

Locating Cyberbullying and Mental Health in the Recent Literature

Musthafa Mubashir

Department of Media Studies, REVA University (India)

Thanveera Nasrin

Department of Psychology, University of Calicut (India)

Communication theories and related literature had significantly explored the effect of media on mental health from its early stage. These theories identified the potentiality of media discourse as a constructive phenomenon in the constitution of mental health and stigma. In this line, cyberbullying, a form of mobbing via electronic media affects the mental health. Considering this fact, this systematic review maps how academic enquires responded to the concept of cyberbullying among adolescents that invariably affect mental health. The systematic review confirms that cyberbullying is a global phenomenon, prevalent among all cultures and geographies, and enhances its frequency owing to technological advancements.

Quantitative studies tempt to quantify the mental illness and experiences associated with cyberbullying. The systematic review has also identified a deficit of methodologies for the measurement of cyberbullying and qualitative academic inquires in the recent literature. The majority of the studies conceived cyberbullying from the perspective of victims ignoring the psychological aspects of perpetrators and bystanders. To escape from this positivistic inclination, cyberbullying and mental health have to be addressed footing on the theories of performativity and materiality.

Keywords: *cyberbullying, mental health, social media, systematic review, recent literature.*

The integration of information and communication technologies (ICT) into everyday life situations has created a new type of violence among adolescents (Rice et al., 2015). This cyber-based violence can be termed cyberbullying. A review of the literature by Tokunaga (2010) observed that no articles referenced cyberbullying before 2004. Once it is identified as the potential ground of academic research, many of the early studies are confined to a specific



geography-the USA. (Patchin and Hinduja, 2006; Ybarra and Mitchell, 2004). Subsequently, scholars from different parts of the globe approached cyberbullying and its consequence on mental health. Cyberbullying is considered relatively a new phenomenon that has produced great concern in the educational and scientific community in the recent past (Chun et al., 2020). However, it is still can be viewed as in its embryonic stage because “studies have shown inconsistent findings for the definition, measurement, and prevalence of cyberbullying victimization and perpetration” (Chun et al., 2020, p. 2).

Bullying, traditional bullying in specific, is a repeated, aggressive and intentional behaviour towards one person from another person or group of people causing the victim to feel hurt; physically, mentally or emotionally (Farrington, 1993). Similarly, cyberbullying can be defined on the same lines as “willful and repeated harm inflicted through the medium of electronic text” (Patchin and Hinduja, 2006, p. 152). The existing literature suggests that the conceptualization of cyberbullying is often restricted into two elements: (a) traditional aspects of bullying and (b) an enumeration of the electronic devices through which the bullying occurs. Smith et al. (2008) observed that scholars agreed on the fact that cyberbullying is a global phenomenon and it can occur in any geographic area irrespective of socioeconomic settings of different cultures. It is significant to note that, contrary to traditional bullying, cyberbullying allows people to bully from multiple locations, the ability to be anonymous, to embarrass others with an unlimited audience and to engage in such behaviours with reduced supervision (Kernaghan and Elwood, 2013; Wiseman, 2011). Virtual space is always open, hence, cyberbullying can occur at any temporality irrespective of physical location. Likewise, the content which is already used for cyberbullying can be re-sent over and over that leads to the revictimization and often unable to stop its diffusion (Garaigordobil and Martínez Valderrey, 2018).

In a psychological view, it is important to understand how cyberbullying is studied in the light of mental health. In this systematic review, mental health problems are envisaged as “a recognizable set of emotional problems, symptoms or behaviours associated with considerable distress and substantial interference with personal functions” (Borges Bottino et al., 2015, p. 464). The Internet penetration among youth, who are the potential subjects of cyberbullying, and their online spending time contribute to the constitution of stigma and mental illness. Guan and Subrahmanyam (2009) identified negative consequences of online activities such as addiction, cyberbullying and sexual solicitation among youth which, subsequently, lead to mental illness. A growing body of literature suggests that cyberbullying behaviour peaks during the middle school years and the impact is worldwide (Faucher et al., 2014). In this scenario, the influence of cyberbullying on mental health cannot be left as futile in the related literature. In doing so, this systematic review aims to map the cyberbullying and mental health in the recent literature.

Systematic review seeks to answer focused research questions through a structured review of the evidence. It examines “pre-defined research questions using explicit, reproducible methods to identify, critically appraise and combine results of primary research studies” (Pollock and Berge, 2018, p. 138). Such

reviews emerged in the late 1970s in social sciences and related disciplines (Jahan et al., 2016) which typically search for relevant literature on a particular topic maintaining objectivity in the selection process (Uman, 2011). The primary intention is to provide an exhaustive summary of current evidence, published and unpublished, which is methodical, comprehensive, transparent and replicable (Cooper et al., 2018; Linnenluecke et al., 2019).

Believing in the prominence of systematic reviews, this paper investigates the recent literature (2008-2020) published in the field of media in relation to mental health. It is significant to note that technological advancements and social media have destructed the dominant patterns of established media. Communication theories and related literature had significantly explored the effect of media on mental health from its early stage. Thus this study has formulated its aim asking how academic enquires responded to the concept of cyberbullying among adolescents that invariably affect mental health.

METHODOLOGY

Investigators performed a systematic search on Google Scholar with key term 'cyberbullying+among+adolescents'. The search limited to a period between 2008 to 2020. The search revealed a total number of 2320 results. The results included books, reviews and journal articles. In the next phase, we excluded all other publications except journal articles that published in the English language. The articles were again manually refined by using the keyword combinations of 'cyberbullying', 'adolescents' and 'mental health'. The results produced 156 articles. We further ensured that cyberbullying is included as one of the variables of enquiry and the studies have taken adolescents (between 10 and 18 years of age) as their samples. After identifying 16 such studies, we verified if the full text of article was available on the Internet. In short, this systematic review selected 16 studies by ensuring that each article meets the five phases of inclusion criteria: (a) studies which are published between the years 2008 and 2020, (b) studies that are published in the English language, (c) studies that are produced in the form of journal articles (d) studies that contain cyberbullying as one of the variables of enquiry and (d) studies have taken adolescents (between 10 and 18 years of age) as their samples.

A close examination of 16 articles, which carry a common variable *cyberbullying among adolescents*, revealed that they rigorously map cyberbullying and mental health in the recent literature. Needless to say, all the studies address other variables along with cyberbullying such as online experience, social media usage, mental health and stigma. The list of the studies is given in the Table 1.

Table 1. Studies that are included in the systematic review on cyberbullying

Sl. No	Author(s)	Title of the study	Journal of publication
1	Vandebosch and Cleemput (2008)	Defining cyberbullying: A qualitative research into the perceptions of youngsters	CyberPsychology & Behavior
2	Cassidy et al. (2009)	Sticks and stones can break my bones, but how can pixels hurt me?: Students' experiences with cyber-bullying	School Psychology International
3	Vandebosch and Cleemput (2009)	Cyberbullying among youngsters: Profiles of bullies and victims	New Media & Society
4	Huang and Chou (2010)	An analysis of multiple factors of cyberbullying among junior high school students in Taiwan	Computers in Human Behavior
5	Li (2010)	Cyberbullying in high schools: A study of students' behaviours and beliefs about this new phenomenon	Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma
6	Varjas et al. (2010)	High school students' perceptions of motivations for cyberbullying: An exploratory study	Western Journal of Emergency Medicine
7	Aoyama et al. (2011)	Cyberbullying among high school students: Cluster analysis of sex and age differences and the level of parental monitoring	International Journal of Cyber Behavior, Psychology and Learning
8	Lindfors et al. (2012)	Cyberbullying among finnish adolescents: A population-based study	BMC Public Health
9	Holfeld and Grabe (2012)	middle school students' perceptions of and responses to cyber bullying	Journal of Educational Computing Research
10	Mishna et al. (2012).	Risk factors for involvement in cyber bullying: Victims, bullies and bully-victims	Children and Youth Services Review
11	Holfeld and Leadbeater (2015)	The nature and frequency of cyber bullying behaviours and victimization experiences in young Canadian children	Canadian Journal of School Psychology
12	Rice et al. (2015)	Cyberbullying perpetration and victimization among middle-school students	American Journal of Public Health
13	Baldry et al. (2017)	School Bullying and cyber bullying among boys and girls: Roles and overlap	Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma

Sl. No	Author(s)	Title of the study	Journal of publication
14	Lee and Shin (2017)	Prevalence of cyberbullying and predictors of cyberbullying perpetration among Korean adolescents	Computers in Human Behavior
15	Wang et al. (2019)	"I felt angry, but I couldn't do anything about it": A qualitative study of cyberbullying among Taiwanese high school students	BMC Public Health
16	Chi et al. (2020)	Online time, experience of cyber bullying and practices to cope with it among high school students in Hanoi	Health Psychology Open

Source: Own elaboration.

ANALYSIS

The systematic review primarily analysed the recent literature with the following parameters: (a) variables and research designs (b) methodologies for the measurement of cyberbullying (c) the usage, gender and platforms (d) motives of cyberbullying (e) cyberbullying and mental health in recent literature

VARIABLES AND RESEARCH DESIGNS

The systematic review of the related literature from 2008-2020 reveals that there is a significant number of studies conducted on cyberbullying. The majority of researches adopted quantitative designs which largely ignore the fact that cyberbullying and mental health can be approached from the glances of hermeneutics. It is evident from the review that there is a conspicuous dearth of qualitative or mixed methods in related studies. Further, the inquiry into the geographies where the studies centred clearly shows an inclination towards the west. The majority of the selected studies were conducted in Canada (Cassidy et al., 2009; Holfeld and Grabe, 2012; Holfeld and Leadbeater, 2015; Li, 2010; Mishna et al., 2012) and other western countries (Aoyama et al., 2011; Baldry et al., 2017; Rice et al., 2015; Vandebosch and Cleemput, 2008, 2009). Few studies were conducted in eastern countries (Huang and Chou, 2010; Lee and Shin, 2017; Wang et al., 2019) which can be described as a geographical hierarchy live in the psychological research (Hardwicke et al., 2020; Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002).

Studies related to cyberbullying and mental health are footed on different conceptual frameworks which are reflected in the sampling methods. Some of them conceptualise the phenomenon in a positivistic glance in which cyberbullying and the persons associated with it (victims, perpetrators and witnesses) separated from the socio-cultural discourse. This seems to be negating the mutual constitution of social realities with the infinite number of events

and things (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004; Miller, 2005). Studies attempt to read cyberbullying from the perspectives of victims and perpetrators that stabilise the intensities of the phenomenon; especially the experiences and mental trauma associated with it (see the studies Cassidy et al., 2009; Lee and Shin, 2017; Vandebosch and Cleemput, 2009). In the traditional sense, bullying is considered as a violent act occurring between a perpetrator and a victim. There is one more variable involved in the bullying termed as bystanders who witness the bullying (Steffgen and König, 2009). Understanding this, some studies were conducted among perpetrators, victims and bystanders or witnesses (Holfeld and Grabe, 2012; Huang and Chou, 2010; Li, 2010; Lindfors et al., 2012). Similarly, apart from these three variables, one more variable is added to cyberbullying known as victim-perpetrator who are simultaneously involved in both the actions. This is possible in cyberbullying because, unlike in traditional bullying, cyberbullying does not need physical dominance. A mobile phone or a computer with an Internet connection enables the possibility of cyberbullying. Here, all the subjects are capable of committing cyberbullying and are equally vulnerable to cyberbullying. Understanding this dimension, many studies bring victim-perpetrator into the investigation (Baldry et al., 2017; Mishna et al., 2012; Rice et al., 2015). Cyberspace destabilises the traditional forms of power structure (Foucault, 1991). The hierarchy of power relationships is not visibly manifested in the virtual space as social media is conceived as more *democratic* (Entwistle and Wissinger, 2021); therefore, there could be more perpetrator-victims in cyberspace and the role-turning cycle gains strength (Huang and Chou, 2010). Studies differ in their focal point which consequently leads to different methodologies. Table 2 shows the details of the sampling, research design and focus of the studies included in this review.

Table 2. Illustration of sampling, research design and objectives of the selected studies

Studies	Sample	Research design	Focus/objectives of the study
Vandebosch and Cleemput, (2008)	279 youngsters aged from 11-19 of Belgium.	Qualitative study	The students' perceptions of cyberbullying.
Cassidy et al. (2009)	365 middle school students, aged 11-15 of Canada.	Mixed method study	The students' experiences with cyberbullying.
Vandebosch and Cleemput (2009)	2052 primary and secondary school children in Belgium.	Quantitative study	The profiles of cyber bullies and victims.
Huang and Chou (2010)	545 students of junior high schools in Taiwan.	Quantitative study	Effects of various factors (gender, culture, academic achievement, type of tool, etc.) and three roles in cyberbullying: Bully, victim and bystander.
Li (2010)	269 students of grade 7 in western Canada.	Quantitative study	Students' behaviours and beliefs about cyberbullying.

Studies	Sample	Research design	Focus/objectives of the study
Lindfors et al. (2012)	5516 adolescents aged between 12-18 in Finland.	Quantitative study	Exposure to cyberbullying among 12 to 18-year-old adolescents.
Varjas et al. (2010)	20 high school students from a suburban high school-aged from 15-19.	Qualitative study	High school students' perceptions of the motivations for cyberbullying.
Aoyama et al. (2011)	133 high school students in Central Texas.	Quantitative study	Sex, age and the level of parental monitoring differences in cyberbullying.
Holfeld and Grabe (2012)	665 middle school students in Manitoba (Canada) and North Dakota (US).	Quantitative study	The nature and extent of middle school students' experience(s) with cyber bullying with a specific focus on how youth respond when they are involved in cyberbullying.
Mishna et al. (2012)	2186 middle and high school students of Canada.	Quantitative study	Risk factors for involvement in cyberbullying: victims, bullies and bully-victims.
Holfeld and Leadbeater (2015)	714 students of fifth- and sixth-grade in Canada.	Quantitative study	Frequency of cyberbullying behaviours and experiences.
Rice et al. (2015)	1285 middle-high school students in Los Angeles.	Quantitative study	Explores the role of sexual identity, gender, race, and technology use patterns in cyberbullying.
Baldry et al. (2017)	2,785 Italian students with an average age from 11-17 years.	Quantitative study	Students' involvement in cyberbullying as bully, victim and bully-victim.
Lee and Shin (2017)	4000 Korean middle and high school students.	Quantitative study	Prevalence of cyberbullying and factors in cyberbullying perpetration.
Wang et al. (2019)	48 high school students aged 16-18 from five high schools in Taiwan.	Qualitative study	The students' experiences and perceptions of cyberbullying.
Chi et al. (2020)	215 students 13-18 years secondary schools and high schools in Hanoi, Vietnam.	Quantitative study	Experiences and practices to cope with cyberbullying among high school students.

Source: Own elaboration.

METHODOLOGIES FOR THE MEASUREMENT OF CYBERBULLYING

Scholars agreed on the fact that cyberbullying exist all over the world once the technology is implemented. However, the lack of standard measurement to establish its prevalence is evident in the literature. Comparing prevalence among different geographies and cultures is problematic and complex in nature

because the methodology for measurement is in its embryonic stage. Lindfors et al. (2012) find that the proportion of adolescents who has exposure to at least one of the measured dimensions of cyberbullying (cyber victim, perpetrator and bystanders) is 23% in Finland. Meanwhile, Huang and Chou (2010) reported that out of the 545 students of junior high schools in Taiwan, 34.9% have been cyberbullied and 20.4% have cyberbullied others. Similarly, Mishna et al., (2012) observe that almost one-quarter of the students (23.8%) reported being victimized, 8% reported that they have cyberbullied others and one in four students (25.7%) reported having been involved in any forms of cyberbullying either as bully or victim among the sample of 2186 middle and high school students of Canada. A recent study conducted by Chi et al., (2020) calculates the size of perpetrators (14.4%), victims (45.1%) and witnesses (47%) of the violence in Vietnam. The difference in results is not exclusively related to its sampling size. Rather, epistemological preferences, types of measurement and styles of the survey are contributed to the considerable difference in figures of prevalence. Further, the time reference used and the psychometric properties of the instrument influence the prevalence rates yielded. Table 3 illustrates the different instruments used, sample items of the instrument and the recalling time used as a time frame reference.

Table 3. Details of the instrument used, sample items and recalling time of quantitative studies selected

Study	Instrument used	Example/ sample items	Recalling time
Baldry et al. (2017)	Survey through items derived from The Students' Needs Assessment Scale (Willard, 2007).	Five cyberbullying and five cyber victimization items.	The previous 6 months.
Lindfors et al. (2012)	Four dichotomous questions In terms of cyberbullying,	Have you or your friend been bullied? Was the bullying serious and disturbed your life? Have you bullied others or participated in bullying others?	The previous year.
Rice et al. (2015)	A 5 point Likert scale Survey.	How often have you electronically bullied someone else? How often have you been electronically bullied by someone?	The previous year.
Holfeld and Grabe (2012)	Survey form was developed by the researchers.	Involvement in cyberbullying as a victim, bully, and/or witness, the frequency of their experience(s)	The previous one year and the previous 30 days.

Study	Instrument used	Example/ sample items	Recalling time
Holfeld and Leadbeater (2015)	A measure of cyberbullying and victimization created based on items adopted and modified from the Bullying and Cyberbullying: Perpetrators, Victims, and Witnesses Survey (B&C: PVWS; Mishna, Schwan, Lefebvre, Bhole, and Johnston, 2014).	Have you sent someone a text message on your cell phone to make them angry or to make fun of them? Have you started a rumor online about another person?	The previous 30 days.
Chi et al. (2020)	Tool from the research of Patchin and Hinduja (2006).	Received rude or upsetting messages/photos; (3) being isolated or detached from your online group.	The previous year.
Mishna et al. (2012)	The survey questions were informed by several sources including information gathered in focus groups that had been conducted by the research team with students in the targeted grades.	A series of questions about perpetrating (seven items) or being the victim (six items) of various online behaviours, without explicitly defining the behaviours as bullying.	The previous three months.
Vandebosch and Cleemput (2009)	In the survey, the respondents were asked how often they had been involved with bullying as a victim, perpetrator or bystander	Experience of seven forms of aggressive acts.	The previous three months.
Aoyama et al. (2011)	The self-report survey modified from a model by Willard (2007).	The frequency of cyberbullying offending behaviours.	The previous 6 months.

Source: Own elaboration.

Holfeld and Grabe (2012) noted that 20% of participants reported cyberbullying when the time frame reference was the previous one year. Meanwhile, when the time frame reference was changed to the past 30 days, it was 55% of the cyberbullied participants reported cyberbullying. The difference in prevalence is profound due to the recalling time. The two common tools adopted to measure the cyberbullying and mental health issues are based on the interview/questionnaire: (a) asking respondents specifically whether they have been the victim, perpetrator or the bystander of bullying via electronic communication means and (b) asking respondents in general whether they have been actively or passively involved in hurtful internet or mobile phone activities. When the adolescents was explicitly asked about *bullying* and *being bullied*, rather than the *involvement* of such acts, respondents reported lower rates of bullying (Mishna et al., 2012). Vandebosch and Cleemput (2009) asked the participants directly whether they have ever been actively or passively involved in bullying via the

Internet or mobile phone, one out of 10 respondents answered that they had been a victim, almost two out of 10 had been perpetrators, and about three out of 10 had been bystanders. However, the results of this study revealed that many respondents have experience with the electronic variants of these types of offensive behaviours which are often considered to be 'forms of bullying' (61.9% of respondents had been victims, 52.5% had been perpetrators and 76.3% had been bystanders to at least once in their lifetime). The inconsistent figures resulting from the direct and indirect measurements of cyberbullying suggest that, often, respondents and researchers comprehend the phenomenon of cyberbullying differently. It indicates inadequate methodologies and perceptions for the measurement of cyberbullying to investigate it in the light of mental health.

THE USAGE, GENDER AND PLATFORMS

Studies have predominantly linked the phenomenon of cyberbullying with the use of the Internet. The use of technology has been directly associated with the frequency of cyberbullying. Nearly 90% of people between the ages of 18 and 29 used at least one form of social media (Dollarhide, 2021), hence, according to the studies, potential chances for cyberbullying enhance. High levels of internet usage (more than 3 hours a day) was positively associated with being a cyberbullying perpetrator, victim and perpetrator-victim (Chi et al., 2020; Holfeld and Grabe, 2012; Mishna et al., 2012; Rice et al., 2015); and having internet rules at home (such as time limit imposed by parents) was negatively related with cyberbullying (Rice et al., 2015). In doing so, as we have seen in the conceptual inadequacy and the confinement of cyberbullying into associated actors.

Studies that have investigated whether gender differences exist among victims of cyberbullying have been yielded inconsistent results. Some studies showed that boys were more likely to be cyberbullying perpetrators than girls (Aoyama et al., 2011; Baldry et al., 2017; Holfeld and Leadbeater, 2015; Huang and Chou, 2010; Lee and Shin, 2017; Lindfors et al., 2012) which is in contrast with the results of Holfeld and Grabe (2012). Similarly, considering victimization, the majority of the studies revealed that females are the potential gender likely to be more victims (Baldry et al., 2017; Holfeld and Grabe, 2012; Holfeld and Leadbeater, 2015; Lee and Shin, 2017) which is opposed by the findings of some other studies (Huang and Chou, 2010; Lindfors et al., 2012). The difference in prevalence rate and gender differences can be contributed to different factors such as inconsistencies in the operationalization and measurement of cyberbullying across studies along with several methodological issues including sample selection, study design and scale psychometrics.

Cyberbullying may occur on different social media/internet platforms. Specific features of each platform may affect how cyberbullying is enacted and experienced. Earlier studies suggested that instant messaging, chat rooms and message boards were the most common mediums for middle-school students who experienced and perpetrated cyberbullying (Cassidy et al., 2009; Holfeld and Grabe, 2012; Huang and Chou, 2010). More recently, young people have

migrated to social networking sites such as Facebook and Instagram (Rice et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2019) which necessitates academic inquiries of cyberbullying across contemporary and emerging platforms for youth interaction. This will help to understand the dimensions of mental health across platforms.

Different forms of cyberbullying exist among adolescents. Studies showed that common forms of cyberbullying include name-calling (gossiping), isolation, threatening, outing, making fun of other's slang and sending cruel and nasty messages (Baldry et al., 2017; Chi et al., 2020; Holfeld and Leadbeater, 2015; Huang and Chou, 2010; Wang et al., 2019) which contributes to the different aspects of mental health. Lee and Shin (2017) had found gender differences in the forms of cyberbullying perpetration and victimization behaviours. Boys used chatting services, online gaming and photos/videos than the girls for cyberbullying perpetration. On the other hand, girls tended to employ exclusion strategies than boys. In the case of victimization, boys were cyberbullied through the gaming platforms by calling nasty names, whereas, girls were victimized more by being denied online friendship or joining chat rooms.

Motives of Cyberbullying

It is significant to investigate different dimensions and motives of cyberbullying explored in the literature for understanding the mental health associated with it. It is public in nature resulting in permanent victimisation unlike traditional bullying (Wang et al., 2019). Lack of social cueing and anonymity are other features of cyberbullying. Respondents explained that counter-reactions to bullying behaviour are less in the virtual space because the perpetrators can disable Internet service. Often, this leads to repetitive violence from the perpetrators (Cassidy et al., 2009; Mishna et al., 2012). For the victim, the anonymity of the perpetrator often makes it difficult to know whether the person is someone they actually knew or a stranger. However, the literature indicates that in many instances the victim has a clue about the identity of the perpetrator or is informed of the identity by the perpetrator or a third party (Holfeld and Grabe, 2012; Huang and Chou, 2010; Rice et al., 2015; Vandebosch and Cleemput, 2008).

Qualitative studies attempt to explore the motives of cyberbullying among adolescents. Varjas et al. (2010) described that high school students reported a range of internal and external motivations for cyberbullying. Internal motivations were associated with the perpetrators' emotional states including redirecting feelings, revenge, making themselves feel better, boredom, instigation, protection, jealousy, seeking approval and trying out a new persona. External motivations are derived from the factors specific to the situation or the target. This also includes anonymity/disinhibition effect, no consequences and non-confrontational target. Predominant motivation for engaging in cyberbullying perpetration was reported as 'for fun' or 'due to boredom' followed by revenge, anger, insecurities, jealousy, discrimination and punishment (Cassidy et al., 2009; Holfeld and Grabe, 2012; Vandebosch and Cleemput, 2008; Varjas et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2019). Further, qualitative examination of the motives revealed that students are more likely to be cyberbullied because of specific attributes such as

special needs, academic abilities, un-popularity, physical appearance, physical and mental disabilities, unfashionable clothing, sexual orientation and ethnicity (Cassidy et al., 2009; Vandebosch and Cleemput, 2008; Varjas et al., 2010).

Being vocal about cyberbullying is important for mental health. However, many victims responded that they wanted to avoid both triggering parental concern and labelling to be the “the weak one” (Huang and Chou, 2010). Some did not report to parents fearing the restriction of access to technology (Cassidy et al., 2009; Li, 2010). Similarly, in the case of reporting cyberbullying to teachers, students possibly do not believe that teachers would handle the matter effectively and reporting might not only be useless but counter-productive (Cassidy et al., 2009; Huang and Chou, 2010; Li, 2010). In contrast, Holfeld and Grabe (2012) argued that the majority of participants (83%) indicated teachers tried to stop cyberbullying once they were aware of it.

CYBERBULLYING AND MENTAL HEALTH IN RECENT LITERATURE

Generally, cyberbullying is considered as one of the triggering phenomena of mental illness. Understanding this, many researchers adopted focus group discussions as their method of collecting data. Cassidy et al. (2009) investigated cyberbullying extensively by collecting data from the adolescents through a detailed survey. It helped studies to comprehend adolescents' perceptions of cyberbullying. For instance, Vandebosch and Cleemput (2008) exclusively looked into the adolescents' perceptions of cyberbullying and their study concluded stating adolescents perceive that victim gets hurt mentally by cyberbullying. On the other hand, it seems that scholars limited their inquiry into cyberbullying without approaching its effects on the mental health of adolescents. Studies significantly addressed the types of cyberbullying, the impact of cyber-bullying and incidents associated with the victims and perpetrators. Studies also sought solutions to cyberbullying and inquired reporting practices to authorities (Cassidy et al., 2009). The researchers yet not indulged in the mental health issues that cyberbullying can cause.

Vandebosch and Cleemput (2009) analysed profiles of cyberbullying perpetrators and victims with respect to their socioeconomic status, popularity and number of friends and experience of traditional bullying. The study concluded that the phenomenon of cyberbullying is not a marginal problem but had not discussed its effects on mental health. Similarly, a study based on the junior high school students of Taiwan conducted by Huang and Chou (2010) analysed the multiple contributors of cyberbullying such as technology usage, experiences with traditional bullying, gender difference and academic achievements or difference. They had also not looked into the impact of cyberbullying on mental health. Li (2010) explored the Canadian students' beliefs and behaviours associated with cyberbullying. The study looked into cyberbullying through four perspectives: (a) reaction, (b) behaviour, (c) consequence of informing others and (d) helper. The researcher found out that there are issues caused to the victim due to cyberbullying, still had not looked into what issues those are and how it affects them i.e. qualitative inquiries are highly needed to address these parameters.

A population-based study on Finnish adolescents conducted by Lindfors et al. (2012) stated that the participants rarely considered cyberbullying a serious or disruptive issue. Varjas et al. (2010) focused on the motivation for engaging in cyberbullying and explored the same by interviewing high school students. This study succeeded in providing a framework that substantiates to explicate the internal and external factors of motives of cyberbullying. The study acts as an aid for the development of preventive interventions that may avert the behaviour of cyberbullying and, consequently, its negative effects on mental health.

Aoyama et al. (2011) confined the investigation into the analysis of cyberbullying among high school students emphasising sex, age and the level of parental monitoring. Similar to many studies, this has also ignored the aspects of mental health. Holfeld and Grabe (2012) investigated the middle school students' perceptions of and responses to cyberbullying. They explored the nature and extent of cyberbullying practices and the sequences of the sequence of events that occur when middle school students are involved in cyberbullying. The study agreed that cyberbullying is problematic behaviour but does not analyse how and what the effects are contributing to mental health.

Wang et al. (2019) qualitatively addressed cyberbullying and associated experiences of Taiwanese high school students. The study explored themes such as the sites, features, types and motivation of cyberbullying. Importantly, the study reported how the participants felt when they have undergone the cyberbullying and effects of cyberbullying on the mental health of the victim. However, the impact of cyberbullying on perpetrators' mental health is not addressed. Chi et al. (2020) also looked into the matter placing the victims at its centre and the perpetrators at its periphery. Overtly, many studies addressed the mental health of victims but not of the perpetrators or bystanders.

Considering the importance of mental health associated with new media and cyberbullying a sizeable portion of the victims seems to ignore its effects on mental health (Chi et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2019). Some of the victims responded that they have developed their own strategies such as talking to friends, inviting the intervention from teachers, confrontation, blocking the perpetrator, deleting the account and leaving the group (Chi et al., 2020; Vandebosch and Cleemput, 2008; Wang et al., 2019). Chi et al. (2020) reported that 23.7% of the cyberbullying victims saved evidence for revenge later. This in turn gives rise to the cyber victim-perpetrators and mental health-related issues.

CONCLUSION

This systematic review of 16 articles on cyberbullying and mental health among adolescents attempted to explore the phenomenon in recent literature (2008-2020). The review confirms that cyberbullying is a global phenomenon, prevalent among all cultures and geographies, enhances its frequency owing to technological advancements. Cyberbullying among adolescents is a critical problem affected on mental health. This review identified a significant dearth of qualitative studies related to cyberbullying and mental health. Quantitative studies tempt to quantify

the mental illness and experience associated with cyberbullying. Importantly, such positivistic approaches confine the phenomenon of cyberbullying into three associated subjects —victims, perpetrators and bystanders— and read it footing on their perspective. This review also identified a lack of methodologies and standardised tools for the measurement of cyberbullying which are important to conceive the idea of cyberbullying. If not, it leads to an *over-involvement* of other associated cyber-crimes into cyberbullying. Recent related literature included many variables such as gender, forms of cyberbullying, different social media platforms and motives of cyberbullying. However, mental health is addressed without providing exclusive academic attention. It is evident from the fact that mental health is conceived from the perspective of victims in the literature rather than the perpetrators and bystanders. To conclude, this review suggests more qualitative inquires, as Mubashir and Haneef (2020) proposed, which address cyberbullying and mental health from the perspectives of performativity and materiality that equally include all the contributors.

Musthafa Mubashir, PhD, is an assistant professor in the Department of Media Studies, REVA University, Bangalore, India and received a doctoral degree from Pondicherry University. His PhD thesis primarily interrogates how dress constitutes identities on social

media, focusing on the materiality and performativity of the dress. Related interests include performativity of gender, fashion within popular cultural discourses, films and new media. He has several academic and media publications under his credit.

Thanveera Nasrin is a postgraduate student in Applied Psychology in the Department of Psychology, University of Calicut, Kerala, In-

dia. With a keen interest in Social Psychology, she focuses her research on the behaviour of youth in cyberspace.

References

- Aoyama, Ikuko; Barnard-Brak, Lucy, and Talbert, Tony L. (2011). Cyberbullying among high school students: Cluster analysis of sex and age differences and the level of parental monitoring. *International Journal of Cyber Behavior, Psychology and Learning*, 1(1), 25-35.
- Baldry, Anna Costanza; Farrington, David P., and Sorrentino, Anna (2017). School bullying and cyberbullying among boys and girls: Roles and overlap. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 26(9), 937-951.
- Borges Bottino, Sara Mota; Bottino, Cássio M. C; Gómez Regina, Caroline; Villa Lobo Correia, Aline, and Silva Ribeiro, Wagner (2015). Cyberbullying and adolescent mental health: Systematic review. *Cadernos de Saúde Pública*, 31(3), 463-475.

- Cassidy, Wanda; Jackson, Margaret, and Brown, Karen N. (2009). Sticks and stones can break my bones, but how can pixels hurt me? Students' experiences with cyber-bullying. *School Psychology International*, 30(4), 383-402.
- Chi, Pham Thi Lan; Lan, Vu Thi Hoang; Ngan, Nguyen Hanh, and Linh, Nguyen Thuy (2020). Online time, experience of cyber bullying and practices to cope with it among high school students in Hanoi. *Health Psychology Open*, 7(1).
- Chun, Jongserl; Lee, Jungup; Kim, Jinyung, and Lee, Serim (2020). An international systematic review of cyberbullying measurements. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 113(2).
- Cooper, Chris; Booth, Andrew; Varley-Campbell, Jo; Britten, Nicky, and Garside, Ruth (2018). Defining the process to literature searching in systematic reviews: A literature review of guidance and supporting studies. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 18(1), 1-14.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Félix (2004). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Continuum.
- Dollarhide, Maya E. (2021). Social media: Sharing ideas and thoughts. *Investopedia*. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/s/social-media.asp>. Accessed 11 March 2022.
- Entwistle, Joanne and Wissinger, Elizabeth (2021). Dress like a mum/mom: Instagram style mums and the fashionable ideal. *Fashion Theory*, 1-38.
- Farrington, David P. (1993). Understanding and preventing bullying. *Crime and Justice*, 17, 381-458.
- Faucher, Chantal; Jackson Margaret, and Cassidy, Wanda (2014). Cyberbullying among university students: Gendered experiences, impacts, and perspectives. *Education Research International*, 2014, p. e698545.
- Foucault, Michael (1991). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. Penguin.
- Garaigordobil, Maite and Martínez Valderrey, Vanesa (2018). Technological resources to prevent cyberbullying during adolescence: The cyberprogram 2.0 program and the cooperative cybereduca 2.0 videogame. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9.
- Guan, Shu-Sha Angie and Subrahmanyam, Kaveri (2009). Youth Internet use: Risks and opportunities. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*, 22(4), 351-356.
- Hardwicke, Tom E.; Wallach, Joshua D.; Kidwell, Mallory C.; Bendixen, Theiss; Crüwell, Sophia, and Ioannidis, John P. A. (2020). An empirical assessment of transparency and reproducibility-related research practices in the social sciences (2014-2017). *Royal Society Open Science*, 7(2).
- Holfeld, Brett and Grabe, Mark (2012). Middle school students' perceptions of and responses to cyberbullying. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 46(4), 395-413.
- Holfeld, Brett and Leadbeater, Bonnie J. (2015). The nature and frequency of cyberbullying behaviors and victimization experiences in young Canadian children. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 30(2), 116-135.
- Huang, Yun-yin and Chou, Chien (2010). An analysis of multiple factors of cyberbullying among junior high school students in Taiwan. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(6), 1581-1590.
- Jahan, Nusrat; Naveed, Sadiq; Zeshan, Muhammad, and Tahir, Muhammad A. (2016). How to conduct a systematic review: A narrative literature review. *Cureus*, 8(11).
- Kernaghan, Donna and Elwood, Jannette (2013). All the (cyber) world's a stage: Framing cyberbullying as a performance. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace*, 7(1).
- Lee, Changho and Shin, Namin (2017). Prevalence of cyberbullying and predictors of cyberbullying perpetration among Korean

- adolescents. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 68, 352-358.
- Li, Qing (2010). Cyberbullying in high schools: A study of students' behaviors and beliefs about this new phenomenon. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, Routledge, 19(4), 372-392.
- Lindfors, Pirjo L.; Kaltiala-Heino, Riittakerttu and Rimpelä, Arja H. (2012). Cyberbullying among finnish adolescents: A population-based study. *BMC Public Health*, 12(1027).
- Linnenluecke, Martina K.; Marrone, Mauricio, and Singh, Abhay K. (2019). Conducting systematic literature reviews and bibliometric analyses. *Australian Journal of Management*, 45(2), 175-194.
- Miller, Daniel (2005). Materiality: An introduction. In Daniel Miller (Ed.), *Materiality* (pp. 1-51). Duke University Press.
- Mishna, Faye; Khoury-Kassabri, Mona; Gadalla, Tahany, and Daciuk, Joanne (2012). Risk factors for involvement in cyber bullying: Victims, bullies and bully-victims. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34(1), 63-70.
- Mubashir, Musthafa and Haneef, Shuaib Mohamed (2020). Dress and Gulf imagery in two Malayalam films: *Pathemari* and *Marubhoomiyile Aana*. *Film, Fashion & Consumption*, 9(2), 177-192.
- Patchin, Justin W. and Hinduja, Sameer (2006). Bullies move beyond the schoolyard: A preliminary look at cyberbullying. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 4(2), 148-169.
- Pollock, Alex and Berge, Eivind (2018). How to do a systematic review. *International Journal of Stroke*, 13(2), 138-156.
- Rice, Eric; Petering, Robin; Rhoades, Harmony; Winetrobe, Hailey; Goldbach, Jeremy; Plant, Aaron; Montoya, Jorge, and Kordic, Timothy (2015). Cyberbullying perpetration and victimization among middle-school students. *American Journal of Public Health*, 105(3), 66-72.
- Smith, Peter K.; Mahdavi, Jess; Carvalho, Manuel; Fisher, Sonja; Russell, Shanette, and Tippett, Neil (2008). Cyberbullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 49(4), 376-385.
- Steffgen, Georges and König, Andreas (2009). Cyber bullying: The role of traditional bullying and empathy. Presented at the *The good, the bad and the challenging. Conference Proceedings*, 2, Brussels.
- Tokunaga, Robert 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.
- Uman, Lindsay S. (2011). Systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 20(1), 57-59.
- Vandebosch, Heidi and Cleemput, Katrien van (2008). Defining cyberbullying: A qualitative research into the perceptions of youngsters. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 11(4), 499-503.
- Vandebosch, Heidi and Cleemput, Katrien van (2009). Cyberbullying among youngsters: Profiles of bullies and victims. *New Media & Society*, 11(8), 1349-1371.
- Varjas, Kris; Talley, Jasmine; Meyers, Joel; Parris, Leandra, and Cutts, Hayley (2010). High school students' perceptions of motivations for cyberbullying: An exploratory study. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 11(3), 269-273.
- Wang, Chia-Wen; Musumari, Patou Masika; Techarivichien, Teeranee; Suguimoto, S. Pilar; Chan, Chang-Chuan; Ono-Kihara, Masako; Kihara, Masahiro, and Nakayama, Takeo (2019). 'I felt angry, but I couldn't do anything about it': A qualitative study of cyberbullying among Taiwanese high school students. *BMC Public Health*, 19(1).
- Willard, Nancy E. (2007). *Cyberbullying and cyberthreats: Responding to the challenge of*

- online social aggression, threats, and distress*, 2nd edition. Research Press.
- Wimmer, Andreas and Glick Schiller, Nina (2002). Methodological nationalism and beyond: Nation-state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks*, 2(4), 301-334.
- Wiseman, Brian (2011). Cyberbullying in schools: A research study on school policies and procedures. University of Nevada.
- Ybarra, Michele L. and Mitchell, Kimberly J. (2004). Youth engaging in online harassment: Associations with caregiver-child relationships, Internet use, and personal characteristics. *Journal of Adolescence*, 27(3), 319-336.