

Exploring Cyberbullying among High School Students in Surakarta

Aniq Hudiayah Bil Haq, Permata Ashfi Raihana and Eny Purwandari

Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta

ahb123@ums.ac.id, par192@ums.ac.id dan ep271@ums.ac.id

Abstract

Advances in technology have both positive and negative impacts. When an individual acts and it injures another person using information technology media, then it can be considered as an activity of cyberbullying. However, the problems caused by cyberbullying cannot be ignored, especially cyberbullying among the high school students. This study explored the intensity of cyberbullying and other factors (gender, cyberperpetrator, bystanders, forms of cyberbullying and the victims) among high school students in Surakarta. The survey method was performed on 290 students at junior high school and 200 students at senior high school in Surakarta. Data collection was assessed by the scale of cyberbullying. The results of this study showed that 308 subjects or around 62.9% had never done cyberbullying activity and 37.1% subject had ever done cyberbullying activity. The respondents did cyberbullying for amusement, it means that one among the intentions of cyberbullying was to make fun something or someone, because they had many time using the internet access (33.9% had more than 3 hours/day). The forms of cyberbullying in high school students was by sending or posting gossip or rumors to damage a reputation of someone or something.

Keywords: Cyberbullying, Survey, High School Student.

1. Introduction

Despite of the role of technological advances in the development of the nation, many abusements related to the technology as a medium have also been reported. In the academic realm, the development of technology access can affect the social interaction of students and enhance their learning experience. Nevertheless, it also has negatives impacts, one of them is an increase in the cases of cyberbullying in schools. Cyberbullying is a serious kind of school violence, the aggressive behaviour among the peers has negative effect on mental development and learning. Experiencing bullying can increase the possibility of other victimization, including child maltreatment, conventional crime, and psychological problems (Huang & Chou, 2010). Large number of cyberbullying incidents, can make the victim get harmful consequences such as psychosomatic symptoms, anti-social behaviours and suicidal behaviours (Chen, Ho, & Lwin, 2016).

Cyberbullying is a form of media usage information with abuse and humiliation through the virtual world which is now a lot of experienced by school-age children (Bastiaensens et al., 2014; DeSmet et al., 2016; Wegge, Vandebosch, Eggermont, & Pabian, 2014). Bullying is traditionally conducted face-to-face, but now can be done in the virtual world called cyberbullying, so in other words the difference between bullying and cyberbullying is in the context of media abuse and humiliation carried out by someone to someone else (Cassidy, Faucher, & Jackson, 2012).

The prior research investigated by Li (2007), he surveyed 177 adolescents in the urban city about bullying. The results showed that about 57% of adolescents had become the victims

of bullying and approximately 14.25% of them had been cyberbullied. Other results showed that one of three teenagers ever conducted bullying, while 15% of them did bullying by a means of social media. The victims of cyberbullying comprised of 60% young women and 52% young men.

In Indonesia, one of cyberbullying case had been reported in the news online in Sukoharjo. A student burned the school because he was anger of being a victim of bullying (Suryono, 2016). A study carried out by Rahayu (2012) in Yogyakarta reported cyberbullying occurs in fairly large number (28%), without the serious impacts. Cyberbullying is associated with serious negative outcomes for student, including poorer educational attainment, higher school absenteeism and also lower self-esteem (Beran and Li, 2007)., Based on this background, it can be considered that cyberbullying is a serious problem for the students.

This study explored the cyberbullying-related activities among the high school students in Surakarta regarding with the intensity of cyberbullying and other factors including gender, cyberperpetrator, bystanders, kinds of cyberbullying and the victims. Those factors were relevant to the context in Indonesia. The data collected from the survey was a preliminary exploration to know about the cyberbullying, so the researcher should continue another study of cyberbullying in different analysis.

1.1 Definition of Cyberbullying

Bullying is done using communications technology, such as computers, mobile phones, tablets, and other similar media to deliberately spread hatred to others referred to cyberbullying. Besides the violence committed intentionally not only within one time only, but the attack is repeated. One message is pitched hostility or also in the form of a public comment can be regarded as cyberbullying, it is also said to cyberbullying if the message is intended to harass, humiliate, intimidate, manipulate, and more and disseminated so that hurt the feelings of the victim (Netzley, 2014.). Smith et al., made a definition that cyberbullying refers to an aggressive, intentional act carried out by individual and also it could be group use the electronic forms of contact and on the victim who cannot easily defend him or herself, this action is done repeatedly (Chen et al., 2016). Cyberbullying is also defined as the intentional aggressive act or behaviour carried out by someone or a group by employing information and communication technology (ICT) as an instrument, they do it repeatedly (von Marees & Petermann, 2012).

Cyberbullying can take different forms (Willard, 2007), cyberbullying is being cruel to others by sending or posting harmful material or engaging in other forms of social aggression using the digital technologies or Internet. The forms of cyberbullying are classified into 8 (eight) forms: (1) Flaming. sending electronic messages with angry and vulgar language about someone by online or email; (2) Harassment. repeatedly sending nasty, mean, and insulting messages; (3) Cyberstalking. Repeated, intense harassment and denigration that includes threats or creates significant fear makes the victim can't sleep because he/she feels like that fear is around him/her, this harassment can be sent by email, messages, phone, group discussion in one time; (4) Denigration (put-downs). "Dissing" someone online. Sending or posting untrue gossip or rumors about a person to damage his or her reputation; (5) Outing. Sharing the secrets of someone or posting the embarrassing information or images by online, use electronic media; (6) Treachery. Talking to someone to reveal secrets or embarrassing information, then sharing it online; (7) Exclusion. Intentionally and cruelly exclude someone from an online group; (8) Impersonation. Pretending to be someone else and sending or posting material to get that person in trouble or danger or to damage that person's reputation or friendships.

From the previous studies, it can be examined that the media used by perpetrators of cyberbullying comprising of 20.2% by email, 27.8% via chatrooms, 5.6% and 39.4% via mobile phone through media such as SMS, Facebook, BBM and others (Li, 2007). The intensities of the victims in experiencing cyberbullying were 4 times, 4-10 times, and more than 10 times, which were, 54.9%, 20.3%, and 21.1%, respectively. While for the perpetrators of cyberbullying, the intensities of their cyberbullying-related activities were 4 times, 4-10 times, and more than 10 times, which amounted to 30.5%, 43.4%, and 20.7%, respectively (Li, 2007).

Bystander behavior refers to the action an individual adopts when he or she sees or hears a problematic or emergency situation (Cao & Lin, 2015). The term emphasizes an individual's position as a witness to a special situation, instead of someone who is involved in that situation. It is reported that in offline bullying or traditional bullying, bystanders are important actors, because of their reactions may either enhance or attenuate the harmful behaviours. In offline settings, when witnessing an aggressive behavior, bystanders' roles can be generally divided into two categories (Cao & Lin, 2015): (1) the defenders, who stop the bullying behaviors, help victims, or ask for adults' intervention, and (2) the passive bystanders, who silently witness what is happening and ignore the ongoing bullying behavior. Bystanders seldom join in the bullying behaviors in traditional bullying situations; however, some studies have indicated that participation behaviors make cyberbullying very distinctive from offline bullying.

In cyberbullying, bystander behavior will occur in many kinds such as telling the cyberperpetrator to stop cyberbullying (prosocial), comforting the victims (prosocial), joining in the cyberbullying (antisocial), or just ignoring it (indifferent) (Cao & Lin, 2015). Prosocial bystander behaviors refer to actions that are beneficial for victims and society as a whole, such as acting as a defender of victims and reporting the perpetrators; whereas antisocial behaviors may cause damage to others and the society, such as acting as reinforcers or cyberbully assistants. Prosocial behaviors are the opposite of antisocial behaviors; however, the two types of behavior do not have to be mutually exclusive. A person is likely to perform prosocial and antisocial behaviors. Coping in a prosocial way often results from bystanders' feeling sympathy for others, feeling guilty about the wrong doing, and exercising self-control before doing something wrong.

Cyberperpetrator means individual or group of persons who do the cyberbullying. In the context of cyberbullying, 10 and 8 personal factors have been identified to predict cyberbullying perpetration and victimization, respectively (Chen et al., 2016). Specifically, extant empirical studies on cyberbullying have documented that moral disengagement, narcissism, depression, and self-efficacy, are positively associated with cyberbullying perpetration. On the other hand, self-esteem, emotional management, popularity, and school commitment are negatively associated with cyberbullying perpetration (Chen et al., 2016).

2. Research Metode

This study used a survey research model (Creswell, 2013) with qualitative and quantitative approaches, quantitative assessed the frequency of prevailing cyberbullying and qualitative approach processed the descriptive data that has been filled by students. Participants in this study were obtained using purposive sampling. They were adolescents aged 12-18 years in both men and women, all of them were the high school students in Surakarta. Data collected by using a scale that measures the factors regarding with cyberbullying, such as by examining the medium used to conduct cyberbullying, and others. The scale used to test the validity and reliability, so that the tools used in this research was accurate and reliable.

3. Results and Discussion

The subject in this research were 490 students from several schools in Surakarta. They were 290 students at junior high school and 200 students at senior high school.

3.1. Personal data

Personal data is important to see how the scale is different. The subjects of this study were students in senior and junior high school in Surakarta, East Java, Indonesia. In addition, they consisted of young men of 46.7% and young women of 53.3%, in which 95% of them are Muslims. As many as 326 respondents (66.5%) had one gadget while 164 respondents (33.5%) admitted they have more than one gadget. The question about the reasons they had internet access were: 56.9% students answered they were online for completing their tasks, 31.2% students answered for social media, and 9.6% students answered for online game. The distribution of the respondents can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Personal Data Distribution.

No.	Personal Data	Category	Frequency	Percent
1.	Sex	Young men	229	46,7%
		Young women	261	53,3%
2.	Age	12-15 years	317	64,7%
		16-18 years	173	35,3%
3.	Ethnic Group	Java	432	88,2%
		Other Ethnics	58	11,8%
4.	Religion	Muslim	467	95%
		Christian	18	3,7%
		Catholic	4	0,8%
		Hindu	1	0,2%
5.	Education Level	Junior high school/SMP	290	59,2%
		Senior high school/SMA	200	40,8%
6.	Number of Gadgets	One	326	66,5%
		More than one	164	33,5%
7.	Online Duration/day	1 hour	119	24,3%
		2 hours	128	26,1%
		3 hours	70	14,3%
		More than 3 hours	166	33,9%
8.	Purpose of Internet Access	School tasks	279	56,9%
		Social Media	153	31,2%
		Online game	47	9,6%
9.	Parent's Educational background	Junior high school/SMP	44	9%
		Senior high school/SMA	206	42%
		University	238	48,6%

3.2. Cyberperpetrator (Media and Intensity in doing Cyberbullying)

Based on the data, 308 respondents or around 62.9% never had done cyberbullying and 37.1% respondents had ever done cyberbullying-related activities. From 143 cyberperpetrator

of bullying, there were 29.2% subjects had done it once or twice, 6.1% subjects had done the cyberbullying several times, 1.2% had done it in many times, and 0.6% subjects do the cyberbullying almost every day. Another question on the intensity in doing cyberbullying, almost 208 subjects or 42.4% had never conducted cyberbullying. The percentage of the cyberperpetrator of bullying using social media was 61.8%, smartphone was 15.1%, online image sharing was 6.9%, video or youtube was 1.6%, and e-mail was 0.4%.

Table. 2 Media and Intensity in doing Cyberbullying

No.	Cyberbullying Data	Category	Frequency	Percent
1.	Have you ever done the cyberbullying ?	Never	308	62,9%
		Once/ Twice	143	29,2%
		Several Times	30	6,1%
		Many Times	6	1,2%
		Almost every day	3	0,6%
2.	Media of Cyberbullying	SMS	25	5,1%
		Smartphone	74	15,1%
		E-Mail	2	0,4%
		Image Online	34	6,9%
		Video/Youtube	8	1,6%
		Social Media, Facebook, Twitter, etc	303	61,8%
		Other	41	8,4%
3.	Intensity of Cyberbullying	Never	208	42,4%
		Once/ Twice	169	34,5%
		Several Times	75	15,3%
		Many Times	26	5,3%
		Almost all day	16	2,4%

Results of analysis by cross-tabulation, indicated most of the Cyberperpetrator is boys (102 subjects) and girls of 80 subjects. In senior high school, 81 subjects were doing the cyberbullying., and in junior high school student there were 101 subjects. In the senior high school there were 119 students had never done cyberbullying and 189 students in junior high school had never done cyberbullying.

Table. 3 Cyberperpetrator based on cross-tabulation analysis.

		Gender		Education Level		Percent
		Boy	Girl	Senior	Junior	
Cyberbullying activity	Yes	102	80	81	101	37,1%
	No	127	181	119	189	62,9%

3.3. The victims of Cyberbullying

When the victim of cyberbullying asked about that are the Cyberperpetrator doing in the real situation too? Number the victims answered never were 44.1%, one/twice were 34.3%, many times were 5.9%, and almost every day were 2.9%. There are a variety form of cyberbullying consisting of: Giving Mocking name/ giving negative nickname of 63.5% , being a victim of negative slander/ rumour/ gossip of 25.7%, Threatened / being threats of 2.9%, receiving unwanted sexual-content material of 1.8%, and spreading the images / stories by online of 2.9%. The next question was what will they do, if they were a cyberbullying victim? The answers included: Revenge of 24.9%, Ignore 48.3%, Tell the teacher of 3.5%, Tell the parents of 11.4%, Tell the police of 2.0%, Tell friends of 8.6%, and others of 1.3%.

Bystanders of friends who were cyberbullying victims, approximately 211 subjects reported that they never knew their friend was a victim of cyberbullying, but 279 or 56.9% recognized that their friend was a victim of cyberbullying.

Tabel. 4 The Victims of Cyberbullying

No.	Cyberbullying victim	Category	Frequency	Percent
1.	Someone doing Cyberbullying and also in Real Situation	Never	216	44,1%
		Once/ Twice	168	34,3%
		Several Times	62	12,7%
		Many Times	29	5,9%
		Almost all day	14	2,9%
2.	Form of cyberbullying	Mocking name / giving negative nickname	311	63,5%
		Being a victim of slander / rumour / negative gossip	126	25,7%
		Threatened / being threats	14	2,9%
		Receiving unwanted sexual-content material	9	1,8%
		Spreading the images / stories by online	14	2,9%
		Revenge	122	24,9%
3.	Responses of cyberbullying victim	Ignore	236	48,3%
		Tell the teacher	17	3,5%
		Tell the Parents	56	11,4%
		Tell the Police	10	2,0%
		Tell Friends	42	8,6%
		Others	6	1,3%

Table.5 Bystanders who witness cyberbullying

		Frequency	Percent
Being Bystanders of friend who was the victim of Cyberbullying	No	211	43,1%
	Yes	278	56,9%

3.4. The Motivation of the Cyberperpetrator in doing the Cyberbullying

The motivations of the cyberperpetrator in doing cyberbullying were: (1) Amusement of 49.4% in which they only conducted cyberbullying for having fun or making fun to others. The other students reported that they had done the cyberbullying because they wanted to have a revenge (40.2%), the cyberperpetrators dislike the victims so they did the cyberbullying. Table 4 illustrates the data in details. Subsequently, they performed cyberbullying only to follow others (5.1%). In addition, 3.0% became cyberperpetrator to train or educate someone especially in mentality, and 1% did it as a warning or a personal habit.

Table. 6 Qualitative Data

No.	Category of Answers	Form of Answers	Percent
1.	Amusement	Practical Joke Making fun to others Making other people laugh Hobby Relieving from boring Feeling happy to victimize other in cyberbullying	49,4%
2.	Revenge	Dislike Revenge as they made me disappointed Because he/she envies me Because he/she has a problem with me Because he/she hurts me Because he/she was impolite to me Because I hate his/her attitudes Because he/she was impolite to senior	40,2%
3.	Follow friends	Friend's command Making friend happy Following friends	5,1%
4.	Educated	Making someone stronger in physical and mental Changing his/her bad attitude He/she was immature	3,0%
5.	Warning	As a warning	1%
6.	Habit	It was a personal habit	1%

Discussion

This study explored a new and important issue related to cyberbullying. The preliminary analysis of survey data collection was obtained from the students in junior and senior high school in Surakarta. The students aged 12 until 18 years old, in which in this educational period, the students tend to have many problem related to the peers' violence (Antoniadou & Kokkinos, 2014; Li, 2007). Possible reasons explaining this high frequency of school violence included the drastic biological and social changes experienced by the adolescents. The focus of this study was mainly on the personal data required to identify the characteristics of the subject, including age, religion, school, parents' economical status, etc. The characteristic of the subject might be a major factor why someone is doing the cyberbullying (Li, 2007). Based on the data, 308 subject or around 62.9% had never done cyberbullying and 37.1% subjects had ever done the cyberbullying. The gender of the Cyberperpetrator was also identified in which as many as 102 were boys who admitted they were cyberperpetrator and involved in the cyberbullying, meanwhile, as many as 80 girls had admitted they were cyberperpetrator. In general, it was reported that young men tend to get involved in direct forms of physical or verbal aggression to a greater extent than girls (Smith, 2016). However, further studies are necessary to examine this finding. Research carried out in 2012 at Yogyakarta found out that 28% students had done cyberbullying (Rahayu, 2012), in this research with research site in Surakarta, it was figured out that 37.1% subjects had ever done the cyberbullying. The percentage difference was about 9% in 2016. The purpose in using internet access were for doing the task, connecting in sosial media, and playing online game, of 56.9%,31.2%, and 9.6%, respectively.

In the analysis on the experience of being a Bystanders of friends who was the victim of cyberbullying, as many as 43.1% answered they had never experienced it while 56.9% subjects answered they had ever become a bystanders. Girls were more likely to perform pro-social bystander behaviors, whereas boys tended to behave more antisocially. Girls who had been cyberbullied claimed to adopt more pro-

social bystander behaviors than the opposite gender. Teenagers who had more time in online social interactions relatively had more prosocial bystander reactions, compared to those who interacted less (Cao & Lin, 2015; Patterson, Allan, & Cross, 2015). Antisocial bystander behaviour is influenced by several reasons such as peer influence, violent in TV, and leisure activities.

Concerning with the types of electronic communication used for cyberbullying, the data analysis showed that social media was used as much as 61.8%, smartphone of 15.1%, the online image sharing of 6.9%, a video or youtube of 1.6%, and e-mail of 0.4%. Former research reported that for cyberperpetrator, over 9% of them only used email, 36.4% used only chat-room, and almost 55% used multiple sources to do the cyberbullying. It can be concluded that the majority used more than one type of electronic communication to bully others (Li, 2007).

Examination on the forms of cyberbullying included: (1) Giving Mocking name/ giving negative nickname of 63.5% , (2) Being a victim of slander / rumor / gossip negative 25.7%, (3) Threatened / being threats of 2.9%, (4) Receiving unwanted sexual-content material of 1.8%, (5) Spreading the images / stories by online of 2.9%. From this data, we ought to know that most of cyberperpetrator made someone angry by mocking name/giving name negative (Connell, Schell-Busey, Pearce, & Negro, 2013), in correlation with Willard (2007) the form of cyberbullying is Denigration (put-downs), its means "Dissing" someone via online. Sending or posting gossip or untrue rumours about a person to damage his or her reputation. Denigration also means posting something, untrue, or harmful materials (text, photos, or videos) about or of someone in order to harm the victims. The Responses of cyberbullying's victim also varied in kinds, which were Revenge of 24.9% and Ignore of 48.3%. Most of them answered ignore as their response if they were a cyberbullying victim, this finding showed that revenge does not solve the cyberbullying problem, but 24.9% will do the same as a revenge, so it could be a prediction probability of being a cyberbullying victim. Another research showed an important reciprocal relationship between cyberbullying and cybervictimization. Similarly, engaging in self-reported traditional bullying does not predict cybervictimization, but cyberbullying is related to cybervictimization for both males and females (Connell et al., 2013). Another result from this research showed that 49.4% subject doing cyberbullying for amusement, it means that the intentions of Cyberperpetrator is only to make fun of something or someone, because they have many time to have internet access (33.9% more than 3 hours/day).

Conclusion

This study contributes to know about the latest condition of cyberbullying in Surakarta and the first literature analyze about the cyberbullying, cybervictim, cyberperpetrator, and bystanders of cyberbullying. The percentage of cyberbullying in Surakarta can be considered as relatively high, thus, the teachers, parents, and stakeholders must conduct an intervention and a prevention. In fact, many teachers are unaware on the prevalence of cyberbullying among their students. Nevertheless, even if teachers rank prevention as a priority and set up the possible interventions, policies or programs from the governments are not automatically implemented in the schools. Hence, the collaboration between the school authority and the communities in general should be enhanced in relation to the prevention and intervention as well as to compose more comprehensive strategies.

The cyberperpetrator and their victims have close relationships as indicated in this study, in which in correlation to the previous study, almost 30% of the actors of cyberbullying are also cyberperpetrator. Similarly, about one of three victims are cybervictims and one sixth of those victims had also become the actors of cyberbullying . The further statistical correlation indicates the significant relationships between the actors and the cyberbullying as well as between the bullying victim and cyberbullying victims (Li, 2007). Therefore, to solve the cyberbullying problem, we should recognize to know exactly who is the cyberperpetrator and also his/her victim. The cybervictim will do the same as what they receive to other people.

In this research by a qualitative analysis, 40.2% are the victims of cyberbullying and become a cyberperpetrator for revenge. The implication of this research is to find the most effective technique to solve this problem. There are various effective techniques to eliminate the cyberbullying including to make the students build the awareness of cyberbullying, to increase the awareness about the dangerous

of cyberbullying. In addition, the teachers, parents, and other stakeholders should establish many programs, such as a socialization of media online or offline, scaffolding to use the information technology wisely, and to report the incidents if cyberbullying to teacher or parents. Students should be able to differentiate between practical jokes and harmful materials in their effort to search for amusement. The data collected in this research was obtained from a middle urban city especially in the context of Indonesian community, thus, it is suggested for the next researchers to be cautious when generalize the findings to other regions.

References

- Antoniadou, N., & Kokkinos, C. M. (2014). Cyber and school bullying: Same or different phenomena? *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 25, 363–372. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.09.013>.
- Bastiaensens, S., Vandebosch, H., Poels, K., Van Cleemput, K., Desmet, A., & De Bourdeaudhuij, I. (2014). Cyberbullying on social network sites. An experimental study into bystanders' behavioural intentions to help the victim or reinforce the bully. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 31(1), 259–271 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.10.036>.
- Cao, B., & Lin, W. Y. (2015). How do victims react to cyberbullying on social networking sites? The influence of previous cyberbullying victimization experiences. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 52, 458–465. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.06.009>.
- Cassidy, W., Faucher, C., & Jackson, M. (2012). Cyberbullying among youth: A comprehensive review of current international research and its implications and application to policy and practice. *School Psychology International* Bulut & Gudu Smith & Slonje, 34(6), 575–612. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0143034313479697>.
- Chen, L., Ho, S. S., & Lwin, M. O. (2016). A meta-analysis of factors predicting cyberbullying perpetration and victimization: From the social cognitive and media effects approach. *New Media & Society*. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816634037>.
- Connell, N. M., Schell-Busey, N. M., Pearce, a. N., & Negro, P. (2013). Badgrlz? Exploring Sex Differences in Cyberbullying Behaviors. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 12(3), 1541204013503889–. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1541204013503889>.
- DeSmet, A., Bastiaensens, S., Van Cleemput, K., Poels, K., Vandebosch, H., Cardon, G., & De Bourdeaudhuij, I. (2016). Deciding whether to look after them, to like it, or leave it: A multidimensional analysis of predictors of positive and negative bystander behavior in cyberbullying among adolescents. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 57, 398–415. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.12.051>.
- Huang, Y., & Chou, C. (2010). An analysis of multiple factors of cyberbullying among junior high school students in Taiwan. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(6), 1581–1590. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2010.06.005>.
- Li, Q. (2007). New bottle but old wine: A research of cyberbullying in schools. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23(4), 1777–1791. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2005.10.005>.
- Netzley, P. D. (n.d.). *How Serious a Problem Is Cyberbullying?*
- Patterson, L. J., Allan, A., & Cross, D. (2015). Adolescent perceptions of bystanders' responses to cyberbullying. *New Media & Society*, 1461444815606369–.

<http://doi.org/10.1177/1461444815606369>.

- Rahayu, F. S. (2012). cyberbullying sebagai dampak negatif penggunaan teknologi informasi. *Journal of Information System*, 8(1), 22–31.
- Smith, P. K. (2016). *Cyberbullying Across the Globe*. (R. Navarro, Santiago Yubero, & Larranaga Elisa, Eds.) *Springer International Publishing Switzerland* (Vol. 1). Springer International Publishing Switzerland. <http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-25552-1>.
- Suryono, T. H. (2016, May 23). No Title. *Solopos.com*. Sukoharjo. Retrieved from <http://www.solopos.com/2016/05/23/kebakaran-sukoharjo-akibat-dibully-siswi-mim-bakar-ruang-kelas-mim-ngombakan-722132>.
- von Marees, N., & Petermann, F. (2012). Cyberbullying: An increasing challenge for schools. *School Psychology International*, 33(5), 467–476. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0143034312445241>.
- Wegge, D., Vandebosch, H., Eggermont, S., & Pabian, S. (2014). Popularity Through Online Harm: The Longitudinal Associations Between Cyberbullying and Sociometric Status in Early Adolescence. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, Advance on*, 0272431614556351. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0272431614556351>.
- Willard, N. (2007). Educator ' s Guide to Cyberbullying and Cyberthreats, 1–16.