DISCUSSION PUBLISHERS
Research Center · Open Access Edition

Cyberbullying: A Review of the Literature

Charles Edward Notar, Sharon Padgett, Jessica Roden

Discussion Research ID	DPR-2026-1189
Year	2013
Field	Psychology
DOI	10.13189/ujer.2013.010101
Author ORCID	0000-0003-1114-1354
Licence	CC-BY
Original source	Universal Journal of Educational Research
Permanent link	https://discussionpublishers.com/research/fddc7af2-8e3a-41a4-96c7-61afa9a05359
Publisher	Discussion Publishers discussionpublishers.com

Abstract

The article is a literature review on cyberbullying from 2007-2013. Topics covered in the review have been categorized starting with definition of cyberbullying; roles of persons involved and statistics of who is being targeted; reasons for cyberbullying; differences between traditional bullying and cyberbullying; and gender comparisons related to cyberbullying. This introduction to cyberbullying will provide a foundation for developing a cyberbullying intervention/prevention program

Republished by Discussion Publishers under the original CC-BY licence. Copyright remains with the original authors; please cite the original work.

Cite as: Charles Edward Notar, Sharon Padgett, Jessica Roden (2013). Cyberbullying: A Review of the Literature. Discussion Publish

Universal Journal of Educational Research 1(1): 1-9, 2013
DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2013.010101

Cyberbullying: A Review of the Literature

Charles E. Notar*, Sharon Padgett, Jessica Roden

Secondary Education Department, Jacksonville State University, 700 Pelham Road N, Ramona Wood Building A-3, Jacksonville, AL 36265-1923, USA
*Corresponding Author: cnotar@jsu.edu

Copyright © 2013 Horizon Research Publishing All rights reserved

Abstract The article is a literature review on cyberbullying from 2007-2013. Topics covered in the review have been categorized starting with definition of cyberbullying; roles of persons involved and statistics of who is being targeted; reasons for cyberbullying; differences between traditional bullying and cyberbullying; and gender comparisons related to cyberbullying. This introduction to cyberbullying will provide a foundation for developing a cyberbullying intervention/prevention program.

Keywords Cyberbullying, Cyberworld, Online, Internet, Social Networking

1. Introduction

The word cyberbullying did not even exist a decade ago, yet the problem has become a pervasive one today. Cyberbullies do not have to be strong or fast; they just need access to a cell phone or computer and a desire to terrorize. Anyone can be a cyberbully, and such persons usually have few worries about having face-to-face confrontation with their victims. In fact, the anonymity of cyberbullying may cause students who normally would not bully in the tradition-sense to become a cyberbully (Poland, 2010).

The double-edged nature of modern technology, continuously balancing between risks and opportunities, manifests itself clearly in an emerging societal problem known as cyberbullying (Walrave & Heirman, 2011). More than 97% of youths in the United States are connected to the Internet in some way (Tokunaga, 2010). The number of children and teens who use the Internet at home is rapidly growing, with now over 66% of fourth to ninth graders able to go online from the comfort of their bedrooms. Children can engage in numerous Internet-based activities such as game playing, seeking information, and talking with friends. The constellation of benefits, however, has been recently eclipsed by numerous accounts of the Internet's undesirable social implications, which appear in both scholarly literature and popular media. A fair amount of attention has been given to Internet offenses, including cyberstalking (Seto, 2002), sexual predation (Dombrowski, Lemasney, Ahia, & Dickson, 2004, as cited in Tokunaga, 2010), and cyberbullying (Bhat, 2008; David-Ferdon & Hertz, 2007 as cited in Tokunaga, 2010), which collectively place the safety of children and teens who use the Internet into question (Tokunaga, 2010).

Bullying and hostility among children is a long-standing and pervasive social issue (Jones, Manstead, & Livingstone, 2011). Cyberbullying is the unfortunate by-product of the union of adolescent aggression and electronic communication and its growth is giving cause for concern (Hinduja & Patchin, 2008). While bullying among students is a recalcitrant problem in U.S. schools, research indicates that many students do not disclose bullying they experience or witness despite repeated efforts on the part of adults (Delara, 2012). The opportunity to conduct research on cyberbullying is timely due to its wide prevalence and the social concern that surrounds it. When research is done, individual variables examined should include (a) demographics, (b) personal experiences, (c) vicarious experiences, and (d) preventative resources.

In a study conducted by Wong-Lo and Bullock (2011) a total of 137 participants (62 adolescents; 75 parents) responded to a survey. Results indicated that 90% of the participants from the adolescent group have reported to have experienced cyberbullying either as victims or as a bystander. In addition, 70% of the victims have been cyberbullied one to two times within a month's time and 50% of the victims did not know the perpetrator. Secondly, 89% of parent participants indicated to be knowledgeable about the issues relating to cyberbullying and 89% reported to have no knowledge if their child has or has not been a victim of cyberbullying. Furthermore, qualitative findings of personal perspectives toward cyberbullying from each participating group are discussed. A review of literature is provided and results and analysis of the survey are discussed as well as recommendations for future research. Erdur-Baker's (2010) study revealed that 32% of the students were victims of both cyberbullying and traditional bullying, while 26% of the students bullied others in both cyberspace and physical environments.

The results of this study provide some support for previous studies that have pointed out the relationship between cyber and traditional forms of bullying (e.g. Li,

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1189 https://discussionpublishers.com/research/fddc7af2-8e3a-41a4-96c7-61afa9a05359

2005, 2006; Raskauskas and Stoltz, 2007; Ybarra et al., 2007 as cited in Erdur-Baker, 2010). However, it should be noted that, as Ybarra et al. (2007) conclude, the amount of the overlap between traditional and cyberbullying (32% of overlap for cyberbullying and traditional bullying victimization with 26% of overlap for both types of bullying) is not too large. The conclusion may be drawn from this result that although cyberbullying and traditional bullying share some common ground, cyberbullying seems to be composed of its own unique characteristics (Erdur-Baker, 2010).

Reported rates of victims of cyberbullying actually telling anyone in order to get help were 56% in Study One and 59% in Study Two; these appear low compared to rates for victims of traditional bullying (Whitney & Smith, 1993). Smith et al, (2008) in Study Two, victims of traditional bullying were significantly more likely to tell someone. Qing (2010) states that 40% of cyberbullied students would do nothing and one in ten would inform an adult.

In Mishna's et al (2012) study, over 30% of the students identified as involved in cyber bullying, either as victims or perpetrators; one in four of the students (25.7%) reported having been involved in cyberbullying as both a bully and a victim within a three month period. In Adams' (2010) research, approximately 20% of students admitted to having been cyberbullied. However, many more students reported incidents that fall under its definition. Posting mean or hurtful comments and spreading rumors online was the most common complaint in their random survey of 4,400 students ages 10 to 18 in February 2010. Not surprisingly, cyberbullying is most prevalent among middle schoolers. Moreover, the incidence of cyberbullying increases slightly with age. Finally, teens spending much time on the Internet, reporting higher ICT expertise and owning a computer with privileged online access share an increased likelihood of online bullying behaviour (Walrave & Heirman, 2011).

2. Definition

Researchers have realized the necessity for including cyberbullying definitions in their surveys. (Tokunaga, 2010). The absence of a universal cyberbullying definition is due to a lack of conceptual clarity (Vandebosch & Van Cleemput, 2008; Tokunaga, 2010). Tokunaga emphasized a need for consistent not disparate conceptual and operational definitions. The quality of an operational measure rests heavily on the context where clarity and richness of the conceptual definition from which it is derived. Yet, the absence of a single definition can lead respondents astray and invalidate subsequent findings since most people lack an even rudimentary understanding of cyberbullying and conclusions and eliminates the possibility of drawing meaningful cross-study comparisons. (Vandebosch & Van Cleemput, 2008; Tokunaga, 2010; Smith, 2009 as cited in Durkin & Patterson, 2011) Tokunaga (2010) found the multidimensionality of the cyberbullying construct renders a simple yes/no response almost impossible to accomplish, much less interpret and provide a reliable and valid measure of the cyberbullying. Every definition has one commonality. Cyberbullying is a category of bullying that occurs in the digital realm/medium of electronic text (Wong-Lo & Bullock, 2011). Wong-Lo (2009) cautions while a universal definition may be a useful tool for researchers, results suggest that it does not necessarily yield a more rigorous measure of bullying victimization.

Electronic bullying, online bullying, and/or cyberbullying are new methods of bullying involving forms of bullying defined as harassment using technology such as social websites (MySpace, Facebook, etc.), email, chat rooms, mobile phone texting and cameras, picture messages (including sexting), IM (instant messages), and/or blogs (Miller & Hufstedler, 2009; Beale & Hall, 2007).

Across the sample, the most common sites in which cyberbullying occurred were email (21%), online chatrooms (20%), social networking sites (20%) and mobile phones (19%). Other websites (8%) and other forms of texting, such as Twitter (6%), were also reported. Through free-text response, 12% of participants also reported MSN Messenger as a cyberbullying tool. Figure 1 lists some of the many "tools" a cyberbully can use.

It is clear there is a positive side to online behaviors - even those involving social networking. However, it does not diminish the fact that serious harm has been caused by the large presence of social media in the lives of young people. Students are online frequently and much of their time is spent in positive activities. Students may be researching homework assignments, visiting college sites for information, or may be checking out the website of their favorite movie or sport. The Pew survey (Jackson, 2011) shows percentages of students 12-17 and their involvement on-line (Figure 1). A majority of the uses are constructive Yet the 80% of teens using social networking sites is one of the keys to cyberbullying. Teens who use social media, reported that they have witnessed someone being mean or cruel to another online, with 12% saying this is a 'frequent' occurrence. The 12-17 girls reported (38%) and boys (26%) reported they were had been cyberbullied. The girls and boys age 11-16 reported being cyberbulled in the range 22-34%.

All teens surveyed use the Internet on a regular basis Teens using social networking sites Usage per day	95% 80% 48%
Students visit sites for information: movies, TV shows, music groups, sports stars, or health information and use social networking sites	81%
Visit websites to get news	62%
Watched a video on a video-sharing site such as YouTube or GoogleVideo	57%
Looked online for health, dieting or physical fitness information	31%
Got information about a college, university or other school they are considering attending	55%
Purchased something online like books, clothes or music	49%
Teens who use social media, reported that they have witnessed someone being mean or cruel to another online, with 12 saying this is a 'frequent' occurrence.	88%
Students who are online revealed that they have created online content of some kind	64%

Figure 1. "tools" a cyberbully can use.

Cyberthreat statistics compiled by Pew also showed that

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1189 https://discussionpublishers.com/research/fddc7af2-8e3a-41a4-96c7-61afa9a05359

children and teens who are harassed online are more likely to be harassed offline. Threats can include those against another where bodily harm is threatened or where students exhibit suicidal tendencies in their online posts and messages (Jackson, 2011).

3. Nuances of Electronic Communication

The nuances of electronic communication are important to discuss in order to demonstrate why the phenomenon of cyberbullying deserves attention

To begin, the elements of perceived anonymity on-line and the safety and security of being behind a computer screen, aid in freeing individuals from traditionally constraining pressures of society, conscience, morality, and ethics to behave in a normative manner. The use of pseudonyms or pseudonymous e-mail or user accounts also makes it difficult for victims to easily determine the identity of offenders and also presumably contributes to the freedom an offender has on the Internet. Moreover, it is generally not illegal to use textual communication to mistreat, harass, or tease others because of First Amendment protections (except for cases that can be specifically defined as ‘‘cyberstalking’’). At some point the behavior may cross the legal line into ‘‘harassment,’’ although it is often difficult for law enforcement to get involved in cyberbullying cases unless there is a serious and substantial threat to one’s personal safety (Hinduja & Patchin, 2008).

Bullying, while it has many forms, (figure 2) is going to take place among our youth wherever and whenever there is a lack of a respected adult presence (Haber, & Daley, 2011). Any bully prevention/intervention program must address the types of cyberbullying. Measures should be taken to address each type in a school program.

Types of Cyberbullying		
Cyberharassment		Masquerading/Impersonation
Cyberrbullying harassment by proxy	or	Online grooming
Cyberstalking		Outing
Denigration (Dissing)		Plishing
Exclusion/Gossip Groups		Sexting
Falsify identity		Trickey
Flaming		

Figure 2. Types of Cyberbullying

Another variable that has helped the increase of bullying is technology. Figure 3 provides a list of the ways and means of cyberbully. There should be tips on how to handle each of the listed ways and means of cyberbullying in a training program that trains all stake holders.

With the influx of technology, children often feel as if they are invincible due to the difficulty in tracing internet activity. Adolescents and children will use chat rooms, emails, blogs, and Facebook to bully others. Cell phones are also a main technological component of the rise in bullying behavior. Texting, calls, and voicemails are easy avenues for bullying behavior. Children have a sense of false courage when they are not confronting their victim face to face.

Ways and Means of Cyberbullying		
Blogs	Instant messaging (IM)	Profile sites
Burnbooks	iPod	Social media/Networking
Cameras	iphotos	Sexting
Cell phones	Internet	Skype
Chat rooms	Land line phone	Texting
Cyberbullying	Message boards	Video clips
Cyberstalking	On-line chat (OOVOO)	Videoconferencing
Email	Personal digital assistant (PDA)	Virtual worlds
Gaming devices	Personal pictures of others	Webblogs
Happy-slapping	Photoshopping	Wiki

Figure 3. Ways and Means of Cyberbullying

Past generations were safe from the pressures of peer judgment and abuse once they arrived home from school (the class bully would never actually call your house back then). However, cyberspace has no boundaries, and students today have only their wits to protect them from teasing, harassment, and threats that can reach them online anytime (Mustacchi, 2009)." Cyberbullying is tailor-made for the relational aggression and rumors that girls typically engage in," says Patchin, associate professor of criminal justice at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire and co-author with Hinduja of Bullying Beyond the Schoolyard: Preventing and Responding to Cyberbullying. (Adams, 2010).

4. Reasons for Cyberbullying

Externalizing behaviors were most predictive of cyber victim status. Increased awareness about the use of technology as a vehicle for bullying and identification of potential problems associated with cyber bullying and victimization will aid parents, educators, and psychologists in developing intervention and prevention strategies. (Williams, & Guerra). According to Calvete, et al (2010) cyberbullying was significantly associated with the use of proactive aggression, justification of violence, exposure to violence, and less perceived social support of friends. Other reasons for cyberbullying are: envy, prejudice and intolerance for disability, religion, gender, shame, pride, guilt, and anger. (Hoff & Mitchell, 2009; Jones, Manstead, & Livingstone, 2011)

Figure 4 below provides additional reasons for cyberbullying. These particular reasons can explain the use of cyberbullying by those who would not confront their victim face-to-face.

Reasons for Cyberbullying
Anonymity Approval
Boredom Feel Better
Instigate Jealousy
No perceived consequences Projection of feelings
Protection Reinvention of self
Revenge

Figure 4. Reasons for Cyberbullying

The majority of participants reported victimization during

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1189 https://discussionpublishers.com/research/fddc7af2-8e3a-41a4-96c7-61afa9a05359

the period associated with the transition from primary school to high school.

It's not just on the bus or during recess anymore. Bullying can happen the minute students wake up, can creep in during class time, and can continue after the school day ends — and then follow them home, right into their bedrooms (Mustacchi, 2009) Adolescence is a period in which social relationships outside the family expand, and their quality has been linked to various behavioral outcomes (Mesch, 2009). Social interaction with peers provides a forum for learning and refining socio-emotional skills needed for enduring relationships. Through interactions with peers, adolescents learn how to cooperate, to take different perspectives, and to satisfy growing needs for intimacy. Youth who report having close friends are more confident, more altruistic, and less aggressive; and they demonstrate greater school involvement and work orientation (Mesch, 2009).

According to Mesch (2009) cyberbullying emerges most commonly from relationship problems (break-ups, envy, intolerance, and ganging up); victims experience powerfully negative effects (especially on their social well-being); and the reactive behavior from schools and students is generally inappropriate, absent, or ineffective (Hoff & Mitchell, 2009). There is a significant correlation between becoming a cybervictim and loneliness among adolescents according to Sahin (2012). Studies show that electronic bullying peaks in middle school.

Two studies conducted by Smith, et.al (2008) found cyberbullying less frequent than traditional bullying, but appreciable, and reported more outside of school than inside. Phone call and text message bullying were most prevalent, with instant messaging bullying in the second study. Their impact was perceived as comparable to traditional bullying. Mobile phone/video clip bullying, while rarer, was perceived to have a more negative impact. Age and gender differences varied between the two studies. The first study found most cyberbullying was done by one or a few students, usually from the same year group. It often just lasted about a week, but sometimes much longer. The second study found being a cybervictim, but not a cyberbully, correlated with internet use; many cybervictims were traditional 'bully-victims'. Pupils recommended blocking/avoiding messages, and telling someone, as the best coping strategies; but many cybervictims had told no one about it. It can be concluded cyberbullying is an important new kind of bullying, with some different characteristics from traditional bullying where much more happens outside school.

In Study One phone call and text message bullying were most common, both inside and outside of school. However, pupils were especially aware of picture/video clip bullying happening, probably because this medium achieves a wide local audience. However, the most frequent media of cyberbullying involved mobile phones in other ways (call, text messages); or in Study Two by instant messaging on the internet. Given the recentness of cyberbullying, it is likely there will be changes in the frequency of use for different media, fuelled by technological changes, accessibility, and media publicity (for example, the 'happy slapping' phenomenon appears to have spread from a televised advertisement some years ago). (Smith, et al, 2008) Through interactions with peers, adolescents learn how to cooperate, to take different perspectives, and to satisfy growing needs for intimacy. Youth who report having close friends are more confident, more altruistic, and less aggressive, and demonstrate greater school involvement and work orientation (Mesch, 2009).

Bullying has spread to the computer because it provides a greater advantage for the bully. The bully can make anonymous attacks, inflict greater psychological harm, harass a victim at home, and rest easy knowing that most authority figures will be unable to trace or stop the harassment. A victim, on the other hand, feels more vulnerable and alone. The victim also experiences emotional effects that generally last longer than a black eye (Anderson & Strum, 2007). Online aggression is not just traditional bullying with new tools. It is widespread, devastating, and knows no down time (Hinduja & Patchin, 2011).

5. Roles in Cyberbullying

Adolescents who socialize online have probably been involved in cyberbullying in some form (Trolley et al., 2006; Willard, 2005 as cited in Mason, 2008). There are six different roles identified throughout the literature. Entitlement bullies are individuals who believe they are superior and have the right to harass or demean others, especially if the person is different. Targets of entitlement bullies are individuals who are picked on because bullies believe that they are different or inferior. Retaliators are individuals who have been bullied by others and are using the Internet to retaliate. Victims of retaliators are individuals who have been bullying others, but are now receiving the cruelty of being cyberbullied. Furthermore, bystanders who are part of the problem are individuals who encourage and support the bully or who watch the bullying from the sidelines but do nothing to help the victim. Finally, bystanders who are part of the solution are individuals who seek to stop the bullying, protest it, and provide support to the victim (Trolley et al., 2006; Willard, 2005 as cited in Mason, 2008).

An alternative explanation is that historically less powerful groups may be more powerful (or at least not disadvantaged) when on-line. Minority groups (irrespective of race or ethnicity), although potentially unpopular on the schoolyard, may not be exposed as marginal on the Internet. Moreover, youth who may not stand up for themselves on the playground may be more likely to do so via computer communications if the perceived likelihood of retaliation is minimized. Targets may be ''turning the table'' on bullies

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1189 https://discussionpublishers.com/research/fddc7af2-8e3a-41a4-96c7-61afa9a05359

because of the equalizing characteristics of the Internet and its ability to preempt the relevance of physical intimidation. That is, victims of traditional bullying may seek retribution through technological means (e-mail, instant message, or cellular phone text message) by contacting those aggressors who have harassed them. Some might contend that bullying in the traditional sense requires certain personal or physical traits and qualities that an individual either has or does not have such as physical prowess or social competence. Cyberbullying requires no such personal traits and can be manifested simply through the outward expression of hate. This fact strongly implies a wide net of potential participants in the phenomenon is cast, which as a consequence can exponentially increase the number of offenders and victims—and the negative outcomes that often follow (Hinduja & Patching, 2008).

Snakenborg, Van Acker, and Gable (2011) state cyberbullying is especially insidious because it affords a measure of anonymity and the opportunity to reach a much larger number of victims without a significant threat of punishment. Reece (2012) supports Snakenborg, et al in the anonymous nature of the Internet making it easy to say and do things you would not say or do in person. Anyone could be behind the computer screen: the swim team captain, the most popular guy at school, and/or the quiet girl from science class.

In addition to this anonymity influence, impulsivity among adolescents can be an influential factor in cyberbullying. They will act without considering the full ramifications for themselves and their victim(s) (Bhat, Suniti, Shih-Hua, & Jamie 2010). "Impulsivity may account for cyberbullying actions that are taken in haste to retaliate against someone or to avenge a slight, imaginary or real problem" (Bhat, 2008, p. 56).

Students think they may be anonymous through electronic forms of communication or their actions, posts, or comments to others are fleeting (Holladay, 2010). This is a misunderstanding on their part as the "Library of Congress is archiving all Twitter messages sent from March 2006 forward. Even the 'mean tweets' will be immortalized for future generations" (Holladay, 2010, p. 46 as cited Sbarbaro & Smith, 2011).

6. Victims

Humphrey and Symes (2010) stated students with exceptionalities are bullied at all grade levels, as well as in and away from school. Students with exceptionalities may be bullied directly or indirectly. Cyberbullying and relational bullying were not associated with perceived school safety. Males reported more physical victimization, verbal victimization, and verbal bullying, and less relational victimization. Males and older students reported feeling safer at school. Older students reported less physical, verbal, and relational victimization, and less physical and verbal bullying. More importantly, physical, verbal, and relational bullying and victimization may represent more general underlying constructs of bullying and victimization, calling into question the distinctiveness of individual forms (Varjas, Talley, Meyers, Parris, & Cutts, 2010).

How does giftedness relate to bullying and being bullied? In a recent survey of fifth-grade students, Estell et al. (2009) found that academically gifted students and general education students were less likely than students with mild disabilities to be viewed as bullies by their peers. Teachers also rated academically gifted students as less likely to bully or be bullied than both general education students and students with mild disabilities. Key factors in being perceived as a bully were associations with aggressive and popular peers. Social isolates were the most likely to be bullied. Whereas gifted students are less likely to bully or be bullied according to this research, bullying is still a factor in their lives (Siegle, 2010).

Smith et al (2008) found in line with Raskauskas and Stoltz (2007), that cyber victims had also often been traditional victims, and cyberbullies had often been traditional bullies; many traditional victims or bullies were not cyber victims or bullies, since cyberbullying is substantially less frequent. Cyber victims are more dependent upon the internet, feel less popular, take more internet-related risks, are more often a bystander and perpetrator of internet and mobile phone bullying, and are less often a perpetrator and more often a victim of traditional bullying. (Vandebosch & Van Cleemput, 2008).

Second, the current work by Hinduja and Patching (2008) exposed a link between cyberbullying and traditional schoolyard bullying. Youth who are bullied at or near school are significantly more likely to be a victim of cyberbullying; those who bully off-line also appear to bully on-line. Mesch (2009) surmised the results indicate the risk of youth being bullied is higher for adolescents who have an active profile on social networking sites and participate in chat rooms but not in playing games online. Gender differences emerge in risk factors. A few parental mediation techniques are protective, but most are not. The results indicate the need for more parental participation to reduce risks to youth arising from Internet use for interpersonal communication.

7. Gender Differences in Response to Cyberbullying

Gender research differences in cyberbullying present inconsistent findings (Tokunaga, 2010). Gender has been studied from 2007-2010 and some of the studies show that females are more likely to be victims of cyberbullying.

The fact that females are cyberbullied more often than males adds much of what is known about gender differences in traditional bullying literature. When gender differences are uncovered in traditional bullying, boys are more involved as both bullies and victims than girls (Boulton, Lloyd, Down, & Marx, 2012). Didden et al (2009)

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1189 https://discussionpublishers.com/research/fddc7af2-8e3a-41a4-96c7-61afa9a05359

found significant associations between cyberbullying and IQ, frequency of computer usage, self-esteem and depressive feelings. No associations were found between cyberbullying and age and gender. Females were over-represented among cyberbullies, victims, and bully victims. The psychosocial characteristics of cyber victims and bully victims included externalizing behaviors and low self-esteem. Cyberbullies did not endorse any psychosocial symptoms of maladjustment. Cyberbully victims and victims of both face-to-face and cyberbullying exhibited the poorest psychosocial adjustment.

Adams (2010) found adolescent girls are more likely to have experienced cyberbullying than boys--25.8% versus 16%, respectively. Girls are more likely to spread rumors while boys are more likely to post hurtful pictures or videos. Girls are more likely to become victims of cyberbullying, whereas boys are more inclined to engage in electronic bullying.

Seventy one percent of teen girls have posted sexual content to a boyfriend. The social danger of sexting is, of course, that material can very easily and widely promulgate, over which the originator has no control. This easiness of passing the photos and such on to others can be done purposely and very often used in cases of female bullying. The results and outcomes of sexting can involve a spectrum of negative issues from teen dating violence to blackmail, peer pressure, cyber-bullying and in several instances sexting has even resulted in suicide (LeBlanc, 2011).

7.1. Is Cyberbullying Largely A Problem for Girls?

Conventional wisdom suggests that boys are more likely to bully in person and girls to bully online. But Sheri Bauman notes that "cyberbullying is a new area of inquiry, and it's just hard to draw definitive conclusions from the research that's currently available," she said.

What is clear is that cyberbullying, like traditional bullying, is about power. "Students attempt to gain social status through cyberbullying," said Bauman (as cited in Holloday, 2011). Sameer Hinduja says that gaining social status often means tearing someone else down, and boys and girls often do that differently.

"Girls tend to target each other with labels that carry particular meanings for them," said Hinduja. Labels like "slut," "whore," and "bitch" are common within girl-to-girl cyberbullying. The main tactic of boy cyberbullies who attack other boys is to accuse them of being gay. "The amount of abuse boys encounter because of real or perceived sexual orientation is pronounced (Bauman as cited in Holloday, 2011). Cyberbullying is the main risk for females. Physical threats and aggression are more directed at males (Bosworth, Espelage, & Simon, 1999) Females, in contrast, are more likely to be implicated in bullying experiences involving psychological torment (Stephenson & Smith, 1989). It still remains, however, that no predominate gender differences in the research on victimization could be uncovered (Tokunaga, 2010). Erdur-Baker (2010) concluded that when compared to female students, male students were more likely to be bullies and victims in both physical and cyber environments.

7.2. Traditional v. cyber

Some authorities feel cyberbullying is another form of traditional bullying using 21st-century technologies (Qing, 2007). According to Olweus (1993 as cited in Sbarbaro & Smith, 2011). these facets are “forms of aggression” and more recently considered different types of bullying (e.g. physical bullying, verbal bullying). These types of bullying are physical (e.g. hitting, kicking, and pushing), verbal (e.g. name calling, abusive language), and relational/social (e.g. spreading rumors, social exclusion)

According to Vandebosch and VanCleemput (2008), definitions of *cyberbullying* often include behaviors not covered by traditional definitions of bullying. Indeed, much of the current research suggests that the majority of cyberbullying is a direct extension of face-to-face bullying. That is, the majority of cyberbullying is carried out by youth who bully face-to-face and is directed toward the same victims within previously established social networks (Juvonen & Gross, 2008; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004).

Unlike traditional bullying, in which displays of aggression may be evident to bystanders, the ramification of cyberbullying occurs through unconventional strategies (e.g., text messaging, online Web logs, video sharing) (Wong-Lo & Bullock, 2011). As a result, episodes of digital aggression may be camouflaged by the advancement in technology. Nonetheless, the effects of this digital form of peer aggression can be as detrimental as face-to-face bullying. (Wong-Lo & Bullock, 2011).

8. Conclusions

The virtual world combines intimacy and distance in a unique way that raises new questions about young people’s social and personal development (Cowie & Colliety, 2010). A case can be made for some degree of censorship, but it also must acknowledge the need for educators to provide children and young people with the skill to manage risk effectively, to know how to protect themselves and to support vulnerable peers who are being mistreated online. In other words, while sanctions will always have a place, these will not be effective without the counteracting force of working with the emotions that are at the heart of all people’s social interactions. Being connected online to a community is an essential part of young people’s social reality. Its importance cannot be underestimated as a significant aspect of all young people’s daily activity.

A majority of states have enacted some kind of legislation to combat bullying and more recently cyberbullying. A growing number of community and school leaders recognize the importance of developing policies and

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1189 https://discussionpublishers.com/research/fddc7af2-8e3a-41a4-96c7-61afa9a05359

implementing programs designed to address these acts as well as the norms and social values of students. All students must be taught ways to respond appropriately to cyberbullying and potential bullies must recognize there are serious consequences associated with such behavior, including school discipline, litigation, and criminal prosecution (Beale & Hall, 2007).

Until more is known about proven effective ways to combat bullying, care must be taken to monitor the outcomes of current practices to help ensure that they result in the desired effects (Snakenborg, Van Acker, & Gable, 2011). As we have seen, researchers indicate the importance of distinguishing between minor and serious incidents of cyberbullying. Probably most of the minor instances can be tackled routinely before they escalate into something more serious.

The research also shows that cyberbullying is often an extension of real-world bullying with some young people, such as bully-victims, being especially at risk. While it is tempting to think that tighter regulation and stricter sanctions will have an impact on rates of cyberbullying, it may be more productive to work holistically with the relationships in the peer group and at school in order to develop heightened awareness of the consequences of cyberbullying as well as empathy towards those who are badly affected.

In conclusion, Rivers and Noret (2009) point out, virtual interactions should not be considered fantasy since they are real to the young people engaged with them. We need to understand more about the communities in which these interactions take place.

For resources to help you develop a cyberbullying program see an article by the authors titled *Cyberbullying: Resources for Intervention and Prevention.*

REFERENCES

[1] Adams, C. (2010). Cyberbullying: How to make it stop. Instructor. 120(2), 44-49.

[2] Beran, T. & Qing L. (2007). The relationship between cyberbullying and school bullying. Journal of Student Wellbeing, 1(2), 15-33.

[3] Bhat, C., Suniti, C., Shih-Hua, L., & Jamie A. (2010). Addressing cyberbullyingas media literacy. New Horizons in Education, 58(3), 34-43.

[4] Boulton, M., Lloyd, J., Down, J., & Marx, H. (2012). Predicting undergraduates' self-reported engagement in traditional and cyberbullying from attitudes. Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 15(3), 141-147.

[5] Beale, A. V., & Hall, K. R. (2007). Cyberbullying: What school administrators (and parents) can do. Clearing House, 81(1), 8-12. DOI: 10.3200/TCHS.81.1.8-12

[6] Calvete, E.,Orue, I., Estévez, A., Villardón, L., & Padilla, P.(2010). Cyberbullying in adolescents: Modalities and aggressors' profile. Computers in Human Behavior, 26(5), 1128-1135. 8p. DOI: 10.1016/j.chb.2010.03.017.

[7] Cowie, H., & Colliety, P. (2010). Cyberbullying: Sanctions or sensitivity? Pastoral Care in Education, 28(4), 261-268. DOI: 10.1080/02643944.2010.528017.

[8] deLara, E. W. (2012). Why adolescents don't disclose incidents of bullying and harassment. Journal of School Violence, 11(4), 288-305.

[9] Dehue, F., Bolman, C., & Völlink, T. (2008). Cyberbullying: Youngsters' experiences and parental perception. CyberPsychology & Behavior, 11(2), 217-223.

[10] Diamanduros, T., & Downs, E. (2011). Creating a safe school environment: How to prevent cyberbullying at your school. Library Media Connection, 30(2), 36-38.

[11] Didden, R., Scholte, R. H. J., Korzilius, H., de Moor, J. M. H., Vermeulen, A., O'Reilly, M., Lang, R., & Lancioni, G. E. (2009). Cyberbullying among students with intellectual and developmental disability in special education settings. Developmental Neurorehabilitation. 12(3), 146-151. DOI: 10.1080/17518420902971356.

[12] Durkin, K., & Patterson, D. (2011). Cyberbullying, cyberharassing, and cyberstalking. In: The Routledge handbook of deviant behavior.Bryant, C. D. (Ed.); New York, NY, US: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, 450-455. [Chapter]

[13] 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. DOI: 10.1177/1461444809341260.

[14] Estell, D. B., Farmer, T. W., Irvin, M. J., Crowther, A., Akos, P., & Boudah, D. J. (2009). Students with exceptionalities and the peer group context of bullying and victimization in late elementary school. Journal of Child & Family Studies, 18(2), 136-50.

[15] Fredrick, K. (2010). Mean girls (and boys): Cyberbullying and what can be done about it. School Library Media Activities Monthly, 25(8), 44-45.

[16] Haber, J. D., & Daley, L. A. (2011). Cyberbullying Protection Plan. Camping Magazine, 84(2), 32-37.

[17] Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2008). Cyberbullying: An exploratory analysis of factors related to offending and victimization. Deviant Behavior, 29(2), 129-156.

[18] Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2010). Cyberbullying: A review of the legal Issues facing educators. Part of a special issue: Cyberbullying: Preventing School Failure, 55(2), 71-78.

[19] Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2011). High-tech cruelty. Educational Leadership, 68(5), 48-52.

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

[21] Holladay, J. (2011). Cyberbullying. Education Digest, 76(5), 4-9.

[22] Humphrey, N., & Symes, W. (2010). Responses to bullying and use of social support among pupils with autism

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1189 https://discussionpublishers.com/research/fddc7af2-8e3a-41a4-96c7-61afa9a05359

spectrum disorders (ASDs) in mainstream schools: A qualitative study. Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 10(2), 82-90.

[23] Jackson, C. (2011). Your students love social media ... and so can you Teaching Tolerance, 39, 38-41.

[24] Johnson, S. (2013). The antithesis of cyberbullying. Desert Dispatch, The (Barstow, CA), Jan 23, 2013.

[25] Jones, L. M., Mitchell, K. J., & Finkelhor, D. (2010).Online harassment in context: Trends from three youth internet safety surveys (2000, 2005, 2010). Psychology of Violence, 3(1). Special issue: Technology and Violence, 53-69.

[26] Jones, S. E., Manstead, A. S. R., & Livingstone, A. G. (2011). Ganging up or sticking together? Group processes and children's responses to text-message bullying. British Journal of Psychology, 102(1), 71-96.

[27] Juvonen, J, & Gross, E. F. (2008). Extending the school grounds?--Bullying experiences in cyberspace. Journal of School Health, 78(9), 496-505.

[28] Katzer, C. (2009). Cyberbullying in Germany: What has been done and what is going on. Zeitschrift für Psychologie/Journal of Psychology, 217(4), 222-223.

[29] Kinan, E. L. (2011). Teacher attitudes towards three types of bullying. Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 71(11-A), pp. 3913. [Dissertation]

[30] Kowalski, R. M. Limber, S. P., & Agatston, P. W. (2008). Cyber bullying: Bullying in the digital age. Blackwell Publishing, 218 pp.

[31] Law, D. M., Shapka, J. D., Hymel, S., Olson, B F., & Waterhouse, T. (2012). The changing face of bullying: An empirical comparison between traditional and internet bullying and victimization. Computers in Human Behavior, 28(1), 226-232. DOI: 10.1016/j.chb.2011.09.004.

[32] Mason, K. L. (2008). Cyberbullying: A preliminary assessment for school personnel. Psychology in the Schools, 45(4), 323-348.

[33] Menesini, E., Nocentini, A., Palladino, B. E., Frisén, A., Berne, S., Ortega-Ruiz, R., Calmaestra, J., Scheithauer, H., Schultze-Krumbholz, A., Luik, P., Naruskov, K., Blaya, C., Berthaud, J., & Smith, P. K. (2012). Cyberbullying definition among adolescents: A comparison across six European countries. CyberPsychology, Behavior & Social Networking, 15(9), 455-463. DOI: 10.1089/cyber.2012.0040.

[34] Mesch, G. S. (2009). Parental mediation, online activities, and cyberbullying. CyberPsychology & Behavior, 12(4), 387-393.

[35] Miller, J. D., & Hufstedler, S. M.. (2009). Cyberbullying knows no borders. Australian Teacher Education Association, Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Australian Teacher Education Association (ATEA) (Albury, Jun 28-Jul 1, 2009). (ED524610)

[36] Mishna, F., Saini, M., & Solomon, S.(2009). Ongoing and online: Children and youth's perceptions of cyber bullying. Children & Youth Services Review, 31(12), 1222-1228. DOI: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2009.05.004

[37] Mishna, F., Khoury-Kassabri, M., Gadalla, T., & Daciuk, J. (2012).Risk factors for involvement in cyber bullying: Victims, bullies and bully–victims. Children & Youth Services Review, 34(1), 63-70. DOI: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2011.08.032. add authors to citation in paper

[38] Molins, N. C. (1999). Understanding teachers' judgments of problematic classroom behavior: The influence of depression education on teachers' perceptions and judgments. (behavior problems). Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 60(4-B), pp. 1863. [Dissertation]

[39] Moore, M. J., Nakano, T., Enomoto, A., & Suda, T. (2012). Anonymity and roles associated with aggressive posts in an online forum. Computers in Human Behavior, 28(3), 861-867. DOI: 10.1016/j.chb.2011.12.005.

[40] Mustacchi, J. (2009). R U Safe? Educational Leadership, 66(6), 78-82.

[41] National Crime Prevention Council's (2012) http://www.ncpc.org/topics

[42] Naylor, P., Cowie, H., & Rey, R. (2001). Coping srategies of secondary school children in response to being bullied. Child & Adolescent Mental Health, 6(3), 114-120. DOI: 10.1111/1475-3588.00333.

[43] Patchin, J. W, & Hinduja S. (2006). Bullies move beyond the schoolyard: a preliminary look at cyberbullying. Youth Violence & Juvenile Justice, 4(2), 148-69

[44] Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2012). Cyberbullying prevention and response: Expert perspectives. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. (ED529048)

[45] Poland, S. (2010). Cyberbullying continues to challenge educators. District Administration, 46(5), 55.

[46] Raskauskas, J., & Stoltz, A. D. (2007). Involvement in traditional and electronic bullying among adolescents. Developmental Psychology, 43(3), 564-575.

[47] Reece, T. (2012). Cyberbullying 411. Current Health Teens, 38(5), 7-9.

[48] Rivers, I., & Noret, N. (2010). British Educational Research Journal, 36(4), 643-671.

[49] Şahin, M. (2012). The relationship between the cyberbullying/cybervictmization and loneliness among adolescents. Children & Youth Services Review, 34(4), 834-837.

[50] Sbarbaro, V., & Smith, T. M. E. (2011). An exploratory study of bullying and cyberbullying behaviors among economically disadvantaged middle school students. American Journal of Health Studies, 26(3), 139.

[51] Siegle, D. (2010). Cyberbullying and sexting: Technology abuses of the 21st century. Gifted Child Today, 33(2), 14-65.

[52] Smith, P. K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., & Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry, 49(4), 376-385.

[53] Snakenborg, J., Van Acker, R., & Gable, R. A.

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1189 https://discussionpublishers.com/research/fddc7af2-8e3a-41a4-96c7-61afa9a05359

Cyberbullying: Prevention and intervention to protect our children and youth. Preventing School Failure, 55(2), 88-95. DOI: 10.1080/1045988X.2011.539454.

[54] Ubertini, M. (2010). Cyberbullying may reduce adolescent's well-being: Can life satisfaction and social support protect them? ProQuest LLC, Psy.D. Dissertation, Hofstra University. 2010 122 pp.

[55] Sutton, S. (2009). School solutions for cyberbullying. Principal Leadership: High School Edition, 9(6), 38-42.

[56] Thomas, K., & McGee, C. (2012). The Only Thing We Have to Fear is... 120 Characters. TechTrends: Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning 56(1), 19-33.

[57] Tokunaga, R. S. (2010). Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of research on cyberbullying victimization. Computers in Human Behavior, 26(3), 277-287. DOI: 10.1016/j.chb.2009.11.014.

[58] Topçu, Ç., Erdur-Baker, Ö., & Çapa-Aydin, Y. (2008). Examination of cyberbullying experiences among Turkish students from different school types. CyberPsychology & Behavior, 11(6), 643-648. DOI: 10.1089/cpb.2007.0161.

[59] Vandebosch, H., & Van Cleemput, K. (2008).Defining cyberbullying: A qualitative research into the perceptions of youngsters. CyberPsychology & Behavior, 11(4), 499-503. DOI: 10.1089/cpb.2007.0042.

[60] Vandebosch, H., & Van Cleemput, K. (2009). New Media & Society, 11(8), 1349-1371.

[61] Varjas, K., Talley, J., Meyers, J., Parris, L., Cutts, H., & Hankin, A. (2010). High school students' perceptions of motivations for cyberbullying: an exploratory study. Western Journal of Emergency Medicine, 11(3), 269-273.

[62] Wade, A., & Beran, T. (2011). Cyberbullying: The new era of bullying. Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 26(1), 44-61.

[63] Walrave, M., & Heirman, W. (2011). Cyberbullying: Predicting victimisation and perpetration. Children & Society, 25(1), 59-72.

[64] Williams, K. R., & Guerra, N. G. (2007). Prevalence and predictors of Internet bullying. Journal of Adolescent Health, 41(6,Suppl), S14-S21.

[65] Wilson, E. (2007). As bullies go high-tech, lawmakers say schools should be fighting back Seattle Times, The (WA). 02/07/2007.

[66] Wong-Lo, M. (2009). Cyberbullying: Responses of adolescents and parents toward digital aggression. ProQuest LLC, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of North Texas. (ED515345)

[67] Wong-Lo, M., Bullock, L. M. (2011). Digital aggression: Cyberworld meets school bullies. Part of a special issue: Cyberbullying By: Preventing School Failure, 55(2), 64-70. DOI: 10.1080/1045988X.2011.539429

[68] Ybarra, M. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2004). Online aggressor/targets, aggressors, and targets: a comparison of associated youth characteristics. Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry, 45(7), 1308-1316. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.00328.x.

[69] Ybarra, M. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2004). Online aggressor/targets, aggressors, and targets: a comparison of associated youth characteristics. Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry, 45(7), 1308-1316. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.00328.x.

[70] Ybarra, M. L.; Boyd, D., Korchmaros, J. D., Oppenheim, J. (2012). Defining and measuring cyberbullying within the larger context of bullying victimization. Journal of Adolescent Health, 51(1), 53-58

[71] Tokunaga, R. S. (2010). Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of researchon cyberbullying victimization. Computers in Human Behavior 26, 277–287..

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1189 https://discussionpublishers.com/research/fddc7af2-8e3a-41a4-96c7-61afa9a05359