2010) have suggested about cognitive empathy and cyberbullying: "girls, regardless of heir levels of cognitive empathy … reported similar and indistinguishable levels of cyberbullying behaviour" (p. 395). Thus, when DSI techniques are used, its distancing qualities might require reevaluation, or more careful facilitation, in order to better encourage affective empathy among participants.

Girl identity manifests as multiple avatars online. In this study, girls conceptualized their online identities as multiple, disconnected avatars (de Zwart & Lindsay, 2012; Stermitz, 2008), as illustrated in Scene Three of the ethnodrama. Davis (2010) argued that, "the internet provides individuals with even more options for identity experimentation" than offline (p. 150), echoing Adrian's (2008) assertion that "[virtual worlds] make … [a] multiplicity of identity actionable" (p. 368). Online environments appear to facilitate "liquid identity" (p. 368). Adrian also proposed that, "what is changing [with online worlds] is not the 'self', which remains unitary, but the effortlessness with which the 'self' can manipulate its appearances in different physical spaces" (p. 368).

The girls demonstrated this concept when creating and discussing their avatar images. Salvatore placed her Facebook and Tumblr identities on extremes of a continuum, from composition to psychological intimacy. Robin described herself as a steampunk pirate captain, and separated this identity from her Facebook profile picture of Beaker from the Muppets. Rin described her identity in a role-playing game as elf-like, but discussed her need to identify her boyfriend and interests on VK (a social media program like Facebook). Andy suggested that Google would reveal elements of her school and family identity through news articles, but that her Tumblr account truly revealed her inner thoughts.

Davis (2010) argued, "blogging allows [girls] to disclose certain thoughts and feelings that they otherwise would not have the opportunity or inclination to share in other contexts … [that] intimacy can also be maintained through blogging" (p. 158). Salvatore and Andy both expressed their discomfort with sharing their Tumblr pages with

friends and acquaintances. The girls were clear that Tumblr allowed them to share their personal ideas and interests without the fear of feeling the consequences of judgement. They are only "followed" by very close friends or complete strangers on Tumblr, despite the fact that these girls conceptualize the Internet as a predatory space with faceless oppressors.

The girls identified their disconnected avatars as different from their "true" offline selves. What are the implications of these identities? Stermitz (2008) suggested that the "liquidity" of identity online is a way for girls to "choose and change between body concepts and fragments [to] therefore ques[tion] [ideologies] in their repressivity," (p. 538). Thus, liquid identity might be viewed as a source of empowerment for teenaged girls. Alternatively, I wonder what this "liquidity" is indeed empowering girls to do. Furthermore, how does this affect the ways in which girls build identity offline in "real-life" spaces, even if their avatars are distinctly different from their offline "selves."

Implications for Further Research

Tracy (2010) proposed that "good qualitative research" not only explores new or evocative phenomena, but also employs "methodologically significant approaches" (p. 846). I believe that the primary implications for further research lie in this study's methodological significance, using Drama for Social Intervention to engage participants with the phenomenon of cyberbullying in abstract and meaningful ways. Cahnmann (2003) recognized "recent interest and support for alternative forms of data representation" that includes "poetry, story, and theater" (p. 29).

The "secrets wall" activity, found poetry, and choral reading script used in this study allowed the girls to generate an original, abstract description of cyberbullying that

addressed the multidimensionality of this phenomenon, "giv[ing] rise to ways of saying what might not otherwise be expressed" (Cahnmann, 2003, p. 31). Similarly, Booth and Swartz (2013) asserted that "in a very few well-chosen words, a poet can help [an audience] see an event from a different viewpoint, or from a different angle, so that we understand more about everyone involved" (p. 8). The DSI techniques arguably facilitated this process of abstraction, engaging girls in the choral reading of their sensory "Cyberbullying is" poetry and allowing girls to use rich metaphors in their comparison of cyberbullying to physical objects.

The girls reported that arts-based methods facilitated their individual growth and reflective practices. For example, Rin identified that she "actually started to care" about cyberbullying as a phenomenon for those who have experienced it. Andy shared that the activities made her feel more aware of cyberbullying, making it more tangible for her. Salvatore and Robin both explained that their online communications had changed because of their increased awareness of alternative perspectives. Robin felt that the other girls understood her better as she was able to share her own experiences in an indirect way through the DSI activities.

The use of ethnodrama (Campbell & Conrad, 2006; Saldaña, 1999) to communicate the findings of this study "enhance[d] [the] presentation of recorded data, building on previous transcription conventions," and "communicat[ing] with more liveliness and accuracy when representing data to larger audiences" (Cahnmann, 2003, p. 31).

The multiplicity of girl avatar identities demands that research reevaluate cyberbullying language, supporting the "critical overhaul" of "anti-bullying discourses"

argued by Ringrose and Renold (2010, p. 591). I propose that the cyberbully, victim, and bystander discourses do not account for the multiplicity of roles assumed by girls online. Similarly, the ways in which girls perceive online identities reinforces Sbarbaro and Enyeart Smith's (2011) demand "to further identify influential factors revolved around bullying and cyberbullying" (p. 150), as the girls take on multiple avatar identities.

The issue of distancing (Eriksson, 2011) problematized the methodologies of the study. Distancing raised questions about how to create balance in research between what students feel safe sharing and meaningful experiences. When distancing devices that are meant to facilitate ethical practices effectively disengage participants from the research topic, how does a researcher reengage them? I believe that part of the girls' disengagement lay in the fact that DSI was a novelty to them, as many reported not having participated in drama activities since they were in younger grades. I ask researchers to consider ways of removing the novelty of such methodologies so as to not distract participants from the topic of the study.

Cahnmann (2003) asserted that "[e]ducational researchers can benefit from arts-based approaches to research that question the limits of tradition" (p. 34). I believe that methodological traditions need to be revisited in order to better address and engage modern participants in meaningful research. As Cahnmann suggests, "just as important as what is included in the poem is what is left out" (p. 34). In the ethnodrama, the girls' gaps in understanding and communication should be carefully considered as they identify the ways in which qualitative research needs to continue to develop in more "multidimensional, penetrating, and more accessible ways" (p. 35).

Implications for Teachers and Administrators

Teachers and administrators need to recognize the multiplicity girls' online (avatar) identities. The understanding that girls perceive themselves as having many separate identities should influence how we educate them about online safety, as well as inform the ways in which we understand the complexities of girls' experiences with cyberbullying. This notion returns to a need for a working language that better addresses the realities of girls' avatar identities in the cyberbullying context (Ringrose & Renold, 2010). If "violence is normalised through the blurring of boundaries between games, play-fighting and violence" (Ringrose & Renold, 2010, p. 580), thus, by continuing to employ no longer appropriate cyberbullying discourses, cyber-violence is normalised in the blurring of divisions between girls' online spaces and identities. The traditional "bully-victim" concept needs fleshing out to better address current realities for girls.

Another implication for teachers and administrators is that girls have particular sites of safety online. In this study, the girls made it clear in which communities they were comfortable sharing more intimate details about their personalities and ideas (e.g., as Tumblr). Teachers and administrators must be aware that girls may be more comfortable sharing intimate personal details with strangers online than they may with close friends and acquaintances. It appears that girls assume that the anonymity of their online audience creates a safe space for expression.

Finally, it appears that there is a need to incorporate empathy-building into cyberbullying programs in schools. Ang and Goh (2010) argued that "empathy training and education should be included in cyberbullying intervention programs," (p. 395). In this study, girls suggested that discussing incidents of cyberbullying from the news media

(in awareness programs) does not empathetically engage students. Furthermore, Ringrose and Renold's (2010) argued that "dominant 'bully discourses' employed to make sense of and address conflict offer few resources or practical tools for addressing and coping with everyday, normative aggression and violence in schools" (p. 575). Additionally, the DSI techniques employed in this study did not appear to access the girls' affective empathy. I encourage teachers and administrators to consider refocusing and reconceptualising the ways in which they educate students about cyberbullying in order to better address these disengaging discourses and better generate affective empathy in students.

Conclusions

This discussion examined the major findings of this study. It explored the girls' definition of cyberbullying, experiences of cyberbullying, and the affect of drama on their perceptions. It continued to discuss unanticipated findings: not all girls were comfortable sharing, distancing techniques contributed to participant disengagement, and girl identity manifests as multiple avatars online.

In the implications for further research, I emphasized the methodological significance of this study in both its ability to engage the girls in an abstract exploration of the research topic, and the growth in personal reflection reported by the girls. Furthermore, I proposed a need for new cyberbullying discourses that better address online girl identities, demanding that researchers find ways of better engaging participants while using DSI distancing techniques.

In the implications for teachers and administrators, I emphasized a need for educators to better understand the ways in which girls exist online as multiple, separate

avatars. Again, I suggested a re-evaluation of the language used to address cyberbullying with girls to better include the functions of their online identities. As well, I asked teachers and administrators to consider that girls may feel safe sharing intimate information and ideas with "strangers" online and that this needs to be addressed. Finally, I encouraged educators to incorporate affective empathy-building practices (Ang & Goh, 2010) into their cyberbullying awareness programming to better engage in preventative practices

In Chapter One of this study, I presented the background of the research, proposing research questions and providing details pertinent to my qualifications as a researcher. In Chapter Two I reviewed the current literature in the areas of cyberbullying and DSI, suggesting that as arts-based qualitative research DSI may be an effective way of addressing cyberbullying with teenaged girls. In Chapter Three, I outlined my methodologies, describing the format and content of each of the nine study sessions and the data collected therein. Furthermore, I provided an extensive description of ethnodrama as a unique method of communicating research. In Chapter Four, I presented the ethnodrama titled "Cyberbullying: An Invisible Web" in which the girls' journey through this study illuminates the emergent themes from the data. Finally, I concluded with a discussion of these findings and provided suggestions for further research, teachers and administrators.

Like Salvatore, Andy, Rin, and Robin, I genuinely hope that this research will affect the ways in which researchers and educators address cyberbullying with teenaged girls. I believe that the answers to our questions about how to better address this phenomenon lie in the experiences and understandings of the teenagers who live it every

day. I believe that their words and ideas will pave the way to create more effective and

preventative cyberbullying programming.

References

Adrian, A. (2008). No one knows you are a dog: Identity and reputation in virtual worlds. *Computer Law and Security Report*, *24*, 366-374.

Ang, R., & Goh, D. H. (2010). Cyberbullying among adolescents: The role of affective and cognitive empathy, and gender. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, *41*, 387-397.

Balfour, M. (2000). Drama, masculinity and violence. *Research in Drama Education*, *5*(1), 9-21.

Barone, T. (2008). How arts-based research can change minds. In M. Cahnmann-Taylor & R. Siegesmund (Eds.), *Arts-based research in education: Foundations for Practice* (pp. 28-50). New York, NY: Routledge.

Barone, T., & Eisner, E. W. (2012). *Arts based research*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Bauman, S. (2010). Cyberbullying in a rural intermediate school: An exploratory study. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *30*(6), 803-833.

Bauman, S., Toomey, R. B., & Walker, J. L. (2013). Associations among bullying, cyberbullying, and suicide in high school students. *Journal of Adolescence*, *36*(2), 341-350.

Beckman, L., Hagquist, C., & Hellström, L. (2013). Discrepant gender patterns for cyberbullying and traditional bullying: An analysis of Swedish adolescent data. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *29*(5), 1896-1903.

Belliveau, G. (2006). Using drama to achieve social justice: Anti-bullying project in elementary schools. In L.A. McCammon & D. McLauchlan (Eds.), *Universal mosaic of drama and theatre: The IDEA 2004 dialogues* (pp. 325-335). Ottawa, Canada: IDEA.

Bennett, B., & Rolheisser, C. (2001). *Beyond Monet: The artful science of instructional integration*. Toronto, ON: Bookation.

Boal, A. (2008). *Theatre of the oppressed*. (C. A. McBride, M-O.L. McBride, & E. Fryer, Trans.). London, UK: Pluto Press.

Bond, E. (2006). *Two plays: The children & have I none*. London, UK: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama.

Booth, D., & Swartz, L. (2013). *The bully the bullied the bystander the brave*. Markham, Ontario: Rubicon.

Bresler, L. (2006, Fall). Toward connectedness: Aesthetically based research. *Studies in Art Education*, *48*(1), 52-69.

Bryanston, C. (2001, Winter). The Children. *Drama Magazine*, 29-35.

Cahnmann, M. (2003, April). The craft, practice, and possibility of poetry in educational research. *Educational Researcher*, *32*(3), 29-36.

Campbell, G., & Conrad, D. (2006). Arresting change: Popular theatre with young offenders. In L.A. McCammon & D. McLauchlan (Eds.), *Universal mosaic of drama and theatre: The IDEA 2004 dialogues* (pp. 375-391). Ottawa, Canada: IDEA.

Cassidy, W., & Jackson, M. (2005, Winter). The need for equality in education: An intersectionality examination of labeling and zero tolerance practices. *McGill Journal of Education*, *40*(3), 435-456.

Chisholm, A. (2004, Winter). Bullying, schools and the law. *Teaching and Learning*, *1*(3), 22-30.

Clark, J. (2009). Acting up and speaking out: Using theatre of the oppressed and collective memory work as alternative research methods and empowerment tools in work with girls. *Agenda: Empowering Women for Gender Equity*, *79*, 49-64.

Coates, S. (2001, Fall). Pouring paint: Using drama to address intolerance. *Stage of the Art*, *14*(1), 27-30.

Collins, L., & Patterson, J. (2004, Winter). Cyber bullying: The new frontier. *Teaching and Learning*, *1*(3), 32-34.

Conrad, D. (2004). Popular theatre: Empowering pedagogy for youth. *Youth Theatre Journal, 18*, 87-106.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000, Summer). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, *39*(3), 128.

Cyberbullying Research Centre. (2013). Retrieved from http://cyberbullying.us

Davis, K. (2010). Coming of age online: The developmental underpinnings of girls' blogs. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *25*(1), 145-171.

de Zwart, M., & Lindsay, D. (2012). My self, my avatar, my rights? Avatar

   identity in social virtual worlds. In D. Riha (Ed.), *At the interface / probing the*

   boundaries: *Frontiers of cyberspace* (pp. 81-100). Amsterdam, The Netherlands:

   Rodopi B.V.

Denzin, N. K. (1997). Performance texts. In W. G. Tierney & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.).

   Representation and the text: Re-framing the narrative voice (pp. 179-218).

   Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Denzin, N. K. (2003). *Performance ethnography: Critical pedagogy and the politics of*

   culture. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Edell, D. (2013). "Say how it is": Urban teenage girls challenge and perpetuate

   stereotypes through writing and performing theatre. *Youth Theatre Journal*, *27*(1),

   51-62.

Eisner, E. (2008a). Art and knowledge. In J. G. Knowles & L. C. Ardra (Eds.) *Handbook*

   of the arts in qualitative research: Perspectives, methodologies, examples, and

   issues. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Eisner, E. (2008b). Persistent tensions in arts-based research. In M. Cahnmann-Taylor &

   R. Siegesmund (Eds.), *Arts-based research in education: Foundations for*

   practice (pp. 16-27). New York, NY: Routledge.

Erdur-Baker, Ö. (2010). Cyberbullying and its correlation to traditional bullying, gender

   and frequent and risky usage of internet-mediated communication tools. *New*

   Media & Society, *12*(1), 109-125.

Eriksson, S. A. (2011). Distancing. In S. Schonmann (Ed.), *Key concepts in*

   theatre/drama Education (pp. 65-71). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Finley, S. (2008). Arts-based research. In J. G. Knowles & A. L. Cole (Eds.) *Handbook of the arts in qualitative research: Perspectives, methodologies, examples, and issues*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Freire, P. (2011). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary edition, M. Bergman Ramos, Trans.). New York, NY: Continuum International.

Froese-Germain, B. (2008). Bullying in the digital age: Using technology to harass students and teachers. *Our Schools/Our Selves*, *17*(4), 45-54.

Garber, E. (2010, Fall). Global and local: Rethinking citizenship in art and visual culture education. *Encounters on Education*, *11*, 117-133.

Gardner, H. (2003, April). *Multiple intelligences after twenty years*. [Invited Address] Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, 1-14. Chicago, IL.

Gonzalez, J. B. (2002, Spring). From page to stage to teenager: Problematizing 'transformation' in theatre for and with adolescents. *Stage of the Art*, *14*(3), 17-21.

Greene, M. (1995, January). Art and imagination: Reclaiming the sense of possibility. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *76*(5), 5.

Harris, M. (2005). Is journaling empowering? Students' perceptions of their reflective writing experience. *Health Sa Gesondheid: Journal of Interdisciplinary Health Sciences*, *10*(2), 47-60.

Hatton, C. (2004). On the edge of realities: Drama, learning and adolescent girls. *Drama Australia Journal NJ*, *28*(1), 87-102.

Haug, F. (2008, December). Memory work. *Australian Feminist Studies*, *23*(58), 537-541.

Heap, S., & Simpson, A. (2005). A lesson for the living: Promoting HIV/AIDS competence among young Zambians. *Youth Theatre Journal*, *18*(1), 89-101.

Heathcote, D., & Bolton, G. (1995). *Drama for learning: Dorothy Heathcote's mantle of the expert approach to education*. Portmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Henderson, L. K. (2013, March). Exploring critical themes through the human figure. *Art Education*, *66*(2), 20-34.

Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2011). *Qualitative research methods*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

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

Horitz, T. (2001). 'B-O-U-R-N-E-M-O-U-T-H! Our Town!' Effects on male teenagers of participation in a community play. *Research in Drama Education*, *6*(1), 69-84.

JanMohamed, A. (1985). The economy of Manichean allegory: The function of racial difference in colonialist literature, *Critical Inquiry*, 12, 59-87.

Johnson, D. (2012, April 5). Secrets worth sharing. *The St. Catharines Standard*, A2.

Jonker, T. (2012, Winter) The fun of "found poetry." *Children and Libraries: The Journal of the Association for Library Service to Children*, *10*(3), 64.

Kauffman, J. M., & Landrum, T. J. (2013). *Characteristics of emotional and behavioral disorders of children and youth*. (10th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Kessel Schneider, S., O'Donnell, L., Stueve, A., & Coulter, R. W. S. (2012). Cyberbullying, school bullying, and psychological distress: A regional census of high school students. *American Journal of Public Health*, *102*(1), 171-177. Doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2011.300308

Kloeble, C. (2012, June). *Far from the heart: Report of the effectiveness of forum theatre as an educational tool regarding youth dating violence and sexual assault in Saskatchewan schools*. Unpublished report, University of Regina Community Research Unit, University of Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lepp, M. (2011). Drama for conflict management DRACON international. In S. Schonmann (Ed.), *Key concepts in theatre/drama education* (pp. 99-104). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Mangeni, P. (2006). Negotiating learning contexts: Some experiences of culture, power, and gender in working with multi-cultural communities through theatre for development. In L. A. McCammon & D. McLauchlan (Eds.), *Universal mosaic of drama and theatre: The IDEA 2004 dialogues* (pp. 233-243). Ottawa, Canada: IDEA.

Marin, C. (2007). A methodology rooted in praxis: Theatre of the oppressed (TO) techniques employed as arts-based educational research methods. *Youth Theatre Journal, 21*, 81-93.

Mas, S. (2013, July 23). Proposed cyberbullying law draws NDP support. *CBC News*. Retrieved from http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics

McCall, M. M. (2000). Performance ethnography: A brief history and some advice. In

    N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.,

    pp. 421-433). New York, NY: Sage.

Mienczakowski, J., Smith, L., & Morgan, S. (2002). Seeing words – hearing feelings:

    Ethnodrama and the performance of data. In C. Bagley (Ed.), *Dancing the data*

    (pp. 34-52). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Mixed Company Theatre. (n.d.) Retrieved from: http://Mixedcompanytheatre.com

Mlama, P. (2002). Popular theatre and development – challenges for the future: The

    Tanzanian experience. *Contemporary Theatre Review*, *12*(1&2), 45-58.

Nelson, B., Colby, R., & McIlrath, M. (2000). 'Having their say': The effects of using

    role with an urban middle school class. *Youth Theatre Journal*, *15*, 59-66.

Nicholson, H. (2003). Acting, creativity and social justice: Edward Bond's *The Children*.

    Research in Drama Education, *8*(1), 9-23.

Nogueira, M. P. (2006). A mosaic of community theatre practices in Southern Brazil. In

    L.A. McCammon & D. McLauchlan (Eds.), *Universal mosaic of drama and*

    theatre: The IDEA 2004 dialogues (pp. 269-278). Ottawa, Canada: IDEA.

O'Farrell, L. (2010). Introduction. *Encounters on education*, *11*, xi-xiii.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2012a). Bill 13: An Act to amend the Education Act with

    respect to bullying and other matters. Legislative Assembly of Ontario. Retrieved

    from: http://ontla.on.ca/web/bills/bills_detail.do?locale=en&BillID=2549

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2012b). Safe schools. Retrieved from:

    http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/safeschools/respect.html

Österlind, E. (2011). Forum play: A Swedish mixture for consciousness and change. In S. Schonmann (Ed.), *Key concepts in theatre/drama education* (pp. 247-251). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Paget, M. A. (1995). Performing the text. In J. Van Maanen (Ed.), *Representation in ethnography* (pp. 222-244). New York, NY: Sage.

Pelfrey, W. V. Jr., & Weber, N. L. (2013). Keyboard gangsters: Analysis of incidence and correlates of cyberbullying in a large urban student population. *Deviant Behavior*, *34*(1), 68-84.

Rabin, C. L. (2009). The theatre arts and care ethics. *Youth Theatre Journal*, *23*, 127-143.

Ramamoorthi, P. (2006). Freedom space: Drama therapy with prisoners in Madurai. In L. A. McCammon & D. McLauchlan (Eds.), *Universal mosaic of drama and theatre: The IDEA 2004 dialogues* (pp. 367-374). Ottawa, Canada: IDEA.

Ringrose, J., & Renold, E. (2010, August). Normative cruelties and gender deviants: The performative effects of bully discourses for girls and boys in school. *British Educational Research Journal*, *36*(4), 573-596.

Rogers, D., Frellick, P., & Babinski, L. (2002). Staging a study: Performing the personal and professional struggles of beginning teachers. In C. Bagby & M. B. Cancienne (Eds.), *Dancing the data* (pp. 53-69). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Roper, B., & Davis, D. (2000). Howard Gardner: Knowledge, learning and development in drama and arts education. *Research in Drama Education*, *5*(2), 217-232.

Saldaña, J. (1999). Playwriting with data: Ethnographic performance texts. *Youth Theatre Journal*, *13*, 60-69.

Saldaña, J. (2006, July). *An introduction to ethnodrama: Autoethnogoraphy as monologue*. Workshop presented at the American Alliance of Theater and Education (AATE) annual conference, Chicago, ILL.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Saldaña, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of qualitative research: Understanding qualitative research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Sanders, J. H. III. (2006). Performing arts-based education research: An epic drama of practice, precursors problems and possibilities. *Studies in Art Education a Journal of Issues and Research*, *48*(1), 89-107.

Sbarbaro, V., & Enyeart Smith, T. M. (2011). An exploratory study of bullying and cyberbullying behaviors among economically/educationally disadvantaged middle school students. *American Journal of Health Studies*, *26*(3). 139-151.

Schoffstall, C. L., & Cohen, R. (2011). Cyber aggression: The relation between online offenders and offline social competence. *Social Development, 20*(3), 587-604.

Shariff, S. (2005, Winter). Cyber-dilemmas in the new millennium: School obligations to provide student safety in a virtual school environment. *McGill Journal of Education*, *40*(3), 457-477.

Sheatre Educational Alternative Theatre. (2012). Retrieved from: http://Sheatre.com

Siegesmund, R., & Cahnmann-Taylor, M. (Eds.). (2008). *The tensions of arts-based research in education reconsidered: The promise for practice. Arts-based research in education: Foundations for practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Smith, P. K., & Slonje, R. (2010). Cyberbullying: The nature and extent of a new kind of bullying, in and out of school. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 249-262). New York, NY: Routledge.

Stermitz, E. (2008). World of female avatars: An artistic online survey on the female body in times of virtual reality. *Leonardo*, *41*(5), 538-539.

Sutherland, A. (2006). Making visible the invisible: Drama as voice for youth at risk in a South African context. In L.A. McCammon & D. McLauchlan (Eds.), *Universal mosaic of drama and theatre: The IDEA 2004 dialogues* (pp. 337-346). Ottawa, Canada: IDEA.

Taft, J. K. (2011). *Rebel girls: Youth activism and social change across the Americas.* New York, NY: NYU Press.

Teitel, E. (2012, October 29). Cyberbullying: Bullied to death. *Maclean's*, *125*(42), 68-70.

Tilley, S. (2003). "Challenging" research practices: Turning a critical lens on the work of transcription. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *9*(5), 750-773.

Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight "big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *16*(10), 837-851.

Trousdale, A., Bach, J., & Willis, E. (2010, November). Freedom, physicality, friendship and feeling: Aspects of children's spirituality expressed through the choral reading of poetry. *International Journal of Children's Spirituality*, *15*(4), 317-329.

Turner, V. (1987). Betwixt and between: The liminal period in rites of passage. In V. L. Turner, C. Mahdi, S. Foster, & M. Little (Eds.), *Betwixt & between: Patterns of masculine and feminine initiation* (pp. 3-19). Peru, IL: Open Court.

Underwood, M. K., & Rosen, L. H. (2011). Gender and bullying: Moving beyond mean differences to consider conceptions of bullying, processes by which bullying unfolds, and cyberbullying. In D. L. Espelage and S. M. Swearer (Eds.) *Bullying in North American schools* (2nd ed.; pp. 13-22). New York, NY: Routledge.

UNESCO (2010). *Seoul agenda: Goals for the development of arts education.* The Second World Conference on Arts Education. [PDF document] 1-10.

W5 Staff. (2012, September 21). *Sext-ed: Inside the sexting sub-culture of teens*. CTV W5. Retrieved from: http://www.ctvnews.ca/w5/sext-ed-inside-the-sexting-sub-culture-of-teens-1.963789

Wilson, B. (2006). Ethnography, the internet, and youth culture: Strategies for examining social resistance and "online-offline" relationships. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *29*(1), 307-328.

Winston, J. (1996). Emotion, reason and moral engagement in drama. *Research in Drama Education*, *1*(2), 189-200.

Zatzman, B. (2005, Winter). Staging history: Aesthetics and the performance of memory. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, *39*(4), 95-103.

Appendix A

Recruiting Announcement Scripts

Morning Announcement: First week of September

Attention all girls in Grade 11 and 12. Do you like being creative and expressing yourself? Does the topic of cyberbullying interest you? If you want to participate in an exciting new project, please come to the Resource Room at the beginning of lunch on Thursday, September 13. Remember, that's all girls in Grade 11 and 12 who want to get involved in a creative project on cyberbullying, meet in the Resource Room at the beginning of lunch on Thursday, September 13. We look forward to seeing you there!

Morning Announcement: Second week of September

Attention all girls in Grade 11 and 12. Do you like being creative and expressing yourself? Does the topic of cyberbullying interest you? If you want to participate in an exciting new project, please come to the Resource Room at the beginning of lunch on Thursday, September 13. Remember, that's all girls in Grade 11 and 12 who want to get involved in a creative project on cyberbullying, meet in the Resource Room at the beginning of lunch on Thursday, September 13. We look forward to seeing you there!

Morning Announcement: Third week of September

Attention all girls in Grade 11 and 12. Do you like being creative and expressing yourself? Does the topic of cyberbullying interest you? If you want to participate in an exciting new project, please come to the Resource Room at the beginning of lunch on Thursday, September 20. Remember, that's all girls in Grade 11 and 12 who want to get involved in a creative project on cyberbullying, meet in the Resource Room at the beginning of lunch on Thursday, September 20. If you have already signed up for the project, please return your signed permission forms by Friday, September 21 *at the* latest!

Appendix B

Electronic Recruitment Announcement Scripts

First week of November

Attention all **girls in Grade 11 and 12**. Do you like being creative and expressing yourself? Does the topic of cyberbullying interest you? If you want to participate in an exciting **new Thursday activity,** please come to Miss Fournier's room, (Room 35) at the beginning of lunch on **Tuesday, November 6** or **Thursday, November 8.** Remember, that is all girls in Grade 11 and 12 who want to get involved in a creative project on cyberbullying, meet in room 35 at the beginning of lunch on **Tuesday, November 6** or **Thursday, November 8**. I look forward to seeing you there! If you won't be able to make it out, **email me** and we can set up an alternative meeting time.

Second week of November

Attention all **girls in Grade 11 and 12**. Do you like being creative and expressing yourself? Does the topic of cyberbullying interest you? If you want to participate in an exciting **new Thursday activity,** please come to Miss Fournier's room, (Room 35) at 4:00pm on **Thursday, November 15**. Remember, that is all girls in Grade 11 and 12 who want to get involved in a creative project on cyberbullying, meet in room 35 at 4:00pm, on **Thursday, November 15**. I look forward to seeing you there! If you won't be able to make it out, **email me** and we can set up an alternative meeting time.

Appendix C

Recruitment Meeting Script

- I am a graduate student at Brock University in the Faculty of Education conducting a study that uses drama to address cyberbullying in schools.
- This study will include Grade 11 and 12 girls with the hope that it will lead to a better understanding of how girls understand and experience cyberbullying. Research shows that girls and boys may experience bullying differently.
- This study will also look at how drama techniques can be used to address cyberbullying in schools.
- Participation in this study is totally voluntary. This project is not part of the school curriculum and no grades will be assigned.
- Participants will engage in drama-based sessions after school once a week for ten weeks. Each session will be two hours long. Sessions will begin in **the week of November 22** and finish in **the week of February 7, 2013.**
- During these sessions, the researcher will take observational notes about: student attendance; participant interactions with each other; attitudes expressed verbally and through body language; descriptions of activities and artwork generated in the sessions; and observations about group dynamics.
- The study sessions will result in the creation of a half-hour collective drama performance. It will be presented for a class of your peers in **the week of February 7** and will be followed by a half-hour long discussion led by participants in the study.
- Participants will engage in activities like: setting group goals, using mixed media for artistic expression, creating poetry, using choral speaking, building tableaux, improvising scenes, writing letters, and rehearsing the collective drama creation as a whole
- Each week, two different participants will be asked to have an individual interview with me and respond to questions like: *How does cyberbullying affect you? What have you learned from participating in this study?* Each week, students not participating in the interview will engage in a journaling exercise, responding to a weekly journal prompt such as: *Explain how you make people think a certain way about you online. How do you think it makes people perceive you?*
- Journals will be analyzed by the researcher as data in the study.
- This study has been approved by the Brock University Research Ethics Board and your school Principal.
- The information you provide will be kept confidential. Your responses will never be identified by name and I will not use information from school records. When the study is complete, a summary report on the findings will be given to all participants.
- If you are interested, please take a consent package.
- If you are under the age of 18, you must have parental consent to participate. If you are 18 or over, please complete the bottom half of the form on your own behalf.
- Carefully read the information letter and if you are interested in participating, return the signed permission form by **Thursday, November 15** at the latest.
- On the session days, if you are not willing, you will not be made to participate.
- If at any time you experience stress while participating in the study, student support services are available. The researcher will carry contact information for these supports throughout the research sessions.
- If you want any other information about the study, please contact me or my faculty supervisor, Dr. Debra McLauchlan, at Brock University's Faculty of Education. Please see the contact information in the consent package.
- Are there any other questions?
- Thank you for attending, and please contact me if you think of any other questions.

Appendix D

Weekly Journal Prompts

In Session 1-6, participants who were not asked for an interview completed a journal entry. The girls were given the below instructions each week before responding the journal prompts.

Instructions

Please use this time to respond to the following question in your journal. Aim to write a one-page response to the journal prompt. When you are finished, please hand your journal in to the bin. Thank you and I will see you at our next session.

Journal Prompts

Session I. Explain how you make people think a certain way about you online. How do you think it makes people perceive you?

Session II. What word/phrase did you connect to the most on the "secrets wall"? Explain using why.

Session III. How has today's session changed your understanding of cyberbullying? Describe your reaction to today's drama activities.

Session IV. How do you think you can make a change to incidents of cyberbullying?

Session V. Which object did you find the most connection to today? Why?

Session VI. Explain your letter to "Someone Like [You]." What did you think was the most important part of your letter? Why?

Appendix E

Interview Questions

Session I-IV

The following interview questions were posed to the appropriate participants:

1. Why did you choose to participate in this study?
2. How do you define cyberbullying?
3. How have you experienced cyberbullying?
4. How has today's session changed your understanding of cyberbullying?
5. Describe your reaction to today's drama activities?

Session VI-IX

The following interview questions were posed to the appropriate participants:

1. Has your attitude about cyberbullying changed since you started this study? Why or why not?
2. What have you learned since the beginning of this study?
3. Which *activities* did you learn the most from? *What* did you learn?
4. How has participating in this project affected you?
5. What similarities or differences did you find between what you learned here and what you learn in school and your classes?
6. Is there anything else you would like to add about your experiences in this project?

Appendix F

Avatar and Group Goal Activity Prompts

Avatar Image Activity Prompts

1. How do you emphasize certain parts of your identity online?
2. What do you want people to think about you online?
3. How do people get to see or not see you online?
4. How do you associate yourself with certain ideas or values online?
5. In an online world, what would your "avatar" look like?

Group Goal and Rule-Setting Prompts

1. What are our values as we start our work over these sessions?
2. What is important to us as we talk about cyberbullying?
3. How do we want our sessions to run?
4. How do we want to treat each other during our sessions?
5. What do we want to accomplish by the end of the study?

Appendix G

A Priori and Inductive Codes

A Priori Codes

- Choice to participate
- Definition/understanding of cyberbullying
- Experiences with cyberbullying
- Change in understanding/attitude
- Reaction to activities
- Online identity
- Group values/dynamics
- Ideas for social change
- Advice for others
- Study versus school curriculum
- Audience for collective creation
- Factors resisting the study as intended
- Participant interest in study results

Inductive Codes

- Privacy
- Duration online
- Perceptions of peers
- Frameworks for online spaces
- Ownership
- Lack of ownership
- Gendered behaviour
- Insecurity
- Empathy
- Functions of online communities
- Communication
- Anonymity
- Identity
- Value/worth statements
- Distancing from the study topic
- The cyberbully

Appendix H

Category Group Labels

Category Group Labels	A Priori Codes	Inductive Codes
The Cyberbullying Context	• Definition/ understanding of cyberbullying • Study versus school curriculum	• Frameworks for online spaces • Functions of online communities • Communication • Privacy • Duration online
Perceptions of Self	• Experiences with cyberbullying • Reaction to activities • Choice to participate	• Identity
Othering	• Advice for others • Group values/dynamics	• Value/worth statements • Perceptions of peers
Distancing	• Audience for collective creation • Factors resisting the study as intended	• The cyberbully • Distancing from the study topic • Anonymity • Gendered behaviour • Insecurity • Lack of ownership
Sites of Security	• Participant interest in study results • Online identity • Change in understanding/ attitude • Ideas for social change	• Ownership • Empathy