Matt Bush

Prof. Chris Gerben

PWR 1: 24

12/14/06

Government Involvement in High School Internet Policies:

A Re-Evaluation of the Internet's Benefits and Dangers

The utter diversity of the Internet's content is epitomized by the phenomenon of "blogs," online logs and journals that are usually free and publicly accessible. The use of blogs has surged in the last five years, and now many teenagers and professional adults who use the Internet add new content to their blogs on a weekly or daily basis. The content of these blogs ranges from personal lives and gossip about celebrities to first-hand accounts of news events and the progress of scientific projects. Unfortunately, as useful as the latter could be as primary documents for student research, they might be blocked from access on computers in high schools and libraries. Web filtering in schools, which is in theory a means of protecting children from inappropriate content and online predators, is also capable of inadvertently becoming a form of information censorship. So much valuable content on the Internet, such as these blogs and other interactive pages, is overlooked by United States' policymakers and school administrators when forming Internet access policies in high schools.

While these policymakers have reasonable rationales behind the current laws and policies, in effect these laws could adversely affect students' educational experiences. Interactive sites such as blogs and social networks might scream "dangerous online predators" to policymakers, but also happen to offer a wealth of genuine information about society and culture, as well as a valuable means of long-distance communication, neither of which should be

overlooked by policymakers when analyzing them for school policies. By allowing high school students more freedom on the Internet while at school, the United States can create more educated, competitive, and technology-literate citizens for the future, and can help give students of any social class equal access to Internet resources regardless of Internet availability at home. Thus, the potential to make the Internet as open as possible should be in the best interest of policymakers. With a well-planned Internet literacy program, schools can train students to be responsible web surfers and researchers with minimal Internet policing.

Educators, administrators, and policymakers should be made aware of every aspect of the Internet, not just the commercialized and dangerous aspects of the Internet which are brought to attention through the news. Web filtering software alone, by processing the URL or content of a web page, cannot necessarily decide what material is educational and what is not. Policies governing educational web filtering should be re-evaluated to ensure that they prioritize educational possibilities, not perceived dangers, and are realistically compatible with the logistics of web filtering software of certain standards. The software's filtering should be of a certain type, it should make it easy for teachers or administrators to allow sites during breaks and after school that they block during class hours, and it should enable them to allow any potentially useful website which is blocked. This change in filtering policy should be complemented with a structured Internet education in high schools. Such a course can unlock the educational potential of the Internet by teaching students effective Internet research and content analysis skills, as well as strategies for avoiding online security and safety risks alongside this. This maximizes the students' potential to learn on the Internet, and gives them the attitude of trust and responsibility that they deserve.

Current Filtering Policies and Justifications

Internet filtering in high schools has been in effect because in addition to worrying that the ever-expanding Internet is a distraction to students, parents and policymakers worry for students' safety and exposure to inappropriate material. The Internet has become infamous for its relatively easy access to adult content, compared to print means, because it provides privacy and anonymity that can remove some of the social shame from such situations. But access to this material can happen through unwanted means, such as accidentally clicking on a link or receiving spam email. When Internet access emerged in classrooms as a learning and research tool at the turn of the millennium, teachers and policymakers quickly became concerned with the Internet's inherently unfiltered content. Many filtering policies are unique to individual high schools and libraries, but recently the government has made nationwide filtering mandates as well.

Internet filtering works by installing software in the school's Internet server or router. It can scan the URLs of websites or words appearing in the page before allowing the page to reach the school computers. It can also pick up on special scripts such as video files or interactive games, and can scan pages for viruses. Some filtering is called *white list* filtering, where only a certain set of good websites is allowed to pass through the filter, but the most common style of filtering is *black list* filtering, which has a list of bad websites and/or content words that are not allowed to reach the computer user. Black list filtering is more common because it is generally impossible for a software program or company to review every harmless site on the Internet, and the most effective black lists are entirely comprised of human-reviewed websites to ensure that sites fall into the proper categories. Internet filtering is usually broken down into products for children, such as at home and schools, and products for businesses or organizations, because

different categories and risks come into play with each audience group, such as dating sites and investment sites.

The U.S. passed laws requiring certain high schools to filter specific content types on the web as concerns about inappropriate content arose. Many schools' Internet access is funded by a government program called E-Rate, and is subject to federal policies regarding Internet use, the first of which emerged in 2001. The concerned policymakers created and passed the *Children's Internet Protection Act* (CIPA), which requires these high schools to restrict inappropriate content. The CIPA acts primarily to prevent children from illegally accessing adult content, but in its passing, it was argued to additionally prevent exposure to violence. In a review of CIPA before the House of Representatives in 2001, Susan Getgood, vice president of the web filtering software company SurfControl that offers its product to E-rate schools, voiced her approval of CIPA:

> Educators know that filtering software is reliable, effective, and flexible enough to allow them to tailor it to their specific needs. They also know what filtering technology is not.
>
> It is not a replacement for the guidance of parents and teachers. Schools implement filtering technology for many reasons, and clearly the most compelling reason is the desire to protect children at school from anything to sexually explicit content to how to build a bomb, and how to buy a gun. (CIPA 39)

Getgood raised the important point that web filtering technology is a safety mechanism, not a replacement for supervision. Most likely to promote her company's product, she explained that web-filtering software is flexible and easy to use, although the policy being discussed did not have any specific need of flexibility or exceptions. CIPA passed in 2001 and has been in effect,

reliably preventing the vast majority of adult content online from reaching the eyes of students at schools.

A second policy governing E-Rate school's Internet content emerged five years later when the Internet's social networking sites such as MySpace.com emerged and gained popularity. Likewise, the reported number of sexual predators attempting to meet teenagers on the Internet increased dramatically, perpetuating the Internet's undertones of sexual freedom present in the reaction to adult content. Parents and policymakers became concerned that children risked their safety on social networking sites by giving out personal information. In June 2006, the *Deleting Online Predators Act* (DOPA) was proposed and passed in the House of Representatives. The DOPA would require E-Rate schools to block "commercial social networking sites," due to the perception that they carried more risks than educational benefits. In a review before the House of Representatives regarding this policy, the chairman Fred Upton described the act and some of its rationale. He stated that when children are at schools or libraries, "parents are not able to monitor their children's online use, and that is a situation that H.R. 5319 [DOPA] is designed to address. […] H.R. 5319 would require schools and libraries which receive E-rate funding to restrict minors' access to commercial social networking websites through which such minors may easily be subject to unlawful sexual advances, unlawful requests for sexual favors, or repeated offensive comments of a sexual nature from adults." On behalf of proponents of the law, Upton references genuine public concerns for children and uses them to define the nature of social networking sites. As with Getgood, he stresses supervision of children's use of the Internet and the government's advocacy for child safety. DOPA is awaiting review by the Senate, which was expected in September 2006 but delayed. This law is thus not in

effect and children still have access to commercial social networking sites in schools that do not independently block them.

Sentiments about web filtering in schools outside of the Capitol Building are similar, even on accounts of basic psychology and educational procedures. One text that gives several perspectives on the Internet's role in schools is the book *Does the Internet Benefit Society?*, which contains thirteen passages in which different authors offer a spectrum of perspectives on the social benefits and dangers of the Internet. One proponent of web filtering offers an analysis of child psychology: "The Internet allows potential offenders into a child's environment which is usually perceived as being safe—home, schools, libraries, and friends' houses—thus providing mixed messages and ambiguity about reality for children" (Mur 98). From a safety-oriented standpoint, web filtering in schools is a sensible and necessary practice, based on preventing potential risk. Another text, *Nasties on the Net*, is a study published in a library journal, gathering data from four British high schools in 2002. It stated that "a massive 82 per cent of teachers surveyed had a strong belief that filtering was necessary in schools" and that one teacher wrote, "I feel the present filtering systems are necessary to avoid the possibility that inappropriate material is displayed. While this is inconvenient, there remains a vast resource of useful and appropriate material which can be accessed through the filter" (qtd in Allbon 35). Seeing certain websites as potential distractions and safety risks, these teachers see no problem with web filtering, which to them has not impeded any educational processes.

From laws such as the CIPA and DOPA, US legislators came to accept the idea that not only is the Internet dangerous, but that it is the responsibility of Congress to mandate children's safe use of it in public institutions. While the DOPA draws its concerns from genuine statistics, it

mainly gained support from its basis on bringing safety, liability and supervision in the forefront of educational policymaking, without a noticeable analysis of educational effects.

A Revised View of the Internet

But the foundations and the perceptions upon which these web filtering policies are based, especially the DOPA, can be challenged. Safety is essential to schools, but a school is not merely a day care, so very unlikely safety risks must be sacrificed for educational potential, just as the risk of injuring oneself on a swing set does not mean they are absent from school playgrounds. Within the social networking sites that DOPA intends to block, this educational potential could include learning good communication skills, multimedia skills, and collaboration skills. The American Library Association (ALA)'s response to DOPA, published on its website before DOPA was reviewed by the Senate, brings up several relevant and necessary concerns. "Libraries and schools are where kids learn essential information literacy skills that go far beyond computer instruction and web searching. Indeed, DOPA would block usuage [sic] of these sites in the very environments where librarians and teachers can instruct students about how to use all kinds of applications safely and effectively and where kids can learn how to report and avoid unsafe sites" (ALA). The ALA reassures its readers that without a law like DOPA, schools and libraries will still do all they can to prevent access to unsafe sites. It also raises the issue of equality of access between students of different status. For E-rate schools and libraries, DOPA would "block computer users from accessing Interactive Web applications of all kinds, thereby limiting opportunities for those who do not have Internet access at home. This unfairly denies the students and library users in schools and libraries in the poorest communities from accessing appropriate content and from learning how best to safely manage their own Internet access in consultation with librarians and teachers" (ALA). The ALA sees education as a

development of skills that students should have equal opportunities to learn and be trained in,

and it is concerned that under DOPA's broad definition of risky sites, educationally useful

websites could be blocked.

The ALA argues that access to social networking sites allows students to engage in a new

communication experience. In addition to this, students can access an abundance of writing

styles, subjects, and viewpoints while looking for primary sources within this Internet content

type. Wallace Wang's book *Steal This Computer Book 4.0*, which illustrates the pros and cons of

the information explosion within the Internet, argues that blogs are essential to a complete

understanding of news and events:

> These individual diaries, known as blogs, […] provide raw, unedited stories from
>
> ordinary people who just happen to be caught in the crossfire of world events.
>
> Blogs are uncensored and unedited so you get one person's thoughts, along with
>
> his or her misspellings and grammatical errors. By reading blogs from people on
>
> both sides of a conflict, you can get a more complete and possibly accurate idea of
>
> what's really happening in the world. (Wang 217)

Understandably, many blogs might still be distracting and unlikely to be of any educational

potential. But because millions of blogs can fall under the same domain name, such as the

popular blog server *Blogger.com*, it would be difficult for a web filtering program to separate the

valuable blogs from the distracting ones. In general, sites with potential safety risks to students,

as defined by the DOPA, cannot be reasonably blocked without blocking educational or harmless

sites as at the same time because of the sheer volume of blogs and the method by which they are

treated by a web filtering program. Finally, no website can be truly blocked from a computer,

thanks to proxy servers, a kind of website that allows indirect access to a website usually for the

purpose of bypassing web filters. While most web filters are advanced enough to identify and block proxy servers, proxy servers under new URLs are always being created, so students intent on accessing a blocked social networking site can potentially find an unblocked proxy server and bypass the web filter. This can be more dangerous to the student than accessing the social networking site directly: proxy servers are capable of collecting the information a student enters to log into the social network and using it to hack into their account, a crime known as *phishing*. When analyzing the Internet for its sheer volume of blogs and accounting for methods of bypassing standard filters, it becomes difficult to say whether laws like DOPA that address this kind of site as a problem would be effective, educationally and logistically. And in general, policymakers analyzing any law dealing with the Internet for viability must account for these logistic factors.

To ultimately judge the educational value of sites for filtering, it is important to find a balance between educational use of the Internet and the risks it carries. The U.S.'s current high-school-age children have not known a world without the Internet, and thus they naturally understand its utter size, complexity, and diversity. While parents are often wary of the Internet's multitude of services, children see no strangeness: the children are often oblivious of the dangers of the Internet, but parents and older adults can be oblivious to the depth and order of the Internet. An analysis of the Internet's content helps to clear up this discrepancy. In *Does the Internet Benefit Society?*, one passage that the editor Cindy Mur chose to include is an argument against the educational use of the Internet, because of how commercialized the Internet is. It includes statistics of the content of the Internet, in order to argue that most of the Internet is only meant to gain money: "By 1999, researchers had already determined that 83% of the web served commercial purposes, with only 6% serving science/education (defined as serving university,

college, and research interests)" (Mur 27). These statistics are important for any argument regarding the Internet and education, not just arguments against it. Just because sites are commercial does not mean they are corrupt of educational value, such as an online news site. The passage does not explain what the remaining eleven percent of the Internet's content is comprised of, which could potentially be useful, non-commercial information, such as data storage and personal websites. Because the Internet is comprised of billions of websites, six to eleven percent of the Internet still constitutes a huge amount of useful pages, and high-school-age students are capable of learning to differentiate between commercial and informational content.

It is also important to observe if high schools independently use web filtering software regardless of E-Rate status. To gather data on high school Internet use trends, I sent out an online-based survey to the mailing lists of two all-freshmen dorms at Stanford. The survey asked students what types of web sites were filtered on the computers at their most recent high school, and what activities they used school computers for most often. 48 students responded (Appendix A). All students aware of their school's web filtering policies reported that their schools blocked adult content. Of the students who were certain of their school's policies, 62% reported being subject to text filtering for inappropriate language, 66% reported one or more social networking sites (such as MySpace.com) being blocked, 49% reported online games or entertainment being blocked, and 27% reported email or chat rooms being blocked. Perhaps only about half or less of the students went to schools sponsored by E-rate funding, because only two out of three students reported coming from public high schools, yet filtering for adult content was universal, showing that regardless of federal mandates, all schools' policies have the same foundations. The numbers in other categories are different for every category type, so schools form individual

policies for web filtering based on their students' behavior and Internet needs. Students were also asked to report what activities they used school computers most often for. Over half of the students reported using school computers for Internet-based research and projects "all the time" or "often," while only 41% reported using school computers for non-Internet-based academic purposes with this much frequency, and only 27% using it for school activities such as newspaper or yearbook with this much frequency. It must be noted that these Stanford students represented a high academic performance group within their high school and results for the computer use of high school students in general would be different, but it is safe to say that Internet-based research would still appear to be the most common academic use of school computers in high schools, regardless of filtering practices. This must be taken into account when analyzing the role of the Internet in education.

U.S. Society's Stakes in Internet Freedom

As the ALA's response argued, keeping social networking sites open in high schools helps keep the gap between the socioeconomic classes that can and cannot adequately afford technology from growing. If schools and libraries provide access to social networking sites, students from families on the non-technological side of this gap, known as the digital divide, can still benefit from and learn from this technology. In a project sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, researchers Matthew DeBell and Chris Chapman analyzed data on technological use in U.S. schools in 2003. The abstract of their statistical analysis included:

> There is a "digital divide". Computer and Internet use are divided along
>
> demographic and socioeconomic lines. Use of both technologies is higher
>
> among Whites than among Blacks and Hispanics. Students living with more
>
> highly educated parents are more likely to use these technologies than those

living with less well educated parents, and those living in households with

higher family incomes are more likely to use computers and the Internet than

those living in lower income households. (DeBell iv)

Allowing the opportunities on the Internet such as social networking to remain accessible allows

people who lack Internet access at home to take advantage of an information technology that will

surely become widespread with business and communications in the future. It offers lesser-

privileged kids an equal opportunity to succeed, as are the aims of other U.S. government

programs such as the *No Child Left Behind* Act of 2002. While the United States values child

safety and protection from inappropriate content, it also just as strongly values creating equal

education opportunities for children. Thus some American values reflected in other policies

conflict with the foundations of the DOPA.

Furthermore, freeing Internet access in high schools helps ensure that high school

students are graduating into responsible American citizens. As much as school teaches students

to regurgitate facts, it teaches them to be analytical and critical of our information sources. *Does*

The Internet Benefit Society? offers a simple, neat example of how to integrate this lesson into a

unit of study. In one of its articles, a teacher describes how his eighth-grade class's visits to the

computer lab for practical applications, such as planning a vacation, were complemented by a

brief training of analyzing Internet sources. "We covered how to tell the differences between

government, education, museum, or corporate sites; how to identify perspective and judge

credibility; and how to select and incorporate sources from a variety of viewpoints" (Mur 22).

The Internet not only is a great means of developing critical skills, but also opens up a plethora

of viewpoints and biases. Children deserve to be aware of the broad perspectives of information

and history across the world, and because the Internet is ultimately a way to instant connect

information across the globe, policies governing education should also follow this ideal. Some would argue that to condone blocking of these sites would violate the U.S.'s constitutional principle of free speech, and gives the federal government more power over education than they deserve, considering that they only contribute about 5-10% of funds that public education feeds from.

Finally, students should have some exposure to the situations that laws like the DOPA suggest that schools protect them from. They should be able to browse the Internet in an environment where a teacher or librarian is present to help them understand how to recognize any risks they might encounter, instead of being put at greater risk by only having access to these sites at a potentially less-supervised home computer. *Nasties on the Net*, the study of four British high schools, also includes interviews of students, some of whom had differing views from their teachers on if they were comfortable with having their Internet use at school filtered. "Overwhelmingly, 62 per cent of [student] respondents felt there was no need for all the fuss and concern regarding their Internet usage, despite the degree of exposure to racism, violence, and pornography. As one 14-year-old said: 'No, I don't [need protection] because I feel we are going to find out [about violence and pornography] sometime, so why not now?'" (Allbon 34). This student's question brings up a valid point: it may be better for students to be first exposed to mature content in a safe and knowledgeable environment, just as it is better for students to learn about sexual health from a structured class rather than from myths and misconceptions spread by their peers. While Getgood of SurfControl argued that governmental Internet mandates protect children from violence, doing so eliminates a chance for children to take a mature approach to this kind of content when they are ready. Teachers can answer any sensitive questions children might have and give them knowledgeable, Internet-literate training on how to browse online

safely, without the need for excessive web filtering. While web filtering acts as a seat belt for straightforward online concerns like adult content, it is hard to say that web filtering is the best solution for more controversial, debatable content types.

What the Government and Schools Should Do

For America's students to remain fully technology-literate and responsible in a competitive society, policymakers should focus future legislation on maximizing students' freedom on the Internet in schools to a reasonable extent. The *Children's Internet Protection Act* was executed appropriately and effectively, because the content it forbids is easy to identify and difficult to argue in favor of. However, the *Deleting Online Predators Act* would entail a handful of educational repercussions. If policymakers value other stakes in American education such as technological literacy and analytical skills, they should understand that the DOPA is unreasonable. By ensuring that lawmakers are Internet literate, we ensure that any mandate on web filtering is realistic, and prolong the importance of our values such as free speech. The DOPA suggests that potentially risky websites be filtered even if they include information-rich pages that cannot be filtered separately, and could encourage the use of anonymous-browsing servers that create a whole new risk of phishing. Because of this, the DOPA is logistically unrealistic. If policymakers cannot be convinced that Internet is a safe or rich enough environment for students, then they can encourage students to help make the Internet a richer and friendlier place, especially through user-friendly blog sites.

The DOPA failed to be specific enough as to which kinds of sites constitute "commercial social networking sites," but individual software providers and schools can and should try to be more specific. Because there are many categories of sites to choose whether to filter; such as entertainment, games, chat rooms, and social networking sites, as demonstrated by the survey of

Stanford freshmen; these specific categories all deserve individual consideration in web filtering

software. Filtering software, which can be customized to accommodate these categories, should

be made to meet standards of flexibility and fairness for use in a school. Policymakers should

ensure that high schools use human-reviewed black list web filtering which is the most accurate

and allows the most freedom. The software must also allow teachers or computer administrators

to easily change filtering rules in the event of a discrepancy, and access a log of Internet activity

to monitor the students' Internet behavior to judge how they are using web sites. Finally, filtering

software should be time-flexible, such as being able to accommodate rules that are different

between classroom times and recreational times. For example, if teachers find it problematic to

allow online games during class, they should be able to easily, regularly program the filter to

block it during class times but allow them during lunchtimes as appropriate. This ensures that

educational but questionable sites, such as blogs and social networks, are accessible during free

times for students who have no Internet access at home, satisfying the argument that freeing the

Internet helps prevent the "digital divide" from widening.

Internet safety training for students should be highly recommended for schools that

choose mostly open, flexible Internet filtering policies. As a standalone lesson or as an ongoing

supplement to computer lab time, teachers can help students learn online research methods. This

can range from analyzing sources for credibility to using the Internet to broaden the sources that

a student's research encompasses. And to give back to the Internet, the teacher can readily

encourage creating an effective weblog or contributing to knowledge bases like *Wikipedia*.

Some teachers should also be able to teach students about the risks that the Internet carries and

that the government policies take account of. Students can learn to protect the information they

put online and recognize predatory threats from a fully Internet-literate mentor, without feeling

pressured as may be if a parent were lecturing them. Regardless of levels of web filtering, students' online activity should be mildly supervised. Teachers or librarians are ultimately supervising to encourage productive and safe online behavior, and their attitude and interaction with students can reflect this.

These recommendations and solutions ultimately carry no economic cost. No physical technology purchases at schools are necessary to make these changes, only software changes and upgrades to be compatible with such web filtering software standards would be of any cost. This cost is negligible in the long run of education, and can be covered by E-Rate funding. Schools have to allocate funds towards the cost of a student Internet literacy program, but it can be integrated into a core computer literacy or health course, or done simply the first time a student pursues research on a school computer. The addition of this training in schools is likely going to be inevitable in a few years, so schools should start as soon as possible. And as suggested by the American Library Association's response to the DOPA and the second passage from *Does The Internet Benefit Society?*, keeping the Internet free and training students to use the Internet responsibly creates confident students ready for the twenty-first century. A strong technological training in high school will help U.S. businesses be efficient and communicative, and will ultimately reflect well on our economy.

Conclusions

High school students should get as much freedom as reasonable on the Internet in classrooms and libraries, since the Internet is a big part of the future of learning. Even semi-recreational use of the Internet develops valuable skills for navigating the information web. If students undergo adequate training to surf the Internet responsibly, it would be reasonable to minimize the amount of web filtering that students are subject to on school computers. Web

filtering mandates should be kept to a minimum as long as high school students undergo

adequate training to surf the Internet responsibly. Policymakers know how the Internet affects

our personal safety and security, not just academic information, as well as how it affects

educational quality as a whole. With the students' safety in check, encouraging their use of a

policy-adjusted Internet for developing communicative and analytical skills will help the U.S.'s

educational system to stay current and effective.

And at its best, this shift in policing attitude should help to foster trust between students

and teachers, rather than the mechanical distrust that excessive web filtering reeks of. Internet-

literate teachers and librarians can best help students learn how to identify and deal with

compromising situations on the Internet such as situations of online predators or identity theft.

Because these are risks in the real world, students should be exposed to these situations in a safe

environment, rather than sheltered from them. This necessary attitude change will help to finally

remove any economic technological divides in the United States, bringing responsible Internet

use into all homes and encouraging students and families to embrace the Internet and make it

theirs to develop. New standards of fairness and flexibility in social networking policies should

help to ensure this. Only analyzing the Internet at all levels, including high school filtering

policies, can the Internet's information revolution truly come full circle.

Appendix A

High School Internet Use Survey
Matt Bush
November 2006

Sample: 48 Stanford Freshmen, from any high school background. Random respondents from two all-freshmen dorm email lists constituting about 240 freshmen.

How much of your time spent on school computers consisted of the following activities?						
	All the time	*Often*	*Some-times*	*Rarely*	*Never*	*(Skipped)*
Research and projects involving use of the Internet	6% (3)	47% (22)	23% (11)	19% (9)	4% (2)	(1)
Other academic purposes (CS/Graphics class, word processing, etc)	13% (6)	28% (13)	40% (19)	17% (8)	2% (1)	(1)
Activities (School newspaper, yearbook, art, etc.)	9% (4)	19% (8)	16% (7)	19% (8)	37% (16)	(5)
Recreationally (games, entertainment, etc) when you were supposed to be working	0% (0)	7% (3)	39% (17)	18% (8)	36% (16)	(4)
Recreationally during free time (lunch, after school)	0% (0)	18% (8)	13% (6)	22% (10)	47% (21)	(3)

Did your high school have Internet content filtering? Answer whether a certain Internet content type was blocked on the computers, or put "Not sure" if you had no idea.				
	Blocked	*Not Blocked*	*Not Sure*	*(Skipped)*
Adult Content	83% (40)	0% (0)	17% (8)	(0)
Language (obscenity) filters	38% (18)	23% (11)	40% (19)	(0)
Email and/or chatrooms	25% (12)	67% (32)	8% (4)	(0)
One or more social net-working sites (e.g. Myspace)	60% (29)	31% (15)	8% (4)	(0)
Online games and/or entertainment	42% (20)	44% (21)	15% (7)	(0)
Wikipedia/open-source reference	2% (1)	90% (43)	8% (4)	(0)

Works Cited

"ALA | DOPA." *American Library Association*. November 27, 2006.
        <http://www.ala.org/ala/washoff/WOissues/techinttele/dopa/DOPA.htm>

Allbon, Emily, and Peter Williams. "Nasties on the Net: children and censorship on the Web."
        New Library World. 2002: 30-38.

DeBell, Matthew, and Chris Chapman. *Computer and Internet Use by Students in 2003:*
        Statistical Analysis Report. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics,
        2006.

Mur, Cindy, ed. *Does the Internet Benefit Society?* Detroit: Greenhaven Press, 2005.

"Teentechweek » DOPA." *Young Adult Library Services Association*. November 29, 2006.
        <http://teentechweek.wikispaces.com/DOPA>

United States Committee on Energy and Commerce. *E-Rate and Filtering: A review of the*
        Children's Internet Protection Act. Hearing before the U.S. House of Representatives.
        Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001.

United States Committee on Energy and Commerce. *The Deleting Online Predators Act*. Hearing
        before the U.S. House of Representatives. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing
        Office, 2006.

Wang, Wallace. *Steal This Computer Book 4.0: What they won't tell you about the Internet*. San
Francisco: No Starch Press, 2006.