

**JOURNAL OF  
GENERAL MANAGEMENT RESEARCH**

**Who Should Take Initiatives to Control Cyber Bullying  
Activities on Social Media?**

*Consumers' Perspectives*

**Anagha Shukre**

**Symbiosis Centre for  
Management Studies, NOIDA**

***Abstract***

*Bullying is a menace that has taken its roots online, particularly on social media, where the users, who are mostly youth, exchange and share pictures and messages, converse and comment and like or dislike each other's remarks. Many researchers have quoted the depleting effects of cyber bullying on one's personality and self-esteem. Since bullying online is hazardous, who should take the initiatives of controlling cyber bullying activities? This paper aims to study consumers' perceptions about who should take initiatives to control such activities. The paper also explores whether demographics plays a role in consumers' perceptions about controlling cyber bullying activities and its relationship with Social Networking Sites (SNS) usage.*

*Keywords – Cyber Bullying, Social Media, Social Networking Sites(SNS)*

**INTRODUCTION**

A news snippet in the leading newspaper (Choudhari, 2015), has identified how the main governing body of various schools in India, has taken a serious cognizance of cyber bullying activities, by sending letters to school principals suggesting various steps to deal with cyber bullying. The schools, under its guidance, may hold back or even scrap out results of guilty

students as corrective action against bullying, besides giving minor punishments like oral and written warnings (Choudhari, 2015)

“The responsibility of preventing any undesirable aspect of bullying and ragging rests jointly and individually on all stakeholders, which includes head of the institution, teachers and administration, parents and local community”, said the CBSE Board's Academic Director, as quoted in the newspaper (Choudhari, 2015).

Bullying is not a new phenomenon and this menace has taken its roots online, particularly on social media, where the users, who are mostly youth, are exchanging and sharing pictures and messages, conversing and commenting, and liking or disliking each other's remarks. The speed at which this information is distributed, permeated and the convenient availability of users on social media has led to tremendous effects. Bullying in any form is bad, but has been prevalent in society. All age groups have been subject to bullying. Cyber bullying operates through information technology to torment people. As the medium of socialization and sharing has changed from offline to online, people have been threatened over information technology (Kowalski & Limber, 2007). Various cyber bullying activities as highlighted by Cowie (2013) may include sending and / or posting disturbing and hurtful messages including threats to people on social networking sites or through emails. Bullying also attributes to acquiring a person's confidential information and hacking into their accounts, taking photographs of a person without their consent and sending them across to people, distributing sexually oriented messages and photographs, spreading rumors online or through texts, presuming deceptive personality to hurt others, passing offensive and derogatory remarks, pursuing activities to cause embarrassment in public. Cyber bullying is violent in nature and highly prevailing on the Internet.

It may be instantaneous or may continue for a long time. Sending offensive texts on Facebook is an example of cyberbullying (Kwan and Skoric, 2013).

This research study addresses consumers' perceptions about who should take initiatives to control such activities, the different motives for certain users who engage in these activities, and recommends steps to curb their growing menace. It also talks about expected contributions to the knowledge domain as there is paucity of empirical examination of the influence of demographic variables and usage of social networking sites on the various aspects of cyber bullying behavior.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Cyber bullying affects the psychology of an individual. Cyber bullying on social media is a major threat to all ages, though the frequency is high amongst youth, teenagers and adolescents as they spend a lot of their time on social media. The Internet and technology have penetrated deeply and have an unprecedented convenience. But at the same time, it has become a strong breeding ground for undesirable behaviours such as cyber bullying (Li, 2006). Students of different schools and universities toy with the technical gadgets. According to Jonah Berger (2013), in his book *Contagious*, people are sharing more through technology. The speed at which information is distributed, permeated through technology and the convenient availability of users on social media has led to tremendous effects. The cyber bullying victims are likely to suffer from high distress, emotional instability and social anxiety (Dempsey et al, 2009). It impacts self-esteem and well-being (Drennan et al, 2011). Cyber bullying can result in psychological ailments like chronic depression. It may also result in low morale, low self-confidence and anxiety (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010), leading to suicide in extreme cases. Such bullying activities on social media should be put to a stop for the well-being of people.

There are proposed legislations to reprimand cyber bullying behaviour like the US-Megan Meier Cyber Bullying Prevention Act, 2009. In India, however, the Information Technology act is not applicable to minors (Shalini, 2019).

Cyber bullying exists across the globe amongst the youth in today's times (Kraft, 2006). Cyber bullying is a serious crime and more harmful than traditional bullying (Beran & Li, 2005). Early bullying studies suggest a positive relationship between age and bullying (Olweus 1993). Younger adolescents are more likely to engage in physical bullying (Brame, Nagin and Tremblay, 2001), while the older individuals are more likely to commit to verbal attacks and relational aggression (Espelage, Mebane and Swearer, 2004). Drennan et al (2011) talk about cyber-bullying policy frameworks. Cyber bullying is a public and social problem. Bill Belsey (1999) created a web site [www.bullying.org](http://www.bullying.org) that allows people to connect in a safe, sheltered and secured environment where

they can share their experiences in the forms of stories, their creatives like poetry, drawings, their likes and dislikes for music, animations and videos. According to Hinduja and Patchin (2008), greater the time spent online, higher would be the chances of the individual to be involved in cyberbullying.

Literature cites that the use of technology has led to a rapid transformation of communication, which also has resulted in overgrowth of bullying activities. This insidious form of bullying among young individuals is least studied in the form of taking initiatives to control and stop this social cruelty. In this paper, we also aim to study whether there is an effect of demographic variables on the perceptions of the users in their opinions about controlling and initiating to stop these activities.

## HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

The online use increases with age and thus the potential for cyberbullying also increases (Kowalski & Limber, 2007; Mesch, 2009; Vandebosch & Van Cleemput, 2009; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004). Gender influences exposure, participation, and reactions to cyberbullying. Girls are members of online communities, and use Internet, emails, etc. more than boys. Girls, thus, have increased potential for exposure to cyberbullying (Espinoza & Juvonen, 2011; Lee & Chae, 2007; Pujazon-Zazik & Park, 2010). We also studied the impact of other demographic variable occupation, as the associated literature for this was scanty.

H1a: There is a significant difference in users' perceptions about cyber bullying effects and SNS usage across gender groups.

H1b: There is a significant difference in users' perceptions about cyber bullying effects and SNS usage across age groups.

H1c: There is a significant difference in users' perceptions about cyber bullying effects and SNS usage across occupation groups.

H2a: There is a significant difference in the perceptions about controlling cyber bullying initiatives across gender groups.

H2b: There is a significant difference in the perceptions about controlling cyber bullying initiatives across age groups.

H2c: There is a significant difference in the perceptions about controlling cyber bullying initiatives across occupation groups.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

The study is both exploratory and descriptive in nature. The study was conducted in two phases. In the first phase of study, a comprehensive review of existing literature on cyber bullying on social media and its impact on the users was carried out. A structured questionnaire was developed as the survey instrument. The second phase consisted of data collection.

### Survey Instrument

The questionnaire contained open-ended questions and closed-ended questions. The open-ended question was about the opinions and steps that the respondents would take to curb cyber bullying. The closed-ended questions included multiple choice questions on reasons behind cyber bullying, types of activities regarded as bullying online and who should take initiatives to curb cyber bullying. There were three statements based on Likert scale that also aimed at seeking an opinion from the respondents about controlling cyber bullying. The scale was defined from 1 to 7 ('1' denoted as strongly disagreed and '7' as strongly agreed). These statements were – 1. Cyber bullying activities have increased as usage of social networking sites has increased, 2. Hubs and centres should be created online for controlling cyber bullying, 3. Controlling cyber bullying should be made mandatory for all social networking sites. The questionnaire also included questions based on demographic details of the respondents. The respondents were also asked about the time spent on social networking sites (SNS) in a week.

### Sample Determination

The second phase, or descriptive stage, of the study involved data collection from the desired sample

population. Convenience sampling technique was used for data collection. The internet user who had an account with any of the social networking sites was the sample unit.

## Data Collection

The questionnaire was distributed to 175 Internet users in various popular locations like malls, petrol pumps and local market places. 150 correctly and aptly filled-in questionnaires were received and were taken for the study. Statistical software SPSS ver. 25 was used for data analysis.

## RESULTS

The demographic profile of the respondents is listed in table 1. 57% of the respondents were men while 43% were women. 18% respondents fell in the age group of 18-35 years, 63% were in the age bracket of 36-55 years, 16% were in the age bracket of 56-70 years and 3% belonged in the age bracket of above 70 years. 44% respondents comprised of working population and the remaining 56% fell in the non-working population slot. From table 2, it is clear that 31% spent 2-4 hours online in a week, 39% spent 5-8 hours online in a week and 30% spent 9 hours and above online in a week. 59% respondents were already aware of the Facebook safety club started by Facebook in order to control cyber bullying on its platform (table 3).

**Table 1: Demographic Profile**

S. No	Attribute	Categories	No. of Respondents	Response%
1.	Age (in years)	18-35	27	18
		36-55	95	63
		56-70	23	16
		Above 70	5	3
	Total		150	100
2	Gender	Male	86	57
		Female	64	43
	Total		150	100
3	Occupation	Working	66	44
		Non-Working	84	56
	Total		150	100

**Table 2: Time Spent on SNS in a Week**

S. No	Attribute	No. of Respondents	Response%
1	2-4 hours	47	31
2	5-8 hours	58	39
3	9 hours and above	45	30
	Total	150	100

**Table 3: Awareness about Facebook's Safety Centre**

S. No	Awareness	No. of Respondents	Response%
1	Yes	89	59
2	No	61	41
	Total	150	100

From table 4, we can infer that the statements – “Cyber bullying activities have increased as usage of SNS has increased”, “SNS should have prevention hubs/centres to regulate cyber bullying”, and “Controlling cyber bullying should be made mandatory for all SNS”, have been rated high on the Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7 (strongly disagree to strongly agree). The mean scores of 5.29, 5.52, and 5.44 with standard deviations of 1.616, 1.682, and 1.909 respectively indicate that the respondents majorly agree with these statements and there are low variations in the sample responses.

**Table 4: Descriptive Statistics (Valid for N = 150)**

S. No	Statements (Items)	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	Cyber bullying activities have increased as usage of SNS has increased.	5.29	1.616
2	SNS should have prevention hubs/centres to regulate cyber bullying.	5.52	1.682
3	Controlling cyber bullying should be made mandatory for all SNS.	5.44	1.909

Another question in the questionnaire sought the opinion of the respondents about the possible reasons behind bullying. The respondents were given multiple choices and they could tick mark any three options that they thought to be the most important reason. Of these 150 respondents, 22% agreed that “bullying is undertaken to show off rudimentary power to others”, 14.2% respondents

felt that “it is done for fun and entertainment”, 23.6% were of the opinion that “it is undertaken to get even with someone” and 23.6% agreed with the belief that “the people they bullied deserved it”, while 16.5% believed that “online bullying is done to embarrass people”.

On being asked as to which activities the respondents had observed or experienced as bullying activities, 68.7% agreed that “posting offensive and derogatory comments were a part of the bullying activity”. 14.7% agreed that “being left out in the group was a bullying activity”. Almost 8.7% respondents felt that “there were open online fights between the group members”. “Bad gossiping and making a mockery of the individual” was also considered to be a bullying act by 6% respondents. 2% respondents brought to the notice that “many times individuals were being falsely tricked into strange situations and considered these acts too as acts of bullying”. The most frequently used nature of bullying was “posting offensive and derogatory remarks”.

The respondents were questioned about who should be taking initiatives to curb cyber bullying. This response was based on the rank order scale. The highest rank (rank 6) was rated for the option – “it was the responsibility of various online organizations to create prevention hubs and mental health centres for the prevention of cyber bullying”. “Initiatives from SNSs through awareness campaigns” were ranked (rank 5) the next as a strong measure. 59% respondents were already aware of the Facebook safety club started by Facebook in order to control cyber bullying on its platform (see Table 3). “The third party (peers and friends) from the online groups should step in to stop the bullying activity” was ranked next (rank 4). “Initiatives from SNS should be taken through technical measures” was numbered at rank 3. The option – “the government should make stringent laws to curb this menace”, was ranked second while the respondents rated that “the person being bullied should stand up and report self-abuse”, at the lowest rank.

### Correlation Analysis

Pearson’s correlation analyses were used to examine relationships and associations among the selected variables (Howell, 1992). The results (see Table 5)

revealed that variable – “cyber bullying activities have increased as usage of SNS has increased”, is very strongly and positively correlated to the variable – “SNS should have prevention hubs/centres to regulate cyber bullying activities” ( $r=.768, p<0.05$ ). Both the variables are also positively correlated to the variable – “controlling cyber bullying should be made mandatory for all SNS” ( $r=.380, p<0.05$ ;  $r=.476, p<0.05$ ).

**Table 5: Correlations**

	V1	V2	V3
Cyber bullying activities have increased as usage of SNS has increased. (V1)	1.00		
SNS should have prevention hubs/centres to regulate cyber bullying activities. (V2)	.761**	1.00	
Controlling cyber bullying should be made mandatory for all SNS. (V3)	.380**	.476**	1.00

\*\*Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### Cross Tabulation Analysis

#### Occupation

The demographic variable – occupation (working and non-working population) - was cross tabulated with the online experiences of the respondents who had either seen or experienced the effects of bullying in their respective groups. The respondents were given multiple choices and they could tick mark any three options that they thought to be the most important reason. It is inferred from Table 6 that out of the working population, 40.8% people felt that “offensive remarks were a sign of bullying”, 50% felt that “people excluded from the group on purpose was also a sign of bullying”, 38.5% had experienced/observed online fights and only 8% of the working population was of the opinion that “bad gossiping was a sign of bullying”. From the non-working population, 59.2% respondents felt that “offensive remarks were a cue for bullying, 50% felt that exclusion from the group was a sign of bullying”, 61.5% had witnessed/ experienced online fights, 11.1% respondents had experienced bad gossiping, while none were being tricked in to awkward situations. From Table 7, we can infer that out of the working population, 53.6% agreed that

“bullying is practiced to show off rudimentary powers to others”, 55.6% believed that “it is done for fun and entertainment”, 43.3% were of the opinion that “the people to be bullied deserved it and to get back even with them”, and 52.4% believed that “bullying is practiced to embarrass publicly”. From the non-working population, 46.4% believed that “it is practiced to show off rudimentary powers”, 44.4% believed that “it is practiced for fun and entertainment”, 56.7% thought that “people who were bullied deserved it and to get back even with them”, while 47.6% were of the opinion that “bullying is adopted as a practice to embarrass publicly”. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1 signifies the multiple response sets.

**Table 6: Cross Tabulation between Occupation and Experiences towards Bullying Online**

			Self/friend's (offensive)	Self/friend's (exclusion)	(online fights)	(bad gossiping)	(tricking)	(others)	Total
Occupation	1	No. of respondents	42	11	5	8	0	0	64
		% within Sseen	40.8%	50.0%	38.5%	88.9%	0.0%	0.0%	
2	No. of respondents	61	11	8	1	1	2	79	
		% within Sseen	59.2%	50.0%	61.5%	11.1%	100%	100%	
Total		No. of respondents	103	22	13	9	1	2	143

Percentages and totals are based on respondents.  
1-Working population, 2-Non-working population  
a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

**Gender**

Gender (male and female) was cross tabulated with the online experiences of the respondents who had either seen or experienced the effects of bullying in their respective groups. The respondents were given multiple choices and they could tick mark any three options that they thought to be the most important reason. It is inferred from Table 8 that for the males, 55.3% people felt that “offensive remarks were a sign of bullying”, 50% felt that “people excluded from the group on purpose was also a sign of bullying”, 69.2% had experienced / observed online fights and 77.8% of the males were of the opinion that “bad gossiping was a sign of bullying”. From the category of females, 44.7% respondents felt that “offensive remarks were a cue for bullying”, 50% felt that “exclusion from the group was a sign of bullying”, 30.8% had witnessed/experienced online fights, 22.2% female respondents had experienced bad gossiping, while 10% were being tricked in to awkward situations. 64.3% males believed that “bullying is practiced to show off rudimentary powers”, 61.1% men believed that it is practiced for fun and entertainment, 63.3% believed that the “people deserved it and to get back even with them” while 61.9% agreed that “it is practiced to embarrass people”. 38.9% women, on the other hand, agreed that “bullying is practiced for fun and entertainment”, 35.7% women believed “people bully to show off rudimentary powers to others”, 36.7% believed that they deserved it and 43.45% believed that “bullying is practiced to get even with people” while 38.1% thought that “bullying occurs to cause embarrassment”. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1 signifies the multiple response sets.

**Table 7: Cross tabulation between Occupation and Reasons behind Bullying Online**

			To show off rudimentary power to others	For fun and entertainment	They deserve it	To get back even with someone	To embarrass them	Total
Occupation	1	No. of respondents	15	10	13	13	11	61
		% within Srfb	53.6%	55.6%	43.3%	43.3%	52.4%	
2	No. of respondents	13	8	17	17	10	61	
		% within Srfb	46.4%	44.4%	56.7%	56.7%	47.6%	
Total		No. of respondents	28	18	30	30	21	122

Percentages and totals are based on respondents.  
1-Working population, 2-Non-working population  
a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

**Table 8: Cross tabulation between Gender and Experiences towards bullying online**

			(offensive)	(exclusion)	fights	(bad gossiping)	(tricking)	(others)	Total
Gender	1	No. of respondents	57	11	9	7	0	2	79
		% within Sseen	55.3%	50.0%	69.2%	77.8%	0.0%	100.0%	
2	No. of respondents	46	11	4	2	1	0	64	
		% within Sseen	44.7%	50.0%	30.8%	22.2%	100.0%	0.0%	
Total		No. of respondents	103	22	13	9	1	2	143

Percentages and totals are based on respondents.  
1-Male, 2-Female  
a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

**Table 9: Cross tabulation between Gender and Reasons behind bullying online**

			To show off rudimentary power to others	For fun and entertainment	They deserve it	To get back even with someone	To embarrass them	Total
Gender	1	No. of respondents	18	11	19	17	13	74
		% within \$rfb	64.3%	61.1%	63.3%	56.7%	61.9%	
	2	No. of respondents	10	7	11	13	8	48
		% within \$rfb	35.7%	38.9%	36.7%	43.3%	38.1%	
Total	No. of respondents	28	18	30	30	21	122	

Percentages and totals are based on respondents.

1-Male, 2-Female

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

**Age**

People were classified on the basis of age into four slabs namely 18-35 years, 36-55 years, 56-70 years and above 70 years. Age variable was cross tabulated with the online experiences of the respondents who had either seen or experienced the effects of bullying in their respective groups and also with reasons behind the practice of cyber bullying. The respondents were given multiple choices and they could tick mark any three options that they thought to be the most important reason. 20% respondents in the age bracket of 18-35 years believed that “bullying took place in order to get even with others”. 72.2% respondents in the age bracket of 36-55 years believed that “it is done for fun and entertainment”, while 28.6% respondents believed that “it is practiced to cause embarrassment”. In the slab of 18-35 years, when asked about their experience towards bullying online as offensive, almost 18.4% agreed. 23.1% had witnessed online fights. 88.9% respondents in the age slab of 36-55 years voted for bad gossiping, while 23.1% had witnessed online fights in the age bracket of 56-70 years. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1 signifies the multiple response sets.

**Table 10: Cross tabulation between Age and Reasons behind bullying online**

			To show off rudimentary power to others	For fun & entertainment	They deserve it	To get back even with someone	To embarrass them	Total
Age	1	No. of respondents	6	2	7	6	1	21
		% within \$rfb	21.4%	11.1%	23.3%	20.0%	4.8%	
	2	No. of respondents	19	13	15	18	14	75
		% within \$rfb	67.9%	72.2%	50.0%	60.0%	66.7%	
	3	No. of respondents	3	2	6	5	6	22
		% within \$rfb	10.7%	11.1%	20.0%	16.7%	28.6%	
	4	No. of respondents	0	1	2	1	0	4
		% within \$rfb	0.0%	5.6%	6.7%	3.3%	0.0%	
	Total	No. of respondents	28	18	30	30	21	122

Percentages and totals are based on respondents.

1-18-35 years, 2-36-55 years, 3-56-70 years and 4-above 70 years.

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

**Table 11: Cross tabulation between Age and Experiences towards Bullying Online**

			(offensive)	(exclusion)	(online fights)	(bad gossiping)	(tricking)	(others)	Total
Age	1	No. of respondents	19	1	3	1	0	1	23
		% within \$seen	18.4%	4.5%	23.1%	11.1%	0.0%	50.0%	
	2	No. of respondents	63	16	7	8	1	1	93
		% within \$seen	61.2%	72.7%	53.8%	88.9%	100.0%	50.0%	
	3	No. of respondents	17	5	3	0	0	0	23
		% within \$seen	16.5%	22.7%	23.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	4	No. of respondents	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
		% within \$seen	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	Total		103	22	13	9	1	2	143

Percentages and totals are based on respondents.

1-18-35 years, 2-36-55 years, 3-56-70 years and 4-above 70 years.

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

**One-Way Anova Analysis**

**Table 12: Anova for Age**

		<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Cyber bullying activities have increased as usage of SNS has increased.	Between Groups	19.509	3	6.503	2.569	.057
	Within Groups	369.584	146	2.531		
	Total	389.093	149			
SNS should have prevention hubs/centres to regulate cyber bullying.	Between Groups	7.042	3	2.347	.827	.481
	Within Groups	414.398	146	2.838		
	Total	421.440	149			
Controlling cyber bullying should be made mandatory for all SNS.	Between Groups	18.295	3	6.098	1.697	.170
	Within Groups	524.665	146	3.594		
	Total	542.960	149			

**Table 13: Anova for Gender**

		<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Cyber bullying activities have increased as usage of SNS has increased.	Between Groups	14.702	1	14.702	5.812	.017
	Within Groups	374.391	148	2.530		
	Total	389.093	149			
SNS should have prevention hubs/centres to regulate cyber bullying.	Between Groups	7.619	1	7.619	2.725	.101
	Within Groups	413.821	148	2.796		
	Total	421.440	149			
Controlling cyber bullying should be made mandatory for all SNS.	Between Groups	8.674	1	8.674	2.403	.123
	Within Groups	534.286	148	3.610		
	Total	542.960	149			

**Table 14: Anova for Occupation**

		<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Cyber bullying activities have increased as usage of SNS has increased.	Between Groups	16.055	1	16.055	6.370	.013
	Within Groups	373.038	148	2.521		
	Total	389.093	149			
SNS should have prevention hubs/centres to regulate cyber bullying.	Between Groups	8.116	1	8.116	2.906	.090
	Within Groups	413.324	148	2.793		
	Total	421.440	149			
Controlling cyber bullying should be made mandatory for all SNS.	Between Groups	.025	1	.025	.007	.934
	Within Groups	542.935	148	3.668		
	Total	542.960	149			

**Table 15: Anova for Time Spent in A Week**

		<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Cyber bullying activities have increased as usage of SNS has increased.	Between Groups	2.396	2	1.198	.455	.635
	Within Groups	386.697	147	2.631		
	Total	389.093	149			
SNS should have prevention hubs/centres to regulate cyber bullying.	Between Groups	1.320	2	.660	.231	.794
	Within Groups	420.120	147	2.858		
	Total	421.440	149			
Controlling cyber bullying should be made mandatory for all SNS.	Between Groups	31.320	2	15.660	4.499	.013
	Within Groups	511.640	147	3.481		
	Total	542.960	149			

Tables 12-15 indicate that there are no significant differences in the respondents’ perceptions of the three variables namely – 1. Cyber bullying activities have increased as usage of SNS has increased, 2. SNS should have prevention hubs / centres to regulate cyber bullying, 3. Controlling cyber bullying should be made mandatory for all SNS, on the bases of all demographic variables i.e., age, gender, occupation and the time spent on SNSs. Hence we reject the hypothesis H1a, H1b, H1c, H2a, H2b, and H2c. For age the values of F for all the three variables are (F = 2.569, p> 0.05; F=.827, p>.05; F = 1.697, p>.05). For gender, the values are (F = 5.812, p> 0.05; F=2.725, p>.05; F = 2.403, p>.05). For occupation, the values are (F = 6.370, p > 0.01; F=2.906, p>.05, F =.007, p>.05) and for usage (F = .455, p > 0.05; F =.231, p>.05; F = 4.499, p>.05).

## DISCUSSION

The new forms of communication are the new electronic forms where people share and exchange thoughts about various issues, concepts and ideas. The sharing via technology has caught up with the young people who are breaking boundaries to stay tuned to one another. While these technological advancements are bringing positive aspects, the most negative influence of technology has been on social media where bullying is found to be active. It is a dirty practice that has huge repercussions on one's goodness, safety and self-esteem. It is a consensus that these acts must be put to a stop whether online or offline. But, who should take initiatives to control such acts? We hypothesized that there are significant differences in users' perceptions about its effects and SNS usage across various demographic variables – age, gender, and occupation. We also hypothesized that there are differences in perceptions about controlling cyber bullying activities. We have accepted these hypotheses as it can be inferred from the findings that usage is a predictor of bullying activities. Heavy usage may lead to being a victim of bullying activity. Previous studies have indicated that the people involved in bullying use the Internet more frequently and proficiently. At the same time, it is to be believed that students must be allowed to use Internet and its services including SNS for the development of their skills. From the study, it can be inferred that cyber bullying activities have increased as usage of SNS has increased. SNS should have prevention hubs / centres to regulate cyber bullying. Controlling cyber bullying should be made mandatory for all SNS- on the bases of all demographic variables i.e., age, gender, occupation and the time spent on SNSs.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Following are some of the steps that should to be taken to curb and prevent cyber bullying:

Parents should talk at length about the harmful effects of cyber bullying with their children especially teenagers. Previous studies have indicated that cyber bullying is a phenomenon that occurs mostly with the teenagers. Parents should caution their adolescents about getting involved in such acts. Some form of threatening may also be issued like

loss of pocket money. Access to cell phones and laptops/PCs access may be revoked. Beran and Li (2005) found out that teenagers do not tell their parents about being victims of cyber bullying for their fears of losing their technology gadgets. Parents should create trust in their relationships with teens. Teenagers could share their passwords with their parents. The teens should feel free to report bullying activities to an adult for taking necessary actions. Provoking messages should not be erased, but rather should be kept as proof of a bullying activity. Such accounts should be blocked. A study conducted by Moessner (2007), found that teens perceived blocking a bully online as one of the most effective ways to prevent bullying. Users should manage their settings in such a way that they keep their personal information safe. If the bullying activities prevail, then it is requisite for the adults to monitor such activities by keeping computer systems in open space and not in personal rooms of the teenagers.

## IMPLICATIONS

The managers with the help of technocrats can design online user friendly platforms that can increase Awareness, Alertness, and Action. Information about the “Dos’ and Don’ts” of an online account can be provided to the consumers to keep them safe and away from bullying activities. This can also be done to make them aware about the hazards of bullying. A policy laying down the inclusion and development of technical software to avoid cyber bullying can be incorporated at the corporate level. Technocrats may be trained to build software to keep a track of the same in an online as well as real-time environment (Kraft and Wang, 2009). Similar initiatives like that of Facebook's technical hub may be created to safeguard the interests of all. Cyber laws may be strongly enforced. Embracing the idea of providing experiences, values and ethics lie in creating and developing rich experiences in an online environment.

## SCOPE OF FUTURE RESEARCH

The study may be extended with other consumer-related variables as self-efficacy and personal values in studying consumers' responses and reactions to these activities. Future studies may also explore the

notion of extended activities for Corporate Social Responsibility and may provide a framework to customize the activities for the Corporate Social Responsibility. Studies in law may also be undertaken to suggest frameworks, laws and new ordinances for controlling bullying activities.

## LIMITATION

We have used a convenience sampling technique to select the respondents with a meagre sample size of 150. Future studies may be conducted to identify the harmful effects of cyber bullying with a large sample size.

## CONCLUSION

This research paper addresses consumers' perceptions about who should take initiatives to control such bullying activities, the different motives for certain users who engage in these activities, and recommends steps to curb their growing menace. It also talks about expected contributions to the knowledge domain paucity of empirical examination of the influence of demographic variables, usage of social networking sites, cyber-victimization experience on the cyber bullying behavior where the users who are mostly youth, are exchanging and sharing pictures and messages, conversing and commenting and liking or disliking each other's remarks. From the study, it can be concluded that the consumers believe that it is the responsibility of various online organisations to create prevention hubs and mental health centres for the prevention of cyber bullying. Also, the demographic factors like age, gender, occupation and the time spent on SNS have no role to play in framing perceptions around these initiatives.

## REFERENCES

- Beran, T., & Li, Q. (2005). Cyber harassment: A study of a new method for an old behavior. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 32(3), 265-277.
- Berger, Jonah. (2013) *Contagious: why things catch on*. New York: Simon & Schuster
- Belsey, B. (1999), *Cyberbullying: An Emerging Threat to The "Always On" Generation*. <http://www.billbelsey.com/?p=1827>, accessed on July 21, 2020
- Brame, B., Nagin, D. S., & Tremblay, R. E. (2001). Developmental trajectories of physical aggression from school entry to late adolescence. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 42(4), 503–512. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-7610.00744>
- Choudhari Abhishek (2015), *Cyberbullying is Ragging, treat it as such: CBSE from* <https://Timesofindia.Indiatimes.Com/Home/Education/News/Cyberbullying-Is-Ragging-Treat-It-As-Such-CBSE/Articleshow/46522406.Cms>, accessed on July 21, 2020
- Cowie, H. (2013). Cyberbullying and its impact on young people's emotional health and well-being. *The Psychiatrist*, 37(5), 167–170.
- Dehue, Francine, Catherine Bolman, and Trijntje Vollink. 2008. Cyberbullying: Youngsters' experiences and parental perception. *Cyber Psychology & Behavior* 11: 217-223. doi: 10.1089/cpb.2007.0008
- Dempsey A., Sulkowski Michael L., Nichols Rebecca (2009) Differences between peer victimization in cyber and physical settings and associated psychosocial adjustment in early adolescence, *Psychology in the Schools*, Vol. 46(10), DOI: 10.1002/pits.20437
- Drennan, J., Brown, M. R., & Mort, G. S. (2011). Phone bullying: Impact on self-esteem and well-being. *Young Consumers*, 12(4), 295–309.
- Ellen M. Kraft and Jinchang Wang (2009). Effectiveness of cyberbullying preventing strategies: A Study on student's perspectives. *International Journal of Cyber Criminology*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 513-535, July-December 2009.
- Espelage, D. L., Mebane, S. E., & Swearer, S. M. (2004). Gender Differences in Bullying: Moving Beyond Mean Level Differences. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention* (p. 15–35). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

12. Espinoza, G., & Juvonen, J. (2011). The pervasiveness, connectedness, and intrusiveness of social network site use among young adolescents. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 14(12), 705–709.
13. Goel Puneeta (2018). Gender Differences in Perception of Ethical Practices Empirical Study of Selected Sectors in India, *Journal of General Management Research*, 5(2), 28–38
14. Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2008). Cyberbullying: An exploratory analysis of factors related to offending and victimization. *Deviant Behavior*, 29, 129–156.
15. Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2010). Bullying, Cyberbullying, And Suicide. *Archives of Suicide Research*, 14(3), 206–221.
16. Howell, D. C. (1992). *The Duxbury series in statistics and decision sciences. Statistical methods for psychology* (3rd ed.). PWS-Kent Publishing Co.
17. Jessica N. & Jodie L. Hertzog (2015). Factors that Influence Bystander Behavior in the Cyberbully Context. In *Technology and Youth: Growing Up in a Digital World*. Published online: 24 Sep 2015; 47-72.
18. Kowalski, R. M. & Limber, S. P. (2007). Electronic bullying among middle school students. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41(6), S22–S30.
19. Kraft, E. (2006). Cyber bullying: a worldwide trend of misusing technology to harass others. In K. Morgan, C.A. Brebbia, & K.M. Spector (Eds.). *The Internet society II: Advances in Education, Commerce, & Governance*. Southampton, England: WIT Press.
20. Kwan Grace Chi En, Skoric Marko M (2013). Facebook Bullying: An Extension of Battles in School, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29, 16–25
21. Lee, S. J., & Chae, Y. G. (2007). Children's internet use in a family context: Influence on family relationships and parental mediation. *Cyber Psychology and Behavior*, 10(5), 640–644.
22. Li, 2006 *Cyberbullying in Schools: A Research of Gender Differences*, *Social Psychology International*, May, pp. 157–170 <https://doi.org/10.1177/01430343060645474>
23. Mesch, G. S. (2009). Parental mediation, online activities, and cyberbullying. *Cyber Psychology and Behavior*, 12(4), 387–393. Moessner, C. (2007). Cyber bullying. *Trends and Tunes*, 6(4). from [http://www.harrisinteractive.com/news/newsletters/k12news/HI\\_TrendsTunes\\_2007v06\\_i04.pdf](http://www.harrisinteractive.com/news/newsletters/k12news/HI_TrendsTunes_2007v06_i04.pdf), accessed July 21, 2020
24. Olweus, D. (1993). Bully/victim problems among school children: Long-term consequences and an effective intervention program. *Mental disorder and crime*, pp. 317–349. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
25. Pujazon-Zazik, M., & Park, M. J. (2010). To Tweet, or not to Tweet: Gender differences and potential positive and negative health outcomes of adolescents' social internet use. *American Journal of Men's Health*, 4(1), 77–85.
26. Shalini S. (2019). What is Cyber Bullying or Anti-Bullying Laws in India <https://www.myadvo.in/blog/must-read-what-is-cyber-bullying-or-anti-bullying-laws-in-india>, accessed July 21, 2020
27. Vandebosch, H., & Van Cleemput, K. (2009). Cyberbullying among youngsters: Profiles of bullies and victims. *New Media Society*, 11(8), 1349–1371.
28. Ybarra, M. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2004). Online aggressor/targets, aggressors, and targets: A comparison of associated youth characteristics. *Journal of child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 45 (7), 1308–1316.