



Sohag University



Sohag Medical Journal



Faculty of Medicine

Original Article

Prevalence, Patterns, Predictors and effect of Cyberbullying among Sohag University Students

Tasneem Mohammed Ali, Amira Fayez Shenouda,
Magda Mohamed Ali

*public health and community medicine department, faculty of medicine sohag university, Egypt

Abstract:

Background: Cyberbullying can be defined as intentional aggression through electronic routes, such as text messages, e-mails, chat rooms, online games, and social websites. Numerous subtypes of cyberbullying have been reported.

The aim of the current study was to study the situation, patterns, and the implications of cyberbullying among Sohag University students.

Methods: An analytical cross-sectional study was conducted among 500 students of Sohag University, during the period from October 2022 to April 2023, using a semi-structured questionnaire to collect data about socio-demographic characteristics of the study participants, correlates and patterns of cyberbullying.

Results illustrated that (54.6%) of the study participants reported being cyberbullied. Males reported more subjection to cyberbullying (53.11%) as compared to females. “Facebook” was the first platform on the social media showing existence of cyberbullying, with offensive comments and spreading rumors in most of the cases of cyberbullying.

Recommendation: Based on the results of the study , it’s recommended to: Implement anticyberbullying programs tailored for university students will be a major step .Such programs should include anticyberbullying policies and materials and provision for guidance of students, their parents, and their teaching staff.

Keywords: cyber bullying, sohag , university , students

DOI: 10.21608/SMJ.2024.266810.1451

*Correspondence : tasneem.bakheet@yahoo.com

Received: 31 January 2024.

Revised: 12 February 2024.

Accepted: 14 February 2024.

Published: 01 May 2024.

Introduction:

One billion homes have internet connectivity, and almost one in two people on the planet use it. Over 2.5 billion people utilize the internet in developing nations⁽¹⁾

Between 2009 and 2016, there were 12.3 million internet users in Egypt; by 2016, that number had significantly increased to 29.84 million. ⁽²⁾Egypt is rated 17th in the world for Facebook subscriptions,

with 98% of internet users having accounts, and 52% of those users being under 24. While a third of Egyptian internet users are active on Instagram, half of them have Twitter accounts⁽¹⁾

Social networking has several well-established advantages, including improved social support, communication, information gathering, and access to educational resource. ⁽³⁾

Social media platforms have, however, been linked to a number of detrimental effects, including cyber-crime, exposure to offensive content, and cyber-bullying⁽⁴⁾

Intentional hostility via electronic means, including text messages, e-mails, chat rooms, online games, and social media platforms, is known as cyber bullying. When compared to traditional bullying, cyber bullying has many distinct features that amplify its negative effects. These features include the inability to avoid bullying, the existence of a larger and more potential audience, the continuous nature of bullying regardless of time or location, and the perpetrator's frequent anonymity⁽⁵⁾

Because of these particular requirements, there is a power disparity between the offenders and their victims, which leads to cyber victimization⁽⁶⁾

Subtypes of cyber bullying have been documented: "threatening and intimidation" (sending frightful or terrifying messages), "exclusion" (singling out from online groups or chat rooms), "denigration and mockery" (revealing secrets or sensitive material), "flaming," which consists of intense and hostile arguments that frequently include insulting, "outing," which involves using hurtful statements to put the victim down, and "harassment" (involving unsolicited communications or interactions)⁽⁷⁾

The prevalence of cyber bullying among youth is difficult to monitor due to varying definitions of the term and disparities in the groups that are targeted. Additionally, researchers evaluated victimization at various times and used various strategies⁽⁸⁾

Cyber bullying has been linked to a wide range of psychological impacts, including somatic problems, depression, and suicide thoughts, in addition to emotional discomfort, low academic success, absenteeism, and loss of attention⁽⁹⁾

The present study's goals were to investigate the prevalence and trends of cyber bullying, identify risk factors for cyber bullying among Sohag University students, including family dynamics, and examine the effects of cyber bullying on its victims.

Methodology :

Study setting: The study was carried out at Sohag University, a regional university. It is situated in Sohag governate.

Study design: A cross sectional study was carried out among randomly selected students of Sohag

University. The study was conducted in four randomly chosen faculties, two practical faculties (the faculty of Engineering and the faculty of Nursing) and two theoretical faculties (the faculty of Law and the faculty of Literature).

Sample size: According to the equation: $N = z^2 p (1 - p) / d^2$. The sample size by the equation will include 383 students and increased to 500 students to overcome expected drop out and to increase accuracy of the study. P= prevalence of cyberbullying is based on the finding of a previous study conducted in Beni-suif University where cyberbullying was detected in 48.2 % in students.

Sampling technique: The sample was taken by the mean of cluster random sampling technique among the students of four faculties that were chosen by simple randomization among both the practical and theoretical faculties; the faculty of Engineering and the faculty of Nursing and two theoretical faculties; the faculty of Law and the faculty of Literature. Then a suitable random cluster sample were taken from the students of the determined faculties after fulfilling the eligibility criteria.

Inclusion criteria: Students who accepted to participate in the study.

Exclusion criteria: Students who refused to participate in the study.

Data collection & procedure: Data was collected through personal interviews using a self-administered questionnaire after a brief explanation of the aims of the study and their acceptance. It took around 15–20 minutes to be fulfilled. The investigator chose a suitable time for students; either at break time or at the end of their lectures. Two questionnaires were adapted; the first was from a research from The Reading and Knowledge Journal and the other from a study from the United Arab Emirates University and Beni-suif study. The questionnaire is divided into two sections:

1-The first section: included the socio-demographic characters & correlates of cyber bullying as (age, sex, residence, family factors.....etc.)

2-The second section: included the situation, pattern and implications of cyber bullying on victims; the last were studied using 5-aspects Likert scale that was varying from strongly disagree (score 1) until strongly agree (score 5).

Statistical analysis: The collected data were coded and verified prior to computerized data entry. The data were statistically analyzed using SPSS version 23 to express in tables and Excel program for graphs. The Quantitative data were tested for normality by Kolmogorov-Smirnov then represent in mean

and standard deviation when normally distributed and median and IQ if not. Percentages of Qualitative data were compared by chi-square. In all analyses, P value ≤ 0.05 indicated statistical significance.

Results:

Table 1: Distribution of cyberbullying among students of the study

| Have you been cyberbullied on social media platforms before? | Number | % |
|--|--------|--------|
| Yes | 273 | 54.6% |
| No | 227 | 45.4% |
| Total | 500 | 100.0% |

Table (1) shows that 273 students (54.6%) were subjected to cyberbullying while 227 students (45.4%) reported that they weren't subjected to cyberbullying.

Table 2: Relationship between cyberbullying and sociodemographic characteristic of students in the study

| Variables (n=500) | Have you been cyberbullied on social media platforms before? | | | | Total | P value |
|---|--|-------|--------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|---------|
| | Yes (N=273) | | No (N=227) | | | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| Gender | | | | | | |
| Males | 145 | 52.0% | 134 | 48.0% | 279; 55.8% | 0.185 |
| Females | 128 | 57.9% | 93 | 42.1% | 221, 44.2% | |
| Marital status | | | | | | |
| Single | 248 | 56.5% | 191 | 43.5% | 439 | 0.23 |
| Married | 25 | 41% | 36 | 59% | 81 | |
| Faculty | | | | | | |
| Engineering | 57 | 54.3% | 48 | 45.7% | 105 | 0.33 |
| Nursing | 81 | 55.9% | 64 | 44.1% | 145 | |
| Literature | 73 | 59.8% | 49 | 40.2% | 122 | |
| Law | 62 | 48.4% | 66 | 51.6% | 128 | |
| Age mean±SD median(IQR) range | 20.1±1.4 20(19:21) 18:29 | | 20.4±1.4 20(19,20) 18:24 | | 20.3±1.5 20(19,21) 18:29 | 0.052 |
| Residence | | | | | | |
| Rural | 94 | 46.5% | 108 | 53.5% | 202 | 0.675* |
| Urban | 133 | 44.6% | 165 | 55.4% | 298 | |
| Current resident | | | | | | |
| With family | 168 | 53.5% | 146 | 46.5% | 314 | 0.9* |
| Student dormitory | 67 | 55.8% | 53 | 44.2% | 120 | |
| With friends | 21 | 56.8% | 16 | 43.2% | 37 | |
| With relatives | 17 | 58.6% | 12 | 41.4% | 29 | |
| Room | | | | | | |
| Shared | 205 | 54.5% | 171 | 45.5% | 376 | 0.95* |
| Private | 68 | 54.8% | 56 | 45.2% | 124 | |
| Academic year | | | | | | |
| First | 70 | 54.3% | 59 | 45.7% | 129 | 0.66* |
| second | 69 | 58.5% | 49 | 41.5% | 118 | |
| Third | 75 | 55.1% | 61 | 44.9% | 136 | |
| Fourth | 59 | 50.4% | 58 | 49.6% | 117 | |
| Marital status of parents | | | | | | |
| Existing | 199 | 53.5% | 173 | 46.5% | 372 | 0.69* |
| Divorced | 40 | 58.0% | 29 | 42.0% | 69 | |
| Widow | 34 | 57.6% | 25 | 42.4% | 59 | |
| Conflicts between parents | | | | | | |
| Yes | 27 | 49.1% | 28 | 50.9% | 55, 11% | 0.285* |
| Sometimes | 152 | 53% | 135 | 47% | 287, 57.4% | |
| No | 94 | 59.5% | 64 | 40.5% | 158, 31.6% | |

P value was calculated by Chi square test, the percentages is row percentage

Table (2) shows that 279 students out of 500 were males, 55.8%, of them more than half; 145 students (52%) were subjected to cyberbullying before and 134 students (48%) were not subjected to cyberbullying. In 221 female students, with percent 44.2%; 128 (57.9%) were subjected to cyberbullying before and 93 female students (42.1%) reported didn't cyberbullied before, there is no statistically significant difference in cyberbullying and gender, with p-value ($p = 0.185$) as well as the case in both the age, marital status,

the faculties to which the students belong and even the graduation year, family original residence, student residence at the academic year, room sharing and the current marital status of parents ($p > 0.05$ in each case with approximating percentages). Table (2) shows also that 11% and 57.4% had often or sometimes conflicts between their parents respectively while 158 students (31.6%) reported absence of conflict in their families; although many of them 94 students (59.5 %) were previously subjected to cyberbullying.

Table (3): Role of student's families in cyberbullying

| Variables | | Have you been cyberbullied on social media platforms before? | | | | Total | P value |
|--|-----------|--|-------|------------|-------|-------|---------|
| | | Yes (N=273) | | No (N=227) | | | |
| | | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| Does your family provide the ideal role model for you in using the Internet and specially the social networking sites? | Yes | 133 | 53.6% | 115 | 46.4% | 248 | 0.68 |
| | Sometimes | 111 | 54.4% | 93 | 45.6% | | |
| | No | 29 | 60.4% | 19 | 39.6% | | |
| Is the family interested to know your friends on the real level or on the virtual level? | Yes | 126 | 53.6% | 109 | 46.4% | 235 | 0.18 |
| | Sometimes | 126 | 58.1% | 91 | 41.9% | | |
| | No | 21 | 43.8% | 27 | 56.3% | | |
| Does your family encourage you to spend your spare time in useful work? | Yes | 161 | 52.1% | 148 | 47.9% | 309 | 0.35 |
| | Sometimes | 91 | 58.3% | 65 | 41.7% | | |
| | No | 21 | 60.0% | 14 | 40.0% | | |
| Does your family promote a culture of dialogue among their children? | Yes | 148 | 52.9% | 132 | 47.1% | 280 | 0.61 |
| | Sometimes | 114 | 57.3% | 85 | 42.7% | | |
| | No | 11 | 52.4% | 10 | 47.6% | | |
| Does your family earn you the culture and ethics of safe use of the Internet and social networking sites? | Yes | 84 | 50.3% | 83 | 49.7% | 167 | 0.36 |
| | Sometimes | 136 | 57.4% | 101 | 42.6% | | |
| | No | 53 | 55.2% | 43 | 44.8% | | |
| Does your family follow what you publish on your accounts on social networking sites? | Yes | 63 | 46.7% | 72 | 53.3% | 135 | 0.036 |
| | Sometimes | 140 | 55.1% | 114 | 44.9% | | |
| | No | 70 | 63.1% | 41 | 36.9% | | |
| Does your family follow your friends on social networking sites? | Yes | 47 | 53.4% | 41 | 46.4% | 88 | 0.21 |
| | Sometimes | 118 | 51.1% | 113 | 48.9% | | |
| | No | 108 | 59.7% | 73 | 40.3% | | |
| Does your family warn you against publishing any information about your friends on social media without their knowledge? | Yes | 137 | 56.8% | 104 | 43.2% | 241 | 0.45 |
| | Sometimes | 97 | 51.1% | 93 | 48.9% | | |
| | No | 39 | 56.5% | 30 | 43.5% | | |
| Does the family care to educate you not to repeat rumors or spread them on social media? | Yes | 147 | 55.9% | 116 | 44.1% | 263 | 0.77 |
| | Sometimes | 100 | 53.8% | 86 | 46.2% | | |
| | No | 26 | 51% | 25 | 49% | | |

Chi-square test was used to elucidate significance.

Table (4) illustrates that cyberbullying didn't affected statistically in a significant manner by the student perspectives (whether exposed to be cyber bullied before on the media or not exposed to this experience); regarding the presence of cyberbullying on the social media platforms, nor its

frequency in any of these platforms, nor even the form in which it was predominated in. The reasons for people who cyberbullying others were many as reported by our students, yet these reasons weren't of statistical significance ($p > 0.05$).

Table (4): Student perspective about cyberbullying

| Variables | | Have you been cyberbullied on social media platforms before? | | | | Total | P value |
|--|--|--|-------|------------|-------|-------|---------|
| | | Yes (N=273) | | No (N=227) | | | |
| | | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| Do you think that cyberbullying exists on social media platforms? | Yes | 268 | 54.4% | 225 | 45.6% | 493 | 0.46 |
| | No | 5 | 71.4% | 2 | 28.6% | 7 | |
| Which of the following social media platforms have more cyberbullying? | 1-Facebook | 100 | 47.4% | 111 | 52.6% | 211 | 0.99 |
| | 2-Twitter | 17 | 51.5% | 16 | 48.5% | 33 | |
| | 3-Snapshot | 3 | 75% | 1 | 25% | 4 | |
| | 4-You-tube | 19 | 70.4% | 8 | 29.6% | 27 | |
| | 5-Instagram | 15 | 60% | 10 | 40% | 25 | |
| | 6-Facebook&twitter | 27 | 69.2% | 12 | 30.8% | 39 | |
| | 7-Facebook&Instagram | 44 | 56.4% | 34 | 43.6% | 78 | |
| | 8-Facebook & You tube | 48 | 57.8% | 35 | 42.2% | 83 | |
| If you have come across cyberbullying on social media platforms, what was its form? | 1-Offensive comments | 64 | 48.1% | 69 | 51.9% | 133 | 0.318 |
| | 2-Hate speech | 30 | 61.2% | 19 | 38.8% | 49 | |
| | 3-Online shaming | 1 | 33.3% | 2 | 66.7% | 3 | |
| | 4-Posting or sharing embarrassing photos and /or videos | 21 | 55.3% | 17 | 44.7% | 38 | |
| | 5-Spreading rumors | 27 | 55.1% | 22 | 44.9% | 49 | |
| | 6-Using emojis as a form of ridicule | 19 | 48.7% | 20 | 51.3% | 39 | |
| | 7-Offensive comments&usingemojis as a form of ridicule | 52 | 53.1% | 46 | 46.9% | 98 | |
| | 8-Offensive comments & spreading rumours | 59 | 64.8% | 32 | 35.2% | 91 | |
| In your opinion, why do people cyberbullying others? | 1-Out of boredom | 42 | 56% | 33 | 44% | 75 | 0.63 |
| | 2-To become popular | 35 | 56.5% | 27 | 43.5% | 62 | |
| | 3-A defence mechanism for their own insecurities | 13 | 59.1% | 9 | 40.9% | 22 | |
| | 4-They have personal issues and frustrations | 38 | 53.5% | 33 | 46.5% | 71 | |
| | 5-Other reasons | 27 | 61.4% | 17 | 38.6% | 44 | |
| | 6-out of boredom& to become popular | 54 | 47% | 61 | 53% | 115 | |
| | 7-To become popular and they have personal issues and frustrations | 64 | 57.7% | 47 | 42.3% | 111 | |

Table (5): Reaction of students on cyberbullying

| Variables | | Have you been cyberbullied on social media platforms before? | | | | Total | P value |
|--|--|--|-------|------------|-------|-------|---------|
| | | Yes (N=273) | | No (N=227) | | | |
| | | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| Describe your response to cyberbullying? | 1-I ignore the situation | 68 | 58.1% | 49 | 41.9% | 117 | 0.217* |
| | 2-I change the social media platform | 9 | 56.3% | 7 | 43.8% | 16 | |
| | 3-I respond to bully | 9 | 32.1% | 19 | 67.9% | 28 | |
| | 4-I confide in a friend | 16 | 45.7% | 19 | 54.3% | 35 | |
| | 5-I report the account of the bully | 36 | 60% | 24 | 40% | 60 | |
| | 6-Ignore the situation & confide a friend | 49 | 53.8% | 42 | 46.2% | 91 | |
| | 7-ignore the situation & report the account of the bully | 86 | 56.2% | 67 | 43.8% | 153 | |
| | 8-I ignore the situation & report the account of the bully | 86 | 56.2% | 67 | 43.8% | 153 | |
| If you have told someone about cyberbullying, that person will be : | 1-A friend | 98 | 53.3% | 86 | 46.7% | 184 | 0.12* |
| | 2-Your parent | 65 | 52.8% | 58 | 47.2% | 123 | |
| | 3-Your sibling | 67 | 64.4% | 37 | 35.6% | 104 | |
| | 4-No body | 43 | 48.3% | 46 | 51.7% | 89 | |
| If you were bullied before, what was your emotional response to this situation? | 1-Feeling anger | 47 | 51.6% | 44 | 48.4% | 91 | 0.89** |
| | 2-Feeling hatred | 15 | 62.5% | 9 | 37.5% | 24 | |
| | 3-Feeling sorrow | 60 | 56.1% | 47 | 43.9% | 107 | |
| | 4-Feeling fear | 1 | 100% | 0 | 0% | 1 | |
| | 5-Feeling disappointment | 23 | 56.1% | 18 | 43.9% | 41 | |
| | 6-Feeling loneliness | 12 | 46.2% | 14 | 53.8% | 26 | |
| | 7-feeling anger & sorrow | 61 | 53% | 54 | 47% | 115 | |
| | 8-Feeling sorrow & disappointed | 54 | 56.8% | 41 | 43.2% | 95 | |
| What are the best ways to stop students bullying others online? | 1-Asking them to stop | 11 | 40.7% | 16 | 59.3% | 27 | 0.107** |
| | 2-ignoring it | 81 | 59.1% | 56 | 40.9% | 137 | |
| | 3-Keeping a record of nasty emails or text messages (SMS) | 30 | 56.6% | 23 | 43.4% | 53 | |
| | 4-I did not respond to the threatening or nasty emails | 3 | 75% | 1 | 25% | 4 | |
| | 5-I asked for help from someone I trust such as a friend or family | 22 | 62.9% | 13 | 37.1% | 35 | |
| | 6-Reporting to police or authority | 25 | 50% | 25 | 50% | 50 | |
| | 7-I stayed away from the person bullying me or the website | 0 | 0% | 3 | 100% | 3 | |
| | 8-I made a joke of it | 14 | 42.4% | 19 | 57.6% | 33 | |
| | 9- ignoring it & asking for help from someone trust | 35 | 46.1% | 41 | 53.9% | 76 | |
| | 10-keeping a record of nasty emails& reporting to police | 52 | 63.4% | 30 | 36.6% | 82 | |

*Chi-square test **fisher exact test were used to elucidate significance.

Table (5) describes the reaction of most of the students who exposed to cyberbullying by ignoring the situation or proceed to report the account of the bullying as answered 68 and 86 students (24.9% and 31.5%) respectively, which constituted the same answer for those who didn't exposed to cyberbullying before (49 and 67 students; 21.6% and 29.5% respectively). A friend or the parents

were mostly the person/s who were be told about the cyberbullying in both the already bullied or not bullied before. Feeling anger & sorrow predominated as a feeling toward cyber bullying and ignoring the event was the best ways to stop students from bullying others online in the students opinion.

Table (6): Implications of cyberbullying on victims in the study

| Variables | | Have you been cyberbullied on social media platforms before? | | | | Total | P value |
|---|------------------------------|--|-------|------------|-------|-------|---------|
| | | Yes (N=273) | | No (N=227) | | | |
| | | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| I would like to witness more kindness and respect on social media. | 1-Strongly disagree (score1) | 2 | 25% | 6 | 75% | 8 | 0.46** |
| | 2-Disagree (score2) | 9 | 60% | 6 | 40% | 15 | |
| | 3-Neutral (score3) | 52 | 58.4% | 37 | 41.6% | 89 | |
| | 4-Agree (score4) | 122 | 54.2% | 103 | 45.8% | 225 | |
| | 5-Strongly agree (score5) | 88 | 54% | 75 | 46% | 163 | |
| I would report being cyberbullied | 1-Strongly disagree (score1) | 14 | 63.6% | 8 | 36.4% | 22 | 0.19* |
| | 2-Disagree (score2) | 15 | 50% | 15 | 50% | 30 | |
| | 3-Neutral (score3) | 58 | 65.2% | 31 | 34.8% | 89 | |
| | 4-Agree (score4) | 125 | 51.7% | 117 | 48.3% | 242 | |
| | 5-Strongly agree (score5) | 61 | 52.1% | 56 | 47.9% | 117 | |
| There are effective ways to stop cyberbullying | 1-Strongly disagree (score1) | 25 | 52.1% | 23 | 47.9% | 48 | 0.42* |
| | 2-Disagree (score2) | 61 | 61% | 39 | 39% | 100 | |
| | 3-Neutral (score3) | 43 | 47.3% | 48 | 52.7% | 91 | |
| | 4-Agree (score4) | 91 | 55.8% | 72 | 44.2% | 163 | |
| | 5-Strongly agree (score5) | 53 | 54.1% | 45 | 45.9% | 98 | |
| I would like to see more strict laws dealing with cyberbullies. | 1-Strongly disagree (score1) | 1 | 100% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0.7** |
| | 2-Disagree (score2) | 5 | 55.6% | 4 | 44.4% | 9 | |
| | 3-Neutral (score3) | 41 | 48.8% | 43 | 51.2% | 84 | |
| | 4-Agree (score4) | 128 | 55.7% | 102 | 44.3% | 230 | |
| | 5-Strongly agree (score5) | 98 | 55.7% | 78 | 44.3% | 176 | |
| Cyberbullying online is the same as offline (real world). | 1-Strongly disagree (score1) | 11 | 55% | 9 | 45% | 20 | 0.8* |
| | 2-Disagree (score2) | 37 | 53.6% | 32 | 46.4% | 69 | |
| | 3-Neutral (score3) | 112 | 57.4% | 83 | 42.6% | 195 | |
| | 4-Agree (score4) | 73 | 50.7% | 71 | 49.3% | 144 | |
| | 5-Strongly agree (score5) | 40 | 55.6% | 32 | 44.4% | 72 | |
| Cyberbullying is a crime like any other crime | 1-Strongly disagree (score1) | 2 | 66.7% | 1 | 33.3% | 3 | 0.8** |
| | 2-Disagree (score2) | 7 | 58.3% | 5 | 41.7% | 12 | |
| | 3-Neutral (score3) | 37 | 59.7% | 25 | 40.3% | 62 | |
| | 4-Agree (score4) | 134 | 55.1% | 109 | 44.9% | 243 | |
| | 5-Strongly agree (score5) | 93 | 51.7% | 87 | 48.3% | 180 | |
| Cyberbullies should be Punished. | 1-Strongly disagree (score1) | 3 | 60% | 2 | 40% | 5 | 0.75* |
| | 2-Disagree (score2) | 12 | 60% | 8 | 40% | 20 | |
| | 3-Neutral (score3) | 36 | 59% | 25 | 41% | 61 | |
| | 4-Agree (score4) | 117 | 56% | 92 | 44% | 209 | |
| | 5-Strongly agree (score5) | 105 | 51.2% | 100 | 48.8% | 205 | |

*Chi-square test **fisher exact test were used to elucidate significance.

Table (6) shows the use of 5-aspects Likert scale as a tool to detect the implication of cyberbullying on Sohag University students where the answers of those who were cyberbullied before or not were mostly agreeing or strongly agreeing that they were witnessing more kindness and respect on social media, reporting being cyberbullied and believing that there were effective ways to stop cyberbullying

by strict laws dealing with cyberbullies as it is a crime ; must be punished as well as that in the offline real world

Discussion:

In this study the percentage of cyberbullying among students was 54.6%, the majority of them were males 53.11% but there is no statistically relation

between subjected to cyberbullying before and gender, with p-value ($p=0.185$). In Jara et al. (2017) males were more than females. Unlike researches done in Bani-suef, which showed that females are more than males.

In our study the prevalence was higher in single than married students. We found also that students in age from 18 to 29 were more exposed to cyberbullying unlike Raskauskas & Stoltz, (2007) which showed that the age between 13-18 years are more to be exposed to cyberbullying.⁽¹⁰⁾

The students which live with friends and relatives are more likely to be exposed to cyberbullying than who live with family and this is in line with Buelga et al. (2017) which discuss the family role and its importance in preventing cyberbullying. The more academic years they have, the greater the effects of cyberbullying. Additionally, the more educated the parents are, the greater the effects of cyberbullying on their children.⁽¹¹⁾

Students who use their own devices for Internet access report seeing more instances of cyberbullying than those who use shared devices. It seems sense that higher instances of cyberbullying would be seen among students who use personal devices to access the Internet. Compared to those who use shared devices to access the Internet, individuals who own personal devices have more time, flexibility, and tolerance to use the Internet around-the-clock and participate in online communities.

Regarding the group that had experienced cyberbullying prior to now, their range was 1-8 with a median and interquartile range of 3(2,4). In contrast, the group that had not experienced cyberbullying prior to now had a range of 1-8 with a median and interquartile range of 3(2,4). A statistically significant relationship was found between the number of siblings and having experienced cyberbullying prior to now, with a p-value of 0.004, which is consistent with Monks et al. (2009).⁽¹²⁾

An important aspect for consideration is that the degree of severity of cyberbullying, like traditional

bullying, can have short-, medium-, and long-term effects on victims.

To help victims of cyberbullying, they should be able to reach out for help without feeling scared or intimidated by any consequences. Faculty and staff of educational institutions can hold seminars or sessions to educate children and youth on the negative impacts of cyberbullying.

These should not be onetime awareness sessions, rather comprehensive, detailed programs to help combat cyberbullying. Counseling is also a remedial approach to help victims of cyberbullying.

References:

1. **Arafa A, Senosy S.** Pattern and correlates of cyberbullying victimization among Egyptian university students in Beni-Suef, Egypt. *Journal of Egyptian Public Health Association.* 2017 Jun 1;92(2):107-15
2. **Farid SF.** Conceptual framework of the impact of health technology on healthcare system. *Frontiers in pharmacology.* 2019 Sep 3;10:933.
3. **Amichai-Hamburger Y, Hayat Z.** The impact of the Internet on the social lives of users: A representative sample from 13 countries. *Computers in Human Behavior.* 2011 Jan 1;27(1):585-9.
4. **Subrahmanyam K, Smahel D, Subrahmanyam K, Šmahel D.** The darker sides of the internet: violence, cyber bullying, and victimization. *Digital youth: The role of media in development.* 2011:179-99.
5. **Lindfors PL, Kaltiala-Heino R, Rimpelä AH.** Cyberbullying among Finnish adolescents—a population-based study. *BMC public health.* 2012 Dec;12(1):1-5.
6. **Kowalski RM, Limber SP.** Psychological, physical, and academic correlates of cyberbullying and traditional bullying. *Journal of adolescent health.* 2013 Jul 1;53(1):S13-20.
7. **Safaria T.** Prevalence and impact of cyberbullying in a sample of Indonesian junior high school students. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET.* 2016 Jan;15(1):82-91.
8. **Kumar, Vidhya Lakshmi, and Mark A Goldstein.** "Cyberbullying and Adolescents." *Current pediatrics*

- reports. 2020 vol. 8,3: 86-92. doi:10.1007/s40124-020-00217-6.
9. **Bauman S.** Cyberbullying in a rural intermediate school: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*. **2010** Dec;30(6):803-33.
10. **Raskauskas, J., & Stoltz, A. D.** Involvement in traditional and electronic bullying among adolescents. *Developmental psychology*, 2007. *43*(3), 564.
11. **Buelga, S., Martínez-Ferrer, B., Cava, M. J.** Differences in family climate and family communication among cyberbullies, cybervictims, and cyber bully–victims in adolescents. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 2017., *76*, 164-173.
12. **Monks CP, Smith PK, Naylor P, Barter C, Ireland JL, Coyne I.** Bullying in different contexts: Commonalities, differences and the role of theory. *Aggression and violent behavior*. **2009** Mar 1;14(2):146-56.