

# Incidences of cyberbullying among adolescents

■ Himakshi Baruah, Pragaya Dashora\* and M.K. Chaudhary<sup>1</sup>

Department of Human Development and Family Studies, ASPEE College of Home Science and Nutrition, Sardarkrushinagar Dantiwada Agricultural University, SARDARKRUSHINAGAR (GUJARAT) INDIA

<sup>1</sup>Department of Foods Science and Nutrition, ASPEE College of Home Science and Nutrition, Sardarkrushinagar Dantiwada Agricultural University, SARDARKRUSHINAGAR (GUJARAT) INDIA

(Email: [himakshibaruah23@gmail.com](mailto:himakshibaruah23@gmail.com), [pragayadashora@rediffmail.com](mailto:pragayadashora@rediffmail.com))

## ARTICLE INFO :

Received : 26.05.2017  
Revised : 15.09.2017  
Accepted : 01.10.2017

## KEY WORDS :

Cyberbullying, Adolescents, Nature, Environment, Extent

## HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE :

Baruah, Himakshi, Dashora, Pragaya and Chaudhary, M.K. (2017). Incidences of cyberbullying among adolescents. *Adv. Res. J. Soc. Sci.*, 8 (2) : 143-149, DOI: 10.15740/HAS/ARJSS/8.2/143-149.

\*Author for correspondence

## ABSTRACT

India stands third in the globally visible serious issue of cyberbullying. Urban adolescents are enormous user of technology and Ahmedabad being one of the top city of Internet users is supposed to be at high risk. The study was aimed to examine the nature and extent of cyberbullying among adolescents of Ahmedabad city of Gujarat state. The sample consisted of 240 respondents (120 boys and 120 girls) from standard VII to XII of two private co-educational English medium schools. Self – prepared questionnaire and modified version of Cyberbullying and Online Aggression Survey Instrument (Hinduja and Patchin, 2015) was used to elicit the data. Involvement in cyberbullying was seen for life time and for last thirty days before gathering the data. Findings indicates that nearly fifteen (14.17%) per cent respondents were involved in cyberbullying in their lifetime whereas seven (6.67 %) per cent were involved in last thirty days. The most common ways of cyberbullying were posting mean or hurtful comments and spreading of rumours. Computer instant messages and Facebook was most usual online environment where cyberbullying occurred. Overall, the extent of involvement of respondents in cyberbullying was low but it was sufficient enough to identify its emergence in our society.

## INTRODUCTION

Bullying is a long standing problem since decade which occurs in surroundings such as school, playground or neighbourhood. It is an aggressive behaviour that is repeated and involves a power imbalance favouring the offender (Olweus, 1994). It may be physical, verbal and relational. But rapid development of information and communication technologies has changed the traditional form of bullying into cyberbullying. The term cyberbullying is defined as “wilful and repeated harm inflicted through the use of computers, cell phones and other electronic devices” (Hinduja and Patchin, 2012).

Four types of persons are involved in cyberbullying *i.e.* either cyberbullies, cyber victims, both cyberbully and victims, and those who have neither cyberbullied nor been cyber victimised (Florell and Wygant, 2013).

Wide variation (6 % to 75 %) exists regarding prevalence of cyberbullying (Hinduja and Patchin, 2012) among adolescents. India is on the third position with 53 per cent of children bullied online behind China and Singapore (Global Youth Online Behaviour Survey released by Microsoft in 2012). Further, one in every four Indian teenager is a victim of cyber bullying (Mitch *et al.*, 2014). Adolescents are bullied at different frequencies *i.e.* monthly, weekly and daily (Dinkes *et*

*al.*, 2009).

Cyberbullying occurs by innumerable technological nature or ways. It encompasses publicly revealing personal information (Willard, 2005), sending harmful or threatening messages, posting derogatory comments on web site or social networking site, physically threatening and intimidating someone in a variety of online settings (Burgess *et al.*, 2009), creating web sites with content and posting pictures asking other people to rate things without consent of an individual (Willard, 2006), bothering someone online by teasing in a mean way, calling someone hurtful names, intentionally leaving persons out of things, threatening someone and saying unwanted sexually-related things (Patchin and Hinduja, 2006) etc.

The chief causes for cyberbullying behaviour are high access to technology (Beran and Li, 2005), revenge (Raskauskas and Stoltz, 2007), perceived anonymity (Dempsey *et al.*, 2009), lack of awareness (Campbell, 2005), lack of support and guidance of family (Wells and Mitchell, 2008), negative personal experiences and parental alienation (Mitchell *et al.*, 2007), pleasure seeking and perceived social benefits (Hinduja and Patchin, 2009). Male students (Nabuzoka, 2003) particularly in middle school to high school students (Wolak *et al.*, 2006) are more prone to cyberbullying. In addition to this, students who are from lower income families, overweight or underweight, new or fresh, perceived as weak, depressed, anxious with low self-esteem, antisocial or unpopular are more vulnerable.

Cyberbullying has been linked to multiple maladaptive emotional, psychological, and behavioural outcomes (Patchin and Hinduja, 2006). The effects of cyberbullying vary depending on the victim but the consequences include low self-esteem, anxiety, feeling sad, being scared, feeling embarrassed, depression, anger, truancy, decreased academic achievement, an increased tendency to violate others, school violence and suicide (Beran and Li, 2005; Willard, 2006; Hinduja and Patchin, 2009).

Globally, little scientific research exists till date and when it comes to India there is a dearth of research in this topic. The proposed research was done to bridge the gap and seeks to improve the cyberbullying research.

The objective of the study was to examine the nature and extent of cyberbullying among adolescents of Ahmedabad city of Gujarat state.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted in Ahmedabad which is the most advanced metropolitan city of Gujarat state and supposed to be at high risk of cyberbullying. A total of 240 respondents from class VII to XII were selected from two private co-educational English medium schools through simple random sampling. Three class categories were framed *i.e.* VII-VIII, IX-X and XI-XII and from each category 40 respondents consisting of 20 boys and 20 girls were selected. The data was collected with the use of two tools *i.e.* demographic information questionnaire (self - structured) and modified version of Cyberbullying and Online Aggression Survey Instrument (Hinduja and Patchin, 2015). Demographic information questionnaire elicited information regarding socio-personal and information communication technology variables. A structured questionnaire "Cyberbullying and Online Aggression Survey Instrument" was adopted to examine the nature and extent of cyberbullying. Responses were judged on 5 point scale *i.e.* never=0; twice=1; a few times=2; many times=3; every day=4. Appropriate statistical measures were used to analyze the data.

## OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

The present study in its broad sense is an attempt to find out the existing situation of cyberbullying among adolescents. The study findings have been presented in two parts :

### Demographic information of respondents :

Demographic information of respondents in cyberbullying during their entire life period is presented in Table 1 (socio-personal aspects) and Table 2 (use of ICT). Most of the respondents (85.83%) were not involved in cyberbullying while nearly fifteen per cent (14.17%) were involved in their entire lifetime. The involved respondents includes victims (7.50%), offenders (4.17%) and both (2.50%).

Table 1 illustrates the socio-personal information of respondents. With regard to age, majority of the respondents were in the age range of 16 to 17 years (30.41 %) for total sample. Similar trend was seen for victims (17.65%) and offenders (14.71%). Though equivalent numbers of male and female were taken but it was seen that majority of victim (32.35%) and offender (17.65%) of cyberbullying were male. Same number of respondents

was taken from VII to VIII, IX to X and XI-XII and it was noticed that most of respondents from standard VII to VIII (35.44%) were not involved in cyberbullying. With regard to type of family, most of the respondents from total sample were from nuclear family (59.58%) and forty per cent belonged to joint families (40.42%). Majority of the respondents had two siblings (58.75%) and belonged to first ordinal position (57.91%). Most of the mothers of total respondents were homemakers (71.25%) whereas few were in Government job (6.67%). More than half of the respondents' fathers were involved in business (55.41%). Surprisingly, more than forty per

cent of the total respondents were not aware about their annual income (41.25%) whereas twenty six per cent were having three to five lakh annual family income (26.67%).

Table 2 indicates the use of information communication technology by respondents. With regard to use of internet it was found that majority (93.33%) of the respondents were using internet while few (6.67%) were not using it in day to day life. Internet users were found to be more inclined towards cyberbullying (victim-52.94%, offender-26.47%, both-17.65%) than non-users. For browsing internet mobile phone (79.17%) was

**Table 1 : Distribution of respondents according to socio-personal aspects** (n=240)

Socio-personal information		Not involved in cyberbullying (n=206)	Involved in cyberbullying (n=34)			Total sample
			Victim of cyberbullying (n=18)	Offender of cyberbullying (n=10)	Both victim and offender (n= 6)	
Age	12-13	62 (30.10)	6 (17.65)	1 (2.94)	0 (0.00)	69 (28.76)
	14-15	61 (29.61)	5 (14.71)	4 (11.76)	2 (5.89)	72 (30.00)
	16-17	60 (29.12)	6 (17.65)	5 (14.71)	2 (5.89)	73 (30.41)
	18-19	23 (11.17)	1 (2.94)	0 (0.00)	2 (5.89)	26 (10.83)
Gender	Male	100 (48.54)	11 (32.35)	6 (17.65)	3 (8.82)	120 (50.00)
	Female	106 (51.46)	7 (20.59)	4 (11.76)	3 (8.82)	120 (50.00)
Standard	7-8	73 (35.43)	7 (20.59)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	80 (33.33)
	9-10	66 (32.03)	6 (17.65)	6 (17.65)	2 (5.89)	80 (33.33)
	11-12	67 (32.54)	5 (14.71)	4 (11.76)	4 (11.76)	80 (33.33)
Type of family	Nuclear	122 (59.22)	10 (29.41)	6 (17.65)	5 (14.71)	143 (59.58)
	Joint	84 (40.78)	8 (23.53)	4 (11.76)	1 (2.94)	97 (40.42)
Number of siblings	One	31 (15.04)	2 (5.89)	0 (0.00)	1 (2.94)	34 (14.17)
	Two	119 (57.77)	10 (29.41)	8 (23.53)	4 (11.76)	141 (58.75)
	Three	36 (17.48)	3 (8.82)	1 (2.94)	1 (2.94)	41 (17.08)
	More	20 (9.71)	3 (8.82)	1 (2.94)	0 (0.00)	24 (10.00)
Ordinal position	First	115 (55.83)	12 (35.30)	7 (20.59)	5 (14.71)	139 (57.91)
	Second	74 (35.92)	5 (14.71)	2 (5.89)	1 (2.94)	82 (34.17)
	Third	13 (6.31)	1 (2.94)	1 (2.94)	0 (0.00)	15 (6.25)
	More	4 (1.94)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	4 (1.67)
Occupation of mother	Govt. job	14 (6.80)	1 (2.94)	1 (2.94)	0 (0.00)	16 (6.67)
	Private job	28 (13.59)	3 (8.82)	0 (0.00)	1 (2.94)	32 (13.33)
	Business	18 (8.74)	0 (0.00)	2 (5.89)	1 (2.94)	21 (8.75)
	Homemaker	146 (70.87)	14 (41.18)	7 (20.59)	4 (11.76)	171 (71.25)
Occupation of father	Govt. job	26 (12.62)	4 (11.76)	1 (2.94)	2 (5.89)	33 (13.76)
	Private job	60 (29.13)	4 (11.76)	6 (17.65)	2 (5.89)	72 (30.00)
	Business	118 (57.28)	10 (29.41)	3 (8.82)	2 (5.89)	133 (55.41)
	Agri and allied	2 (0.97)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (0.83)
Annual family income	≤ 3 lakh	28 (13.59)	3 (8.82)	4 (11.76)	4 (11.76)	39 (16.26)
	3 lakh- 5 lakh	55 (26.69)	6 (17.65)	2 (5.89)	1 (2.94)	64 (26.67)
	5 lakh -7 lakh	26 (12.62)	3 (8.82)	1 (2.94)	1 (2.94)	31 (12.91)
	> 7 lakh	6 (2.91)	1 (2.94)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	7 (2.91)
	Do not know	91 (44.17)	5 (14.71)	3 (8.82)	0 (0.00)	99 (41.25)

commonly used device by respondents. Half (50.0%) of the respondents who were involved in cyberbullying as victims were mobile phone users. Internet was mainly used for social interaction (77.92%) and school work (60.42%). Majority (84.58%) of the respondents informed that they used internet for equal or less than two hours. More than half (55.42%) of the respondents were aware while nearly forty five (44.58%) per cent did not know about internet safety. Out of involved respondents little more than thirty two (32.35%) per cent victims had no knowledge about internet safety. The knowledge about cyber safety may minimize the risk of cyberbullying activities. Information about parental control on use of internet depicted that sixty five per cent (65.00%) respondents had parental control for the

use of internet while thirty five (35.0%) per cent reported no control. Due to parental control sixty three (63.11%) per cent respondents were away from the web of cyberbullying. Majority (81.25%) of the respondents were not aware about the term 'cyberbullying' whereas about nineteen per cent (18.75%) respondents were aware.

**Nature and extent of cyberbullying among respondents :**

The nature of cyberbullying was seen in terms of its occurrence, ways of involvement and environment in which it takes place. In last thirty days about six per cent (6.67%) respondents were involved in cyberbullying which consisted of victims (3.33%), offenders (1.67%)

**Table 2 : Distribution of respondents according to their use of ICT (n=240)**

Use of ICT		Not involved in cyberbullying (n=206)	Involved in cyberbullying (n=34)			Total sample
			Victim of cyberbullying (n=18)	Offender of cyberbullying (n=10)	Both victim and offender (n= 6)	
Use of Internet	Yes	191 (92.72)	18 (52.94)	9 (26.47)	6 (17.65)	224 (93.33)
	No	15 (7.28)	0	1 (2.94)	0	16 (6.67)
Devices*	Do not have own	15 (7.28)	0 (0.00)	1 (2.94)	0 (0.00)	16 (6.67)
	Mobile phone	163 (79.13)	17 (50.00)	5 (14.71)	5 (14.71)	190 (79.17)
	Laptop	47 (22.81)	6 (17.65)	0 (0.00)	1 (2.94)	54 (22.50)
	Desktop PC	32 (15.53)	5 (14.71)	1 (2.94)	1 (2.94)	39 (16.25)
	Tablet	14 (6.80)	4 (11.76)	2 (5.89)	0 (0.00)	20 (8.33)
Purpose*	School work	124 (60.19)	13 (38.24)	5 (14.71)	3 (8.82)	145 (60.42)
	Reading	45 (21.84)	5 (14.71)	0 (0.00)	3 (8.82)	53 (22.08)
	Music	82 (39.81)	12 (35.30)	2 (5.89)	5 (14.71)	101 (42.08)
	Games	78 (37.86)	12 (35.30)	5 (14.71)	6 (17.65)	101(42.08)
	Social interaction	153 (74.27)	18 (52.94)	10 (29.41)	6 (17.65)	187 (77.92)
	Shopping	31 (15.05)	5 (14.71)	0 (0.00)	2 (5.89)	38 (15.83)
Time spent on internet/ day (in hours)	≤ 2	176 (85.44)	14 (41.18)	9 (26.47)	4 (11.76)	203 (84.58)
	>2	30 (14.56)	4 (11.76)	1 (2.94)	2 (5.89)	37 (15.420)
Awareness of internet safety	Yes	119 (57.77)	7 (20.59)	5 (14.71)	2 (5.89)	133 (55.42)
	No	87 (42.23)	11 (32.35)	5 (14.71)	4 (11.76)	107 (44.58)
Parental control	Yes	130 (63.11)	14 (41.18)	8 (23.53)	4 (11.76)	156 (65.00)
	No	76 (36.89)	4 (11.76)	2 (5.89)	2 (5.89)	84 (35.00)
Aware about the term cyberbullying	Yes	36 (17.48)	14 (41.18)	8 (23.53)	4 (11.76)	45 (18.75)
	No	170 (82.52)	4 (11.76)	2 (5.89)	2 (5.89)	195 (81.25)

\* Based on multiple responses

**Table 3 : Occurrence of cyberbullying victimization and offending**

Involvement	Cyberbullying victimization (n=240)				Cyberbullying offending ( n=240)			
	Not victimized		Victimized		Not offender		Offender	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Lifetime	216	90.00	24	10.00	224	93.33	16	6.67
Last 30 days	228	95.00	12	5.00	232	96.67	8	3.33

and both victims and offenders (1.67%).

Evaluation of the Table 3 shows that ninety per cent (90.00%) of the respondents were not victimized during their life time but ten per cent (10.00%) were victims of cyberbullying. When viewed for last thirty days (before data collection) it was found that ninety five per cent (95.00%) were not victimized but five per cent (5.00%) respondents were victims. In case of cyberbullying offending it was noticed that almost seven per cent (6.67%) respondents were offender in their lifetime while nearly three per cent (3.33%) were offender in last 30 days (before data collection).

Although the percentage is less for cyberbullying victimization and offending but the situation is alarming and needs timely concern in order to avoid the unfavourable incidence of cyberbullying.

The ways of involvement of adolescents in

cyberbullying during last 30 days (before data collection) are depicted in Table 4. Most common ways for victimization were posting of mean or hurtful comments (5.00%) and spreading of rumours (5.00%) while the least used way was pretending and acting online that was mean or hurtful to the victim (0.83%).

Similarly for offending online posting of mean or hurtful comments (3.33%) and spreading of rumours (3.33%) were usual ways whereas posting of mean or hurtful picture (1.25%) and pretending and acting to be someone else online (1.25%) were chosen rarely.

These results gets support from the findings of Hinduja and Patchin (2009) who mentioned that most common ways of online harassment were posting mean or hurtful comments, spreading rumours, threatening and posting of hurtful video.

Environment in which cyberbullying occurs is

**Table 4 : Ways of involvement in cyberbullying victimization and offending (in last 30 days) (n=240)**

Ways	Cyberbullying victimization (n=240)				Cyberbullying offending			
	Not victimized		Victimized		Not offender		Offender	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Comments	228	95.00	12	5.00	232	96.67	8	3.33
Picture	236	98.33	4	1.67	237	98.75	3	1.25
Video	240	100	-	-	240	100	-	-
Web page	240	100	-	-	240	100	-	-
Rumours	228	95.00	12	5.00	232	96.67	8	3.33
Text message	240	100	-	-	240	100	-	-
Threaten online	237	98.75	3	1.25	236	98.33	4	1.67
Pretend and acting online	238	99.17	2	0.83	237	98.75	3	1.25

**Table 5 : Environment of cyberbullying victimization and offending (in last 30 days)**

Environment	Cyberbullying victimization				Cyberbullying offending			
	Not victimized		Victimized		Not offender		Offender	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Chat room	232	96.67	8	3.33	236	98.33	4	1.67
Email	240	100	-	-	240	100	-	-
Computer instant messages	227	94.58	13	5.41	233	97.08	7	2.92
Cell phone text messages	240	100	-	-	240	100	-	-
Cell phone	239	99.58	1	0.41	239	99.58	1	0.42
Picture Mail or Video Mail	240	100	-	-	240	100	-	-
Facebook	227	94.58	13	5.41	233	97.08	7	2.92
Social networking web site (other than Facebook)	240	100	-	-	240	100	-	-
Twitter	237	98.75	3	1.25	239	99.58	1	0.42
YouTube	239	99.58	1	0.41	240	100	-	-
Instagram	237	98.75	3	1.25	240	100	-	-
Virtual worlds	234	97.50	6	2.50	233	97.08	7	2.92
Massive multiplayer online game	229	95.42	11	4.58	233	97.08	7	2.92
Playing online with Xbox, Playstation, Wii, PSP or similar device	229	95.42	11	4.58	233	97.08	7	2.92

Table 6 : Extent of involvement in cyberbullying victimization and offending (in last 30 days) (n=240)				
Extent of involvement	Cyberbullying victimization (n=240)		Cyberbullying offending	
	F	%	F	%
Not involved (0)	228	95.00	232	96.67
Low extent ( 1-18)	12	5.00	8	3.33
High extent (19-36)	-	-	-	-

another important factor to know about the nature of cyberbullying. The picture about environment (in last thirty days before data collection) has been presented in Table 5. Most common online environments in which victims were cyberbullied were computer instant messages (5.41%) and Facebook (5.41%). It was followed by massive multiplayer online game (4.58%) such as World of Warcraft and playing online with Xbox, Playstation, Wii, PSP or similar device (4.58%). E-mails, cell phone text message, social networking site (other than Facebook) were not used by the respondents.

In case of cyberbullying offending equal number of respondents (2.92%) used computer instant messages, Facebook, virtual worlds (such as Second Life, Gaia or Habbo Hotel), multiplayer online games (such as World of Warcraft) and online play with Xbox, PlayStation, Wii, PSP or similar device.

Extent of involvement in cyberbullying victimization and offending was assessed on the basis of degree of involvement in last thirty days before data collection.

It is evident from Table 6 that majority (95.00%) were not involved in cyberbullying victimization and about five per cent (5.00%) were involved upto low extent. For cyberbullying offending, majority (96.67%) of the respondents were not involved and more than three (3.33%) per cent showed low extent of involvement.

### Conclusion:

The study concludes that most of the respondents were from 16-17 years, belonging to nuclear family, at first ordinal position and were having two siblings. Majority of respondent's mothers were home maker and fathers were doing business. The respondents did not know about family income. Male of 16-17 years, studying in VII-VIII standard, were more prone to cyberbullying. Most of the respondents used internet through mobile phone for social interaction and school work for less than two hours. Awareness about internet safety and the term cyberbullying was low among respondents. They had parental control for the use of internet. Rapid rise was

noticed in occurrence of cyberbullying. Mean and hurtful comments and spreading rumours were common ways of both cyberbullying victimization and offending. Computer instant messages and Face book were the most usual online environment where cyberbullying occurred. The extent of involvement in cyberbullying of involved respondents (victims and offenders) were of low level. Thus, it can be inferred that prevalence of cyberbullying is not less to show the emergence of this perilous situation but as the extent of involvement was low the situation of cyberbullying can be controlled by taking sincere steps from individuals, parents, school and various organizations.

### REFERENCES

- Beran, L. and Li, Q. (2005). Cyber-harassment: A study of a new method for an old behavior. *J. Educational Computing Res.*, **32** : 265-277.
- Burgess, P.A., Patchin, J.W. and Hinduja, S. (2009). Cyberbullying and online harassment: Reconceptualising the victimization of adolescent girls. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Campbell, M.A. (2005). Cyberbullying: An old problem in a new guise. *Australian J. Guidance & Counselling*, **15**(1): 68-76.
- Dempsey, A.G, Sulkowski, M.L., Nichols, R. and Storch, E.A. (2009). Differences between peer victimization in cyber and physical settings and associated psychosocial adjustment in early adolescence. *Psychol. Schools*, **46**(10) : 962-972.
- Dinkes, R., Kemp, J. and Baum, K. (2009). Indicators of school crime and safety. Report. National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs and US Department of Justice. Washington, DC. pp.1-156
- Florell, D. and Wygant, D. (2013). The role of peer attachment and normative beliefs about aggression on traditional bullying and cyberbullying. *Psychol. Schools*, **50**(2): 103-115.

- Hinduja, S. and Patchin, J.W. (2009). *Bullying beyond the schoolyard: Preventing and responding to cyberbullying*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Corwin Press.
- Hinduja, S. and Patchin, J.W. (2012). *School climate 2.0: Preventing cyberbullying and sexting one classroom at a time*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Corwin Press.
- Hinduja, S. and Patchin, J.W. (2015). *Bullying beyond the schoolyard: Preventing and responding to cyberbullying*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Microsoft (2012). *Global Youth Online Behaviour Survey*. Available at [http://www.siliconindia.com/news/general/India-Ranks-Third-in-Cyber-Bullying-nid\\_121339-cid-1.html](http://www.siliconindia.com/news/general/India-Ranks-Third-in-Cyber-Bullying-nid_121339-cid-1.html). accessed 28 May, 2016
- Mitch, G., Paul, V. and Jenny T. (2014). Relationship between peer victimization, cyberbullying, and suicide in children and adolescents. *J. American Medical Association*, **168** (5) : 435-442.
- Mitchell, K.J., Ybarra, M. and Finkelhor, D. (2007). The relative importance of online victimization in understanding depression, delinquency and substance abuse. *Child Maltreatment*, **123** : 14-324.
- Nabuzoka, D. (2003). Experiences of bullying-related behaviours by English and Zambian Pupils: A comparative study. *Educational Res.*, **45**(1): 95-109.
- Olweus, D. (1994). *Bully at school: Long-term outcomes for the victims and an effective school-based intervention program*. In L. Huesmann (Ed.), *Aggressive behavior: Current perspectives* (pp. 97-129). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Patchin, J. and Hinduja, S. (2006). Bullies move beyond the schoolyard: A preliminary look at cyberbullying. *Youth Violence & Juvenile Justice*, **4**:148-169.
- Raskauskas, J. and Stoltz, A.D. (2007). Involvement in traditional and electronic bullying among adolescents. *Developmental Psychol.*, **43**(3): 564-575.
- Wells, M. and Mitchell, K.J. (2008). How do high-risk youth use the internet? Characteristics and implications for prevention. *Child Maltreatment*, **13**(3):227-234
- Willard, N. (2005). Cyberbullying and cyberthreats. In: Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools National Conference. Washington, D.C., United States of America. pp.21-31.
- Willard, N .E. (2006). *Educators guide to cyberbullying: Addressing the harm caused by online social cruelty*. Retrieved April 4, 2009, from: [www.asdk12.org/MiddleLinkIABVbully\\_topics/Educators\\_Guide\\_Cyberbullying.pdf](http://www.asdk12.org/MiddleLinkIABVbully_topics/Educators_Guide_Cyberbullying.pdf).
- Wolak, J., Mitchell, K.J. and Finkelhor, D. (2006). Online victimization: 5 years later. Retrieved January 18, 2010, from <http://www.unh.edu/ccrc/pdf/CV138.pdf>.

  
 ★★★★★ of Excellence ★★★★★