

**THE NATURE OF CYBERBULLYING AT
UNIVERSITY X IN GUYANA****KEYWORDS**

Cyberbullying, University Students, Guyana.

**MRS. MAUREEN ANN
BYNOE**University of Guyana,
Berbice Campus Tain,
Corentyne.**BERBICE GUYANA**University of Guyana,
Berbice Campus Tain,
Corentyne.**ABSTRACT**

This study explored cyberbullying among university students at a Guyanese institution, with a focus on its prevalence, victimisation, and impact. A sample of 500 undergraduate students was invited to participate, but only 50 completed the survey. The research addressed key questions including the extent of cyberbullying, the overlap between victims and perpetrators, differences based on gender and ethnicity, and the platforms used for bullying. Analysis using descriptive statistics, T-tests, and one-way ANOVA revealed that cyberbullying was prevalent, though most participants denied involvement. No significant gender differences were found, nor were there differences between Afro and Indo-Guyanese students. However, Mixed-race students experienced cyberbullying more frequently than Afro and Indo-Guyanese. Most participants took no action after being cyberbullied, and the study highlights the need for more education on the issue.

I. INTRODUCTION

Numerous studies have established that cyberbullying is prevalent in colleges and universities (Selkie, Kota, Chan, & Moreno (2015); MacDonald, & Roberts-Pittman, (2010); Martínez-Monteagudo, Delgado, García-Fernández, & Ruíz-Esteban (2020). According to Tokunaga (2010) cyberbullying can be defined as any act done repeatedly by a college student or group of students through the use of digital or electronic media that transfers destructive or intimidating messages intending to cause harm or discomfort to the victim(s). Whereas Beran & Li (2005) noted that cyberbullying is an act done intentionally online to intimidate, embarrass, or harass. In both definitions the authors have established that cyberbullying is done digitally by malicious persons to hurt the victim (s).

According to Xiao & Wong (2013); Selkie, Kota, Chan, & Moreno (2015); Martínez-Monteagudo, Delgado, García-Fernández, & Ruíz-Esteban (2020) extensive studies were conducted on cyberbullying in middle and high schools but not much in colleges. In support of this view, Faucher, Cassidy & Jackson (2019) posited that not much research has been conducted on cyberbullying among adults. This is possible because cyberbullying is a new form of bullying that became popular in the twenty-first century (Ozden & Icellioglu (2014), as cited in Burnham, Wright, & Houser (2011). Information and communication technologies are used extensively by individuals, especially young people, and have led to changes in accessing information. However, although there are many benefits to using information communication technologies, many people use them to cyberbully others (Martínez-Monteagudo, Delgado, García-Fernández, & Ruíz-Esteban, 2020).

In 2019, the Guyana Times Newspaper reported that a nursing student in Guyana was charged with cyberbullying another student. This student created a fake profile and sent threatening messages to her peer. This is evidence that cyberbullying is taking place in Guyana. Despite national attention, reported cases, and access to media, there has been minimal research on cyberbullying

among college students. A literature search by this author, using Google Scholar, EBSCOhost, and Jstor found limited studies about cyberbullying in colleges and universities. Furthermore, none of the studies focused on the nature of cyberbullying in universities in the Guyanese context.

The purpose of this study was to determine the nature of cyberbullying among students of a university campus in Guyana. The researcher addressed this by seeking answers to these research questions (1) to what extent did university students experience cyberbullying? (2) to what extent were cyberbully victims also bullies? (3) were there differences in the frequency of cyberbullying based on gender and ethnicity? (4) were there differences in the frequency of time on digital media? (5) what were the most frequently used media to cyberbully? What were the effects of being cyberbullied? (7) what actions did victims take after being cyberbullied? and (8) what strategies should the university implement to educate students and staff on cyberbullying?

II. SOME RELATED LITERATURE

The Extent of Cyberbullying

Studies on the extent of cyberbullying among college/university students show varied results. MacDonald and Roberts Pittman (2010) found that 21% of the respondents stated that they were cyberbullied, 38% reported that they knew someone who had been cyberbullied, and 8% reported cyberbullying someone. In 2013, Smith and Yoon noted that 10% of the participants stated that they were cyberbullied in college, while 25% reported that they observed another student being cyberbullied. Macdonald and Roberts-Pittman (2010) reported that 22 % of students were cyberbullied, 38% knew someone who had been cyberbullied, and 9% claimed to have cyberbullied others. Zalaquett and Chatters (2014) claimed that 18.6% of college students stated that they were cyberbullied. Of these students, 28% reported that they had a friend who had experienced cyberbullying. Cilliers (2021) indicated that 36% of the participants reported that they were cyberbullied and 17.3 % acknowledged that they were cyberbullies. These studies are evidence that a number of college/university students have either been cyberbullied, cyberbullied others, or knew someone who was cyberbullied.

Cyberbullying based on Gender and Ethnicity

Zalaquett and Chatters (2014); Webber & Ovedovitz (2018); Bo Sophia and Yee Man (2013) posited that cyberbullying differed due to gender, with more females recounted being cyberbullied compared to males. However, Shaojing, Xitao, & Jianxia (2016); Ndiege, Okello, & Wamuyu (2020) found that males more than females were involved in cyberbullying.

Young (2020) reported that there was a minimal significant relationship between ethnicity and one's experiences of cyberbullying. However, Adebayo, Ninggal, & Bolu-Steve (2020) claimed that there was no significant relationship between race/ethnicity and cyberbullying behaviours. Whereas Mc Cullough et al. (2021) posited that race was not significantly related to cyberbullying but minorities in the USA were cyberbullied at a higher rate than non-minorities.

Frequency of Time on Digital Media

Meyers and Cowie (2017); Brody & Vangelisti (2017) stated in their studies that the amount of time that students spend on social media sites has a relationship with their cyberbullying experiences. Zalaquett and Chatters (2014) found that the frequency of time that the respondents spent on the computer was from one to seven hours daily. Twenty-five percent (25 %) spent between 1 to 3 hours, 45% of the participants spent between 3 to 4 hours, 19 % 5 to 6 hours, and 9% 7 and more hours. Qudah et al. (2019) indicated that 7.1% of the participants spent less than 2 hours on their smartphones, 25.6% spent more than 2 to 4 hours, and 67.3% spent more than 4 hours. Bo Sophia and Yee Man's (2013) indicated that 1% of the participants spent less than 1 hour on the computer, 11.8% 1 to 2 hours, 32.8% 3 to 4 hours, 26% 5 to 6 hours, and 28.8 % 7 and more hours. This is an indication that the participants spent significant time on digital media.

Media to Cyberbully

MacDonald and Roberts Pittman (2010) found that students were cyberbullied via social networking sites, emails, Instant messages, chat rooms, and websites. Whittaker and Kowalski (2015) indicated that they found social media and texting to be the most frequently used means to cyberbully. Zalaquett and Chatters (2014); Walker, Sockman, & Koehn (2011) finding of text messaging as the most frequently used medium to cyberbully is in accordance with those of Whittaker and Kowalski (2015). They also stated that bullies used emails and websites to target their victims as found by MacDonald and Roberts Pittman (2010). Lawler and Molluzzo (2015) on the other

hand noted that looking into students' cell phones, and their emails, and sending harassing emails and pictures were ways in which participants were cyberbullied. In addition, Lawler and Molluzzo (2015) stated that victims were sent pornographic images, harassing messages, and pictures posted on social media sites, and the bullies prevented friends from contacting victims on social media and sexting.

Actions Taken

Rivituso (2014) claimed that after being cyberbullied the participants sought the assistance of the college Vice President of Student Affairs, the local police, or the campus security office. Victims generally coped with cyberbullying by telling someone and avoiding friends and peers (Schenk and Fremouw, 2012). Walker, Sockman, and Koehn (2011) indicated that the majority of the participants either told a parent/guardian or another adult of their cyberbullying experience. Johnson et al. (2016) stated that many of the respondents blocked the bully and that most of them reported the bullying incident to an adult. Weibel & Fern's (2012) finding of participants blocking the cyberbullies was in accordance with those of Johnson et al. (2016). Weibel and Fern (2012) also found that some participants took special care in selecting their social media friends.

Effects of Cyberbullying

Cyberbullied victims suffered in many ways after being bullied. Rivituso (2014); Martínez-Monteagudo et al. (2020) noted that participants suffered from stress, depression, and embarrassment. Schenk and Fremouw (2012) found that participants suffered from depression, anxiety, paranoia, suicidal ideations, planning, and attempts. Cassidy, Faucher, and Jackson (2017) reported that the respondents felt sad, hurt, demeaned wounded, and marginalised, with some wanting vengeance. Some students' grades dropped and they avoided specific persons and places where cyberbullying is likely to occur. Zalaquett and Chatters (2014) stated that 9% encountered a loss of productivity, some felt angry and 6% claimed not be affected.

Cyberbullying Measures

Cilliers (2021); Johnson et al. (2016); Zalaquett and Chatters (2014); Weibel & Fern's (2012); Lawler & Molluzzo (2015) all claimed that most of the participants saw the need for some form of education on cyberbullying. Lawler and Molluzzo, however, claimed that respondents were in favour of education on cyberbullying for the entire university community. Some other strategies advocated by Johnson et al. (2016) are counseling victims and bullies, and the establishment of a center for the prevention and intervention of violence. Faucher, Cassidy, and Jackson (2020) claimed that participants in their study advocated for cyberbullying to be a part of the university's orientation programme, the development of a cyberbullying policy with input from students, putting systems in place so that bullies who use the university sites to bully can be identified, and for students to report cyberbullying incidents anonymously.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The researcher employed the quantitative descriptive design in this study. A convenience sample of approximately 500 undergraduate students from the university's campus were the participants of this study, however, only 50 responded to the questionnaire that was used as the data-gathering instrument. The questionnaire included the definition of cyberbullying as set out by Tokunaga (2010). The goal was to expose every participant to the same definition of cyberbullying for a standardised understanding of the term. The questionnaire consisted of three demographic items and nine items relating to cyberbullying experiences. The demographic items were based on participants' gender, division, and ethnicity. The items relating to cyberbullying were based on the frequency the participant or another student was cyberbullied in the past three years, whether they were bullied, whether the bully was a university student, and whether they or another student they knew cyberbullied anyone. In addition, the items were based on the frequency of use of electronic media, the cyberbullying methods used, the effects of cyberbullying, and the steps that university administration can take to address cyberbullying. The questionnaire was disseminated to the participants from September 2022 to April 2023 through the university's Students' Records Management System and the Campus's Facebook Page. A Survey Monkey link was provided along with a cover letter seeking the participants' consent with assurances of confidentiality and freedom of choice. Descriptive statistics, the T-test, and the one-way ANOVA were used to analyse the data using IBM SPSS. To formulate the questions, the researcher looked at questions that other researchers had used, to gain insight into the kinds of questions and then formulated questions for data collection to

answer the research questions. In order to ensure the validity of the questions, a colleague who had published a number of articles was asked to review the questions. This was done in response to the contention of Mastaglia, Toye and Kristjanson (2003) that an expert can be used to determine the validity of the content of the research instruments. The authorisation to conduct the study was given by the Deputy Registrar of the university under which this responsibility resides. The sample consisted of 43 females, 7 males, 19 Afro-Guyanese, 18 Indo-Guyanese, and 13 Mixed Races. Analysis of the data indicated that 56% (n = 28) of the participants were in the Division of Education & Humanities, 38% (n = 19) from the Division of Social Sciences, and 2% (n = 1) each from the College of Medical Sciences, Natural Sciences, and School of Entrepreneurship & Business Innovation respectively.

IV. RESULTS

Research Question 1: To what extent did university students experience cyberbullying?

Table 1

Times Participants were bullied in the Past Three Years

Times	Frequency	Percentages
0	23	46.0
1 to 3	20	40.0
4 to 6	4	8.0
7 to 10	1	2.0
More than 10	2	4.0

Table 1 shows that 46% (n = 23) of the participants stated that they did not experience cyberbullying. A total of 54% (n = 27) claimed that they experienced cyberbullying more than once, 40% (n = 20) claimed that they were cyberbullied between 1 to 3 times, 8 % (n = 4) 4 to 6 times, 2% (n = 1) 7 to 10 times, and 4% (n = 2) more than 10 times. The data indicated that of the 54 % (n = 27) of the participants who stated that they experienced cyberbullying, 70.1% (n = 19) experienced cyberbullying most frequently between 1 to 3 times. The least frequent times that participants were cyberbullied were 7 to 10 times. The data indicated that most of the participants in the sample experienced cyberbullying. However, it is not a large majority because the answers to whether participants were cyberbullied or not cyberbullied are almost shared.

Research Question Two: To what extent were cyberbully victims also bullies?

Table 2

Participants who were Bullies in the Past Three Years

Options	Frequency	Percentages
Yes	5	10.0
No	40	80.0
Not Sure	5	10.0

Of the 54% (n = 27) participants who indicated that they were cyberbullied, 10% (n = 5) claimed to have cyberbullied someone, 80% (n = 40) were not cyberbullying, and 10% (n = 5) were unsure whether they had committed any cyberbullying acts. The results revealed that few of the victims of cyberbullying were bullies.

Research Question Three: Were there differences in the frequency of cyberbullying based on gender and ethnicity?

An independent- samples t-test was done to conclude if differences occurred between the frequencies of times bullied and the female and male genders. The results indicated that there were a difference but it is not significant $t(48) = .19, p = .85$. The score for females was ($M = 1.79, SD = 1.01$) and higher than the scores for males ($M = 1.71, SD = .76$). Therefore, there is a difference, but it is not significant at the 0.05 level. The standard deviation suggests that the scores for the boys were homogeneous while they were dispersed for the girls.

A One-way ANOVA was conducted to explore whether differences exist between the frequency of times bullies and participants' ethnicity. Data were divided into three groups based on their ethnicities. (Group 1: Afro-Guyanese, Group 2: Indo-Guyanese, and Group 3: Mixed Race). The means and standard deviations are accessible in Table 3 below.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of the different ethnicities

Ethnicity	N	M	SD
Afro-Guyanese	19	1.32	.48
Indo-Guyanese	18	1.67	.59
Mixed Race	13	2.62	1.39

The mean score for Afro-Guyanese ($M = 1.32$, $SD = .48$) was significantly not different than Indo-Guyanese ($M = 1.67$, $SD = .59$). However, for Mixed Race ($M = 2.64$, $SD = 1.39$) a difference existed. Table 3 shows that there was a statistically significant difference at the 0.5 level between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(2, 47) = 9.45$, $p = .001$).

Table 4

Multiple Comparisons,
Turkey HSD

					95% confidence Interval	
(1) condition 4	(j) condition 4	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Afro- Guyanese	Indo- Guyanese	-.351	.276	.419	-1.02	.32
	Mixed Race	-1.300*	.302	<.001	-2.03	-.57
Indo- Guyanese	Afro- Guyanese	.351	.276	.419	-.32	1.02
	Mixed Race	-.949*	.306	.009	-1.69	-.21
Mixed Race	Afro- Guyanese	1.300*	.302	<.001	.57	2.03
	Indo- Guyanese	.949*	.306	.009	.21	1.69

*Significant at the 0.05 level

The results of the One-way Analysis of Variance showed statistically significant differences among the three ethnicities and times cyberbullied, $F(2, 47) = 9.49$, $p = .001$. However, the Turkey HSD test (Table 4) unearthed no significant differences between Afro and Indo-Guyanese condition and the times that they were cyberbullied ($p = .419$, 95% C.I. = [-1.02, .32]). However, there were significant differences between the Mixed Race and Afro-Guyanese ($p = <.001$, 95% C. I. = [-2.03, -.57]). Also, there were significant differences between the Mixed Race and the Indo-Guyanese ($p = .009$, 95 % C.I. = [.21, 1.69]).

Research Question 4: Were there differences in the frequency of time on digital media?

Hours Spent on Electronic Media?

Table 5

Hours that Participants Spent on Digital Media

Hours	Frequency	Percentages
1 to 2 hrs.	6	12.0
3 to 4 hrs.	20	40.0
5 to 6 hrs.	8	16.0
7 + hrs.	16	32.0

The data indicated that most of the participants, 40% ($n = 20$), spent 3 to 4 hours on digital media per day, followed by 32% ($n = 16$) of participants who spent more than 7 hours.

Additionally, 16 % ($n = 8$) and 12% ($n = 6$) of the participants spent approximately 5 to 6 hours and 1 to 2 hours. Evidence suggests that there are differences in the frequency of the time spent by participants on digital media.

Research Question 5: What were the most frequently used methods to cyberbully?

Table 6

Methods Used to Cyberbully

Answer Choices	Frequency	Percentages
Looking in to your cell phone	8	44.44
Looking in to your email	1	5.56
Sending you harassing emails	2	11.11
Sending you harassing pictures	8	44.44
Sending you pornographic images	6	33.33
Posting harassing pictures on a social media	2	11.11
Sexting	3	16.67

The data indicated that the two most frequently used methods that participants (44.44%, $n = 8$) used to cyberbully were looking into students' cell phones and sending harassing pictures. The other most frequent method used to cyberbully was sending pornographic images, with 33.33% ($n = 6$) participants. The least frequent methods used to cyberbully were sexting, 16.67% ($n = 16.67$), sending harassing emails, 11.11% ($n = 2$), posting harassing pictures on social media, 11.11% ($n = 2$), and looking into emails, 5.56% ($n = 1$).

Research Question 6: How were participants affected after being cyberbullied?

Table 7

Effects of Cyberbullying on Participants

Answer Choices	Frequency	Percentages
Felt sad	2	5.41
Was scared	2	5.41
Felt frustrated/helpless	4	10.81
Was embarrassed	7	18.92
Was angry	3	8.11
Suffered increased stress	2	5.41
Lower Self-esteem	6	16.22
Mental health problems	3	8.11
Interrupted sleep patterns	1	2.70
No effect	7	18.92

The data indicated that 18.92% ($n = 7$) of the participants felt embarrassed after being cyberbullied and the same proportion were not affected as a result of experiencing cyberbullying. Another 16.22% ($n = 6$) of participants experienced lower self-esteem. A further 10.81% ($n = 4$) of participants felt frustrated or helpless. Also, 8.11% ($n = 3$) of the participants were angry and experienced mental health problems. An additional 5.41% ($n = 2$) of the participants became sad, scared, or suffered increased stress. Furthermore, 2.70% ($n = 1$) of participants experienced interrupted sleep. The data indicated that the most frequent effects of cyberbullying were feeling embarrassed and experiencing lower self-esteem. It is significant to note that 18.92% ($n = 7$) of the participants claimed that they were not affected in any way by cyberbullying.

Research Question 7: What actions did victims take after being cyberbullied?

Table 8

Actions Taken by Participants after Being Cyberbullied

Answer Choices	Frequency	Percentages
Logged off the device	9	23.68
Changed screen name or email	6	15.75
Called police	3	7.89
Told a friend	6	15.79
Told a staff member	1	2.63
Did nothing	12	31.58
Other (media-fast)	1	2.63

The data showed that most participants, 31.58% ($n = 12$), took no action after experiencing cyberbullying, followed by 23.68% ($n = 9$) who logged off their devices. The other most frequent actions of participants were to change their screen name or email and tell a friend 15.79% ($n = 6$).

respectively. The least frequent actions were to call the police 7.89% (n = 3) of the participants, talk to a staff member, and take a media fast, 2.63% (n = 1).

Research Question 8: What strategies should the university implement to educate students and staff on cyberbullying?

Table 9

Strategies Recommended by Participants that can be used by the University's Administration to Address Cyberbullying

Answer Choices	Frequency	Percentages
Publicise more its policy on cyber-bullying	18	36.0
Publicise the harmful effects of cyber-bullying on students	8	16.0
Sponsor seminars for students on cyberbullying	18	36.0
Sponsor sensitivity seminars for faculty on cyberbullying	4	8.0
Hold sensitivity seminars for other staff members on cyberbullying	2	4.0

The data showed that the most frequent education strategy that participants stated that the university should implement is to publicise more of its policy on cyberbullying and sponsor seminars for students on cyberbullying 36.0% (n = 18) respectively. Followed by publicising ways in which cyberbullying affects students, 16.0% (n = 8). The least frequent education strategy was sponsoring sensitivity seminars for faculty on cyberbullying 8.0% (4) and holding sensitivity seminars for other staff members on cyberbullying 4.0% (n = 4).

V. DISCUSSION

The data showed that 54% of the participants experienced cyberbullying. The findings are consistent with Smith & Yoon (2013), Zalaquett & Chatters (2014), and Cilliers (2021). The proportion of participants who reported experiencing cyberbullying in those studies appeared much lower than what was discovered in this study. A larger sample size could be one explanation for the lower percentages of cyberbullying in those universities. The sample size in this study was 50, whereas it was 604 in Zalaquett & Chatters.

Most of the participants denied cyberbullying anyone online. Ten percent (10%) of those surveyed admitted to cyberbullying, while 10% weren't sure if they had or not. The findings support those of Mac Donald & Roberts Pittman (2010) and Zalaquett & Chatters (2014), who claimed that cyberbullying frequently results in cyberbullying by the victim.

In contrast to other studies, there was no discernible relationship between the incidence of cyberbullying and gender. According to Shaojing, Xitao, and Jianxia (2016) and Ndiege, Okello, and Wamuyu (2020), more men than women engaged in cyberbullying. Webber & Ovedovitz (2018) discovered that there were more women. The size of the sample and the location of the research may be factors contributing to this disparity. Participating in this study were just 7 men. Between Afro and Indo Guyanese, there were no significant differences in the incidence of cyberbullying; however, there were significant differences between Mixed Race and Afro and Indo Guyanese. This somewhat complies with Young (2020), who found a marginally significant correlation between ethnicity and one's encounters with cyberbullying. However, Adebayo, Ningaal, & Bolu-Steve (2020); Mc Cullough et al. (2021) noted that there was no significant relationship between race/ethnicity and cyberbullying behaviours. This suggests that the behaviours of cyberbullying are individual in nature, and not based on racial or ethnic background. Whereas, Mc Cullough et al. (2021) posited that race was not significantly associated with cyberbullying, minorities in the USA were cyberbullied at a higher rate than non-minorities.

Evidence suggests that there were differences in the frequency of the time spent by participants on digital media. This is in keeping with the results of Zalaquett & Chatters (2014) and Qudah et. al (2019). There is an indication that participants regardless of where they lived, used digital media at various times.

The survey found that looking into students' cell phones, sending harassing photographs, and sending sexual photographs were the participants' most popular methods of cyberbullying. The findings of Zalaquett and Chatters (2014); Walker, Sockman, and Koehn (2011), which stated that

text messaging was the most often utilized medium to cyberbully, were different from the results in this study. Sexting, sending harassing emails, posting harassing photos on social media, and reading emails were the other forms of cyberbullying. This is consistent with the research by Lawler and Molluzzo (2015).

The data showed that most participants took no action after experiencing cyberbullying. The studies mentioned in the literature review did not demonstrate this. The participants presumably did not know about the other possibilities, thus explaining their choice. The finding about telling a friend is similar to that of Schenk and Fremouw (2012). The other findings to call the police and talk to a staff member were similar to that of Rivituso (2014), who claimed that after being cyberbullied, they sought the assistance of the college Vice President of Student Affairs, the local police, or the campus security office.

The author of this study, as well as Cassidy, Faucher, and Jackson (2017), discovered that participants felt sad and humiliated as a result of cyberbullying. Additionally, participants in both this study and the one by Martinez-Monteaquedo et al. (2020) reported experiencing mental health issues. Furthermore, in this study as well as Zalaquett and Chatters' (2014) study, several victims indicated that they were not impacted by cyberbullying. The results suggest that university students around the world respond to cyberbullying in a similar way.

The data showed that participants wanted the university to make its policy on cyberbullying more widely known, host seminars for students on cyberbullying, raise awareness of how cyberbullying affects students and fund sensitivity seminars for all staff members. The strategies were comparable to Lawler and Molluzzo's (2015) assertion that respondents preferred educating the entire university community about cyberbullying. The finding also supported the assertion made by Faucher, Cassidy, and Jackson (2020) that participants in their study advocated for cyberbullying in the university's orientation program. The present study did not indicate counseling for victims and bullies as advocated by Johnson et al. (2016).

VI. LIMITATIONS, IMPLICATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, this study has limitations. Firstly, only about 8% of the university's total enrollment made up the sample size. Consequently, the results cannot be applied to the entire university. Approximately 500 students were invited to participate in the study's convenience sampling, and fifty of them did so. Secondly, a closed-ended questionnaire served as the data collection tool. As a result, it might not have covered every answer that could have been given in response to each question, giving participants fewer choices.

The results of this study add to the body of knowledge about the nature of cyberbullying that occurs among university students around the world. Additionally, it offers important preliminary information on cyberbullying among university students in Guyana for administrators, faculty, other staff, students, and other stakeholders. The researcher hopes that greater attention to this expanding global phenomenon will lead to more effective intervention strategies.

Finally, a mixed-method design can be used to replicate the study, which might result in more accurate results because the data can be triangulated. To identify similarities and differences, comparative studies can also be carried out at other universities in Guyana. The results of this study can also be used by other researchers to determine whether participants are familiar with the concept of cyberbullying. In their responses, some study participants admitted that they weren't sure if they had been bullied or not. This might have been because they were unsure of the meaning of cyberbullying.

References

- Adebayo, D. O., Ninggal, M. T., & Bolu-Steve, F. N. (2020). Relationship between demographic factors and undergraduates' cyberbullying experiences in public universities in Malaysia. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(1), 901-914. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13158a>
- 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.
- Bo Sophia Xiao, & Yee Man Wong. (2013). Cyber-bullying among university students: An empirical investigation from the Social Cognitive Perspective. *International Journal of Business & Information*, 8(1), 34-69.
- Brody, N., & Vangelisti, A. L. (2017). Cyberbullying: Topics, strategies, and sex differences. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 75, 739-748. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.06.020>

- Burnham, J.J., Wright, V.H., & Houser, R.A. (2011). Cyberbullying: Emergent concerns for adolescents and challenges for school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling*, 9 (15), 4.
- Cassidy, W., Faucher, C., & Jackson, M. (2017). Adversity in University: Cyberbullying and Its Impacts on Students, Faculty and Administrators. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 14(8), 888. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph14080888>
- Cilliers L. (2021). Perceptions and experiences of cyberbullying amongst university students in the Eastern Cape Province. *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa*.17 (1), Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4102/td.v17i1.776>
- Faucher, C., Cassidy, W., & Jackson, M. (2020). Awareness, Policy, Privacy, and More: Post-Secondary Students Voice Their Solutions to Cyberbullying. *European journal of investigation in health, psychology and education*, 10(3), 795–815. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe10030058>
- Johnson, L.D. Haralson, A., Batts, S., Brown, E., Collins, C., Buren-Travis, A.V., & Spenser, M. (2016). Cyberbullying on social media among college students. *Ideas and Research you can Use*. VISTAS Online. Available at:
- Lawler, J.P. & Molluzzo, J.C. (2015). A Comprehensive Survey on Student Perceptions of Cyberbullying at a major metropolitan university. *Contemporary Issues In Education Research*, 8(3), 159-169.
- MacDonald, C. D., & Roberts-Pittman, B. (2010). Cyberbullying among college students: Prevalence and demographic difference. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 2003–2009.
- Martínez-Monteaagudo, M.C., Delgado B, García-Fernández, J.M. & Ruíz-Esteban, C. (2020) Cyberbullying in the university setting. Relationship with emotional problems and adaptation to the university. *Front. Psychol.* 10:3074. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03074
- Mastaglia, B., Teye, C., & Kristjanson, L. J. (2003). Ensuring content validity in instrument development: challenges and innovative approaches. *Contemp Nurse*, 14(3), 287-291.
- Mc Cullough, C.L., Chesser, S., O'Leary, B.J., & Weathington, B.L. (2021). STEM, gender, ethnicity, and bullying. *American Society for Engineering Education 2021 Annual Conference Paper #34179*. Virtual Meeting. Available at <https://peer.asee.org>stem-gender-ethnicity->
- Meyers, C. A, Cowie, H. (2017). Bullying at university: The social and legal contexts of cyberbullying among university students. *J Cross Cult Psychol.* 48(8), 1172–1182. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022116684208>
- Ndiege, J. R. A., Okello, G., & Wamuyu, P. K. (2020). Cyberbullying among university students: The Kenyan experience. *African Journal of Information Systems*, 12(1), 24–43.
- "Nursing Student Charged for Cyberbullying." (2019, February 24). *Guyana Times*.
- Qudah, M. F. A., Albursan, I. S., Bakhiet, S. F. A., Hassan, E. M. A. H., Alfnan, A. A., Aljomaa, S. S., & AL-khadher, M. M. A. (2019). Smartphone addiction and its relationship with
- Rivituso, J. (2014). Cyberbullying Victimization among College Students: An Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 25(1), 71–75.
- Schenk, A. M., & Fremouw, W. J. (2012). Prevalence, Psychological Impact, and Coping of Cyberbully Victims among College Students. *Journal of School Violence*, 11(1), 21–37.
- Selkie, E. M., Kota, R., Chan, Y. F., & Moreno, M. (2015). Cyberbullying, depression, and problem alcohol use in female college students: a multisite study. *Cyberpsychology, behavior and social networking*, 18(2), 79–86. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2014.0371>
- Shaojing Sun, Xitao Fan, & Jianxia Du. (2016). Cyberbullying perpetration: A Meta-analysis of gender differences. *International Journal of Internet Science*, 11(1), 61–81.
- Smith, J. A., & Yoon, J. (2013). Cyberbullying presence, extent, & forms in a Midwestern post-secondary institution. *Information Systems Education Journal*, 11, 52-78.
- Tokunaga, R.S. (2010). Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of research in cyberbullying victimization. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26, 277-287.

- Walker, C.M., Sockman, B.R., & Koehn, S. (2011). An exploratory study of cyberbullying with undergraduate university students. *TECHTRENDS TECH TRENDS*, 55, 31-38. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-011-0481-0>
- Webber, M. A., & Ovedovitz, A. C. (2018). Cyberbullying among college students: A look at its prevalence at a U.S. Catholic University. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 4(2), 101-107. <https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.4.2.101>
- Weibel, A. & Fern, J. (2012). The Relationship between gender and perceived cyber-bullying. *Journal of Student Research*, 205-220. Available from WeibelAshley.pdf (wisconsin.edu)
- Whittaker, E., & Kowalski, R. M. (2015). Cyberbullying via Social Media. *Journal of School Violence*, 14(1), 11-29.
- Xiao, B.S., & Wong, Y.M. (2013). Cyber-Bullying among university students: An empirical investigation from the Social Cognitive Perspective. *International Journal of Business and Information*, 8 (1), 34-69.
- Young, S. (2020). The influence of ethnicity on the impact of cyberbullying among adults. [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=10952&context=dissertations>
- Zalaquett, C.P., & Chatters, S.J. (2014). Cyberbullying in college: Frequency, characteristics, and practical implications. *SAGE Open*, 1-8. doi: 10.1177/2158244014526721 sgo.sagepub.com