Exploring Cyberbullying: Reporting Practices, Institutional Responses, and Perceptions of Effectiveness

Maitri Unaliya[1], Yachi Kataria[2], Yuvraj Bhutra[3], Rahul Chauhan[4], Andino Maseleno[5], R. Rizal Isnanto[6]

[1]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India

[2]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India

[3]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India

[4]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India, rj88chauhan@gmail.com

[5]Department of Information Systems, Institut Bakti Nusantara, Lampung, Indonesia, andino.maseleno@ibnus.ac.id

[6]Department of Computer Engineering, Diponegoro University, Semarang, Indonesia, rizal@ce.undip.ac.id

Corresponding Author : andino.maseleno@ibnus.ac.id[5]

Abstract: This study investigates the experiences and perceptions of individuals regarding cyberbullying, focusing on reporting practices, actions taken after reporting, and the perceived effectiveness of institutional responses in schools, workplaces, and online platforms. Using ANOVA analysis, no significant differences were found across demographic groups concerning these variables. The findings suggest a pervasive lack of reporting, minimal follow-up actions, and general dissatisfaction with institutional efforts to address cyberbullying. These results highlight the need for stronger intervention strategies, improved reporting mechanisms, and enhanced awareness to foster safer digital environments. Future research should focus on the barriers to reporting and explore how different cultural and contextual factors influence perceptions of cyberbullying and institutional responses. The global significance of addressing cyberbullying lies in its potential to improve mental health and digital safety across diverse populations, contributing to a more secure online experience for all.

Keywords: Cyberbullying, reporting practices, institutional responses

INTRODUCTION

The collection of studies presented explores a wide array of contemporary issues that span education, technology, business ethics, tourism, and digital interactions. These studies contribute significantly to their respective fields by offering fresh insights into how various societal sectors are respond into evolving challenges and opportunities.

In the field of education, Boyland et al. (2016) highlight the importance of school leadership in creating supportive environments for LGBTQ students. They argue that principals can play a pivotal role in promoting inclusivity and ensuring that LGBTQ students feel safe and accepted within schools. The study emphasizes the need for school leaders to be proactive in addressing the unique challenges faced by LGBTQ students, calling for stronger policies, training, and practices to foster equality and safety. This work contributes to the ongoing dialogue about the role of leadership in shaping inclusive educational spaces.

Ciuchita et al. (2022) focus on user-created communication (UCC) in service contexts, examining how digital affordances such as interactivity, visibility, and anonymity influence user behavior and communication in online services. The study demonstrates that these affordances can empower users to participate in co-creating value but also present challenges related to user engagement and privacy concerns. Their research underscores the importance of understanding how technological affordances can shape the way users communicate and engage with service providers, offering valuable insights for businesses looking to enhance customer interaction and service quality.

In a study on ethics in computing, Gordon et al. (2022) explore the ethical implications of computing technologies through a multi-stakeholder analysis. Their research presents a holistic view of computing ethics, addressing concerns raised by various stakeholders, including developers, users, and policymakers. This work highlights the complexity of ethical issues in the tech industry, emphasizing the need for comprehensive ethical guidelines and frameworks that can be applied across different sectors. Expanding on technology adoption, Khan et al. (2024) investigate the acceptance of mobile augmented reality apps in Pakistan, extending the mobile technology acceptance model to consider cultural and regional factors. This study highlights the growing potential of augmented reality technologies in developing countries, providing insights into how users perceive and engage with emerging digital tools. Their findings suggest that local context and user perceptions significantly impact the adoption of mobile technologies, which has implications for technology developers and marketers.

The issue of technology-facilitated violence is explored by Makinde et al. (2021), who examine the nature of violence and abuse among young adults in Sub-Saharan Africa. Their research uncovers the prevalence of online abuse and its detrimental effects on young people, calling for better protections and awareness campaigns to address the growing issue of digital violence. This work contributes to the global conversation about online safety, particularly in regions with limited resources for combating such abuse.

Kim (2023) examines corporate social responsibility (CSR) during the COVID-19 pandemic, focusing on Korean global firms. The study explores how these companies adapted their CSR strategies in response to the pandemic and how stakeholder theory can explain these changes. The research offers valuable insights into the evolving role of CSR in times of crisis, emphasizing the need for companies to align their strategies with stakeholder expectations during challenging periods. Other studies in this collection address topics such as the framing of controversial CSR messages in the hospitality industry (Belarmino et al., 2024), the impact of social media on academic performance in Bangladesh (Chowdhury, 2024), the future of virtual spaces in tourism (Filimonau et al., 2024), and privacy concerns related to social networking sites (Handa et al., 2024). These studies collectively shed light on critical issues shaping digital interactions, business practices, and user experiences in the modern world.

METHOD

This research aims to explore the prevalence of cyberbullying among adolescents in Ahmedabad and its psychological and social impacts on victims. The study adopts a quantitative research approach, employing a structured questionnaire to gather data from a sample of 100

adolescents in the age group of 18 and above.. The methodology details the objectives, sampling procedure, data collection, and data analysis techniques employed in this research.

Objectives
- To analyze the forms and locations of cyberbullying experienced by individuals and examine whether these factors significantly influence the overall impact of cyberbullying.
- To investigate the relationship between reporting cyberbullying incidents, the actions taken afterward, and perceptions of institutional effectiveness in addressing cyberbullying among different groups.

Hypothesis:
Ho1: There is no significant difference in the impact of cyberbullying based on the form it takes or the location where it occurs
Ho2: There are no significant differences in the reporting of cyberbullying incidents, the actions taken after reporting, or perceptions of how well institutions address cyberbullying across different demographic groups.

The sample size for this study on cyberbullying in Ahmedabad consists of 162 participants selected from various schools and colleges across Ahmedabad. The sample was using random sampling techniques to ensure a representative distribution of students from different backgrounds. This sample size is deemed sufficient to achieve meaningful statistical analysis while maintaining manageability for data collection and analysis within the study's scope.

The data for this study on cyberbullying among adolescents in Ahmedabad collected using a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire will consist of closed-ended questions and Likert-scale items to capture detailed information about participants' experiences with cyberbullying. Key areas of focus will include the frequency and nature of cyberbullying incidents, platforms where these incidents occur (such as social media or messaging apps), and the emotional and psychological effects of cyberbullying. Additionally, questions will explore participants' awareness of resources available for addressing and responding to cyberbullying incidents.

The participants, 162 adolescents was through a random sampling method from various schools and colleges in Ahmedabad. The questionnaire will be distributed both in physical form in schools and through online platforms to ensure broad and diverse participation. This mixed-mode of distribution will help improve response rates and ensure that the data is collected efficiently.

The data collection process will adhere to strict ethical guidelines, ensuring participants' confidentiality and anonymity. Informed consent will be obtained from both the participants and, where necessary, their guardians. The data collection is planned to take place over a four-week period, allowing adequate time to gather a representative sample of responses while ensuring the quality of the collected data.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION
The table provides detailed demographic insights into the participants of the study, covering age, gender, and occupation. The age distribution shows that the majority of respondents, 60.7%, are between 18 and 21 years old, indicating that most participants belong to a younger demographic. A smaller portion, 19.6%, falls into the 21-25 age range, while 15.3% are between 25-30 years. Only 4.3% of participants are over 30, highlighting a predominantly youthful population.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents

	Particular	Frequencies	Percentage
Age	18-21 Years	99	60.7
	21-25 Years	32	19.6
	25-30 Years	25	15.3
	30 Above Years	6	4.3
	Total	162	100
Gender	Male	76	47.2
	Female	86	52.8
	Total	162	100
Occupation	Student	76	47.2
	Private Emplyoee	42	25.8
	Government Employee	32	19.6
	Self Employed	12	7.4
	Total	162	100

[Sources: SPSS View]

In terms of gender, the participants are relatively balanced, with females making up 52.8% of the sample and males comprising 47.2%. This slight female majority provides a near-equal representation of both genders, ensuring a balanced perspective from different gender groups in the study. Regarding occupation, nearly half of the participants (47.2%) are students, reflecting a strong presence of individuals in the early stages of their academic or professional journeys. Private employees make up 25.8% of the sample, while 19.6% of respondents are government employees. A smaller group, 7.4%, is self-employed, showing that the study population includes individuals from various employment backgrounds, with students forming the largest segment. This distribution provides a broad view of experiences from different professional and academic settings.

Table 2: ANOVA Table

ANOVA						
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
If you have experienced cyberbullying, what form did it take?	Between Groups	5.572	3	1.857	3.223	.024
	Within Groups	91.051	158	.576		
	Total	96.623	161			
Where did the cyberbullying occur?	Between Groups	6.997	3	2.332	2.748	.045
	Within Groups	133.251	157	.849		
	Total	140.248	160			

[Sources: SPSS View]

The ANOVA table presents the results of an analysis examining two aspects of cyberbullying: the form it took and where it occurred. For the question, "If you have experienced cyberbullying, what form did it take?" the analysis shows a significant difference between the groups, as indicated by an F-value of 3.223 and a p-value of 0.024. This suggests that the different forms of cyberbullying experienced by respondents vary significantly across groups. The between-group variability has a sum of squares of 5.572, with a mean square of 1.857, while the within-group variability is reflected by a sum of squares of 91.051 and a mean square of 0.576.

For the question, "Where did the cyberbullying occur?" the ANOVA results also show a statistically significant difference between the groups, with an F-value of 2.748 and a p-value of 0.045. This indicates that there are significant differences in where the respondents experienced cyberbullying. The sum of squares between the groups is 6.997, and the mean square is 2.332, while the within-group sum of squares is 133.251, with a mean square of 0.849. These results suggest that both the form of cyberbullying and the platform on which it occurred differ significantly between groups.

Table 3 : ANOVA Table

ANOVA						
	Sum of Squares	**Df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**	
If you have experienced cyberbullying, what form did it take?	**Between Groups**	.038	1	.038	.063	.803
	Within Groups	96.586	160	.604		
	Total	96.623	161			
Where did the cyberbullying occur?	**Between Groups**	.244	1	.244	.277	.600
	Within Groups	140.005	159	.881		
	Total	140.248	160			

[Sources: SPSS View]

The table provides results from an ANOVA analysis examining the relationship between two specific variables related to cyberbullying: the form it took and the location where it occurred. For the question "If you have experienced cyberbullying, what form did it take?" the analysis reveals a Between Groups Sum of Squares of 0.038 with 1 degree of freedom (df) and a Mean Square of 0.038. The Within Groups Sum of Squares is 96.586 with 160 degrees of freedom, and the Mean Square is 0.604. The F-value for this comparison is 0.063 with a significance value (Sig.) of 0.803, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference between groups in terms of the form cyberbullying took.

Similarly, for the question "Where did the cyberbullying occur?" the Between Groups Sum of Squares is 0.244 with 1 degree of freedom, and the Mean Square is 0.244. The Within Groups Sum of Squares is 140.005 with 159 degrees of freedom, and the Mean Square is 0.881. The F-value for this analysis is 0.277 with a significance value of 0.600, suggesting no

significant difference between groups regarding where the cyberbullying occurred. In both cases, the high p-values (greater than 0.05) indicate that neither the form nor the location of cyberbullying has a statistically significant impact when comparing the groups involved in the study.

Table 4 : ANOVA Table

ANOVA						
	Sum of Squares	**Df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**	
Did you report the cyberbullying incident?	**Between Groups**	.127	1	.127	.219	.640
	Within Groups	92.318	160	.577		
	Total	92.444	161			
What actions were taken after you reported the cyberbullying (if applicable)?	**Between Groups**	1.747	1	1.747	1.426	.234
	Within Groups	196.062	160	1.225		
	Total	197.809	161			
Do you feel schools, workplaces, or online platforms are doing enough to address cyberbullying?	**Between Groups**	1.346	1	1.346	1.383	.241
	Within Groups	155.765	160	.974		
	Total	157.111	161			

[Sources: SPSS View]

The table presents the results of an ANOVA analysis that explores three specific questions related to the reporting of cyberbullying, the actions taken following the report, and perceptions of institutional responses to cyberbullying. For the question, "Did you report the cyberbullying incident?", the Between Groups Sum of Squares is 0.127 with 1 degree of freedom, and the Within Groups Sum of Squares is 92.318 with 160 degrees of freedom. The F-value is 0.219, and the significance value (Sig.) is 0.640. This suggests no statistically significant difference between groups concerning whether the incident was reported, as the p-value is much higher than the typical threshold of 0.05.

Regarding the question, "What actions were taken after you reported the cyberbullying (if applicable)?", the analysis shows a Between Groups Sum of Squares of 1.747 with 1 degree of freedom and a Within Groups Sum of Squares of 196.062 with 160 degrees of freedom. The F-

value is 1.426, and the significance value is 0.234, which again indicates no significant difference between groups concerning actions taken after reporting.

Finally, for the question, "Do you feel schools, workplaces, or online platforms are doing enough to address cyberbullying?", the Between Groups Sum of Squares is 1.346 with 1 degree of freedom, and the Within Groups Sum of Squares is 155.765 with 160 degrees of freedom. The F-value is 1.383, and the significance value is 0.241, showing no statistically significant difference between groups in their perceptions of institutional efforts to address cyberbullying. In all three cases, the p-values are above 0.05, indicating no significant differences in responses for any of the questions analyzed.

Table 5 : ANOVA Table

ANOVA						
	Sum of Squares	**Df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**	
Did you report the cyberbullying incident?	**Between Groups**	**2.016**	**3**	**.672**	**1.174**	**.321**
	Within Groups	**90.428**	**158**	**.572**		
	Total	**92.444**	**161**			
What actions were taken after you reported the cyberbullying (if applicable)?	**Between Groups**	**3.873**	**3**	**1.291**	**1.331**	**.266**
	Within Groups	**153.238**	**158**	**.970**		
	Total	**157.111**	**161**			
Do you feel schools, workplaces, or online platforms are doing enough to address cyberbullying?	**Between Groups**	**.622**	**3**	**.207**	**.166**	**.919**
	Within Groups	**197.186**	**158**	**1.248**		
	Total	**197.809**	**161**			

[Sources: SPSS View]

The table presents the results of an ANOVA analysis investigating three questions related to the reporting of cyberbullying, the actions taken after reporting, and perceptions of institutional responses to cyberbullying. For the question, "Did you report the cyberbullying incident?", the analysis shows a Between Groups Sum of Squares of 2.016 across 3 degrees of freedom, with a Within Groups Sum of Squares of 90.428 over 158 degrees of freedom. The F-

value is 1.174, with a significance (Sig.) value of 0.321, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference between groups in terms of whether individuals reported the cyberbullying incident.

For the question, "What actions were taken after you reported the cyberbullying (if applicable)?", the Between Groups Sum of Squares is 0.622 across 3 degrees of freedom, with a Within Groups Sum of Squares of 197.186 over 158 degrees of freedom. The F-value is 0.166, with a significance value of 0.919, showing that no significant differences exist between groups concerning the actions taken after the incident was reported.

Lastly, for the question, "Do you feel schools, workplaces, or online platforms are doing enough to address cyberbullying?", the Between Groups Sum of Squares is 3.873 across 3 degrees of freedom, and the Within Groups Sum of Squares is 153.238 over 158 degrees of freedom. The F-value is 1.331, with a significance value of 0.266, indicating no significant group differences in perceptions of whether institutions are adequately addressing cyberbullying. In all cases, the significance values (p-values) are above the 0.05 threshold, suggesting that there are no meaningful differences in the responses to any of the questions based on the group comparisons.

Discussion

The results of this study provide valuable insights into the perceptions and experiences of individuals regarding cyberbullying, particularly in relation to reporting incidents, subsequent actions, and the effectiveness of institutional responses. The ANOVA analyses revealed no statistically significant differences across demographic groups concerning whether incidents were reported, the actions taken post-reporting, or perceptions of institutional adequacy in addressing cyberbullying.

The lack of significant differences in reporting cyberbullying may indicate a pervasive culture of silence or stigma surrounding this issue, which has been documented in previous research. For instance, Kowalski et al. (2014) highlight that many victims of cyberbullying choose not to report their experiences due to fears of retaliation, disbelief, or a lack of faith in the effectiveness of institutional responses. This finding suggests that further efforts are needed to create safe and supportive environments where individuals feel empowered to report incidents without fear of negative consequences.

Similarly, the study's results regarding actions taken after reporting may reflect a gap in the support systems available to victims of cyberbullying. DeSmet et al. (2016) found that the effectiveness of intervention strategies in schools and workplaces is often limited by inadequate follow-up and a lack of clear procedures for addressing reported incidents. The findings from this study reinforce the notion that institutions may need to evaluate and improve their response mechanisms to ensure that victims receive appropriate support and that their reports lead to meaningful action.

The perceptions of whether schools, workplaces, or online platforms are doing enough to address cyberbullying were also not significantly different among groups. This suggests a general discontent regarding institutional responses, echoing concerns raised by Pew Research Center (2018), which reported that many individuals feel that educational and workplace environments are not adequately equipped to deal with cyberbullying effectively. These findings emphasize the necessity for a proactive approach in developing comprehensive policies and practices aimed at combating cyberbullying and fostering a culture of awareness and support.

In conclusion, the absence of significant differences across demographic groups highlights the urgent need for improved awareness, reporting mechanisms, and intervention strategies to address cyberbullying effectively. Future research should explore the barriers to reporting and the factors that contribute to the perception of institutional inadequacy in addressing this critical

issue. By understanding these dynamics, stakeholders can better tailor their efforts to create safer environments for all individuals impacted by cyberbullying.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study underscores the significant challenges surrounding cyberbullying, particularly in the realms of reporting, responses, and perceptions of institutional effectiveness. The findings reveal a concerning lack of significant differences across demographic groups in relation to reporting incidents, actions taken post-reporting, and feelings about how well schools, workplaces, and online platforms address the issue. This lack of variance highlights a shared experience among individuals, suggesting that widespread barriers prevent effective reporting and meaningful institutional responses. The implications of these findings extend beyond the individual level, calling for a comprehensive reevaluation of policies and practices related to cyberbullying. Institutions must prioritize creating safe environments that encourage reporting and ensure that appropriate actions follow each incident. Additionally, training for educators, employers, and online platforms on recognizing and addressing cyberbullying is crucial in fostering a proactive culture of awareness and support.

Future research should aim to explore the underlying factors that contribute to the silence surrounding cyberbullying incidents and the perceived inadequacy of institutional responses. Qualitative studies could provide deeper insights into the experiences of victims, while longitudinal research could assess the effectiveness of implemented strategies over time. Furthermore, examining cultural differences in perceptions and responses to cyberbullying across various global contexts would enrich the understanding of this issue and inform tailored interventions.

The global impact of addressing cyberbullying is profound. As digital communication continues to evolve, understanding and mitigating the consequences of cyberbullying is essential for promoting mental well-being and fostering safe online environments. By prioritizing this issue, stakeholders can work collectively to create a world where individuals feel secure in their digital interactions, ultimately contributing to healthier communities and societies.

Acknowledgement

REFERENCES

Ahmad, E. (2024). The convergence of Education 4.0 and Industry 4.0: a Twin Peaks model. *Journal of Innovative Digital Transformation*, *1*(1), 68–83. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIDT-10-2023-0029

Alfandari, R., Crous, G., & Fuentes-Peláez, N. (2023). Children's Participation in Research on Violence Affecting Them: A European Overview. In M. Roth, R. Alfandari, & G. Crous (Eds.), *Participatory Research on Child Maltreatment with Children and Adult Survivors* (pp. 27–49). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80455-526-220231003

Al-Nasrawi, S. (2021). Combating Cyber Violence Against Women and Girls: An Overview of the Legislative and Policy Reforms in the Arab Region*. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 493–512). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211037

Bailey, J. (2021). Introduction. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 21–23). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211060

Bailey, J., & Shayan, S. (2021). The Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women Crisis: Technological Dimensions #   *. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 125–144). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211007

Bailey, J., Henry, N., & Flynn, A. (2021). Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse: International Perspectives and Experiences. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 1–17). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211001

Belarmino, A., Whalen, E. A., & Guzzo, R. F. (2024). The impact of message framing on perceptions of controversial CSR in hotels. *International Hospitality Review*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/IHR-12-2022-0062

Beneito, P., & Vicente-Chirivella, Ó. (2022). Banning mobile phones in schools: evidence from regional-level policies in Spain. *Applied Economic Analysis*, *30*(90), 153–175. https://doi.org/10.1108/AEA-05-2021-0112

Blair, M., Rigby, M., & Alexander, D. (Eds.). (2019). Index. In *Issues and Opportunities in Primary Health Care for Children in Europe* (pp. 393–410). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78973-351-820191021

Boyland, L. G., Swensson, J., Ellis, J. G., Coleman, L. L., & Boyland, M. I. (2016). Principals Can and Should Make a Positive Difference for LGBTQ Students. *Journal of Leadership Education*, *15*(4), 117–131. https://doi.org/10.12806/V15/I4/A1

Carlson, B., & Frazer, R. (2021). Attending to Difference in Indigenous People's Experiences of Cyberbullying: Toward a Research Agenda. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 145–163). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211008

Cheung, A. (2021). Doxing and the Challenge to Legal Regulation: When Personal Data Become a Weapon. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 577–594). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211041

Chowdhury, E. K. (2024). Examining the benefits and drawbacks of social media usage on academic performance: a study among university students in Bangladesh. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-07-2023-0097

Ciuchita, R., Medberg, G., Penttinen, V., Lutz, C., & Heinonen, K. (2022). Affordances advancing user-created communication (UCC) in service: interactivity, visibility and anonymity. *Journal of Service Management*, *33*(4/5), 688–704. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-10-2021-0407

Coombs, E. (2021). Human Rights, Privacy Rights, and Technology-Facilitated Violence. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 475–491). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211036

Dayal, D. N. (2022). The Paradox of Constitutional Protection and Prejudice Experienced by LGBTQ+ People in South Africa. In M. S. Schotanus (Ed.), *Gender Violence, the Law, and Society* (pp. 105–120). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80117-127-420221009

Dunmade, A. O., & Tella, A. (2023). Libraries and librarians' roles in ensuring cyberethical behaviour. *Library Hi Tech News*, *40*(7), 7–11. https://doi.org/10.1108/LHTN-04-2023-0068

Dunn, S. (2021). Is it Actually Violence? Framing Technology-Facilitated Abuse as Violence. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 25–45). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211002

Ferdiansyah, D., Isnanto, R., & Suseno, J. E. (2023, May). Organizational indicators on startup software for implementing secure software development lifecycle (SSDL): A systematic literature review. In *AIP Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 2683, No. 1). AIP Publishing.

Filimonau, V., Ashton, M., & Stankov, U. (2024). Virtual spaces as the future of consumption in tourism, hospitality and events. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, *10*(1), 110–115. https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-07-2022-0174

Flynn, A. (2021). Introduction. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 619–622). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211066

Forssell, R. C. (2020). Cyberbullying in a boundary blurred working life. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, *15*(2), 89–107. https://doi.org/10.1108/QROM-05-2018-1636

Gordon, D., Stavrakakis, I., Gibson, J. P., Tierney, B., Becevel, A., Curley, A., Collins, M., O'Mahony, W., & O'Sullivan, D. (2022). Perspectives on computing ethics: a multi-stakeholder analysis. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, *20*(1), 72–90. https://doi.org/10.1108/JICES-12-2020-0127

Handa, M., Bhalla, R., & Ahuja, P. (2024). My privacy at risk – my guard is on: a study of SNS use among young adults. *Vilakshan - XIMB Journal of Management*, *21*(1), 126–140. https://doi.org/10.1108/XJM-05-2023-0108

Harris, B., & Woodlock, D. (2021). Digital Coercive Control and Spatiality: Rural, Regional, and Remote Women's Experience. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 387–406). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211030

Hastings, L. J., & McElravy, L. J. (2020). FURTHER EXAMINATION OF YOUTH LEADERSHIP SKILLS PREDICTORS. *Journal of Leadership Education*, *19*(1), 99–118. https://doi.org/10.12806/V19/I1/R4

Hrick, P. (2021). The Potential of Centralized and Statutorily Empowered Bodies to Advance a Survivor-Centered Approach to Technology-Facilitated Violence Against Women. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 595–615). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211043

Jaakson, K., & Dedova, M. (2023). Do (gendered) ageism and ethnic minorities explain workplace bullying? *International Journal of Manpower*, *44*(9), 199–215. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-10-2022-0492

Jane, E. A. (2021). "Feminism is Eating Itself": Women's Experiences and Perceptions of Lateral Violence Online. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 171–188). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211009

Johnson, C. E. (2014). Why "Good" Followers Go "Bad": The Power of Moral Disengagement. *Journal of Leadership Education*, *13*(4), 36–50. https://doi.org/10.12806/V13/I4/C6

Juwita, O., Isnanto, R. R., Prasetijo, A. B., & Slamin, S. (2023). Crowdfunding Platform as an Open Innovation Model: The Importance of Effective Platform Governance. In *E3S Web of Conferences* (Vol. 448, p. 02007). EDP Sciences.

Khan, S., Zhang, Q., Khan, S. U., Khan, I. U., & Khan, R. U. (2024). Understanding mobile augmented reality apps in Pakistan: an extended mobile technology acceptance model. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-04-2022-0131

Kim, S. (2023). The COVID-19 pandemic and corporate social responsibility of Korean global firms: from the perspective of stakeholder theory. *Emerald Open Research*, *1*(4). https://doi.org/10.1108/EOR-04-2023-0013

Lytle, R. D., Bratton, T. M., & Hudson, H. K. (2021). Bystander Apathy and Intervention in the Era of Social Media. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 711–728). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211052

Makinde, O. A., Olamijuwon, E., Ichegbo, N. K., Onyemelukwe, C., & Ilesanmi, M. G. (2021). The Nature of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse among Young Adults in Sub-Saharan Africa. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 83–101). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211005

Malik, A., Dhir, A., Kaur, P., & Johri, A. (2021). Correlates of social media fatigue and academic performance decrement. *Information Technology & People*, *34*(2), 557–580. https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-06-2019-0289

Marganski, A. J., & Melander, L. A. (2021). Technology-Facilitated Violence Against Women and Girls in Public and Private Spheres: Moving from Enemy to Ally. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 623–641). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211046

Marques, O. (2021). Intimate Image Dissemination and Consent in a Digital Age: Perspectives from the Front Line. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 309–328). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211022

Martin, J. (2010). Comparative Book Review. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives*, *7*(2), 73–79. https://doi.org/10.18538/lthe.v7.n2.41

Martzoukou, K. (2022). "Maddie is online": an educational video cartoon series on digital literacy and resilience for children. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, *15*(1), 64–82. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-06-2020-0031

McCarthy, S., Rowan, W., Mahony, C., & Vergne, A. (2023). The dark side of digitalization and social media platform governance: a citizen engagement study. *Internet Research*, *33*(6), 2172–2204. https://doi.org/10.1108/INTR-03-2022-0142

Morah, D. N., & Nwafor, O. A. (2024). Beyond tribal politics for e-participation and development: social media influence on Nigeria's 2023 presidential general election. *Journal of Innovative Digital Transformation*, *1*(1), 32–47. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIDT-08-2023-0004

Muhonen, T., Jönsson, S., & Bäckström, M. (2017). Consequences of cyberbullying behaviour in working life. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, *10*(5), 376–390. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJWHM-10-2016-0075

Pacheco, E., & Melhuish, N. (2021). The Face of Technology-Facilitated Aggression in New Zealand: Exploring Adult Aggressors' Behaviors. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and*

Abuse (pp. 103–123). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211006

Thomasen, K., & Dunn, S. (2021). Reasonable Expectations of Privacy in an Era of Drones and Deepfakes: Expanding the Supreme Court of Canada's Decision in R v Jarvis. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 555–576). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211040

Todorova, A. (2024). Examining emotional intelligence evolution with age: insights from Bulgarian digital entrepreneurs of different generations. *IIMT Journal of Management*, *1*(1), 5–23. https://doi.org/10.1108/IIMTJM-12-2023-0075

Tzanetakis, M., & Marx, S. A. (2023). The Dark Side of Cryptomarkets: Towards a New Dialectic of Self-Exploitation Within Platform Capitalism. In M. Tzanetakis & N. South (Eds.), *Digital Transformations of Illicit Drug Markets: Reconfiguration and Continuity* (pp. 141–154). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80043-866-820231010

Vaahensalo, E. (2021). Creating the Other in Online Interaction: Othering Online Discourse Theory. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 227–246). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-848-520211016

Walker, G., & Venker Weidenbenner, J. (2019). Social and Emotional Learning in the age of virtual play: technology, empathy, and learning. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, *12*(2), 116–132. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-03-2019-0046