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- Asia
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DEFINITIONS

- **AGGRESSION:** intent to cause harm
- **CYBER-AGGRESSION:** intent to cause harm using mobile phones or the internet
- **BULLYING:** repeated aggressive acts, carried out by a group or individual, against someone who cannot easily defend themselves, - or ‘a systematic abuse of power’.
- **CYBERBULLYING** repeated aggressive acts, carried out by a group or individual, against someone who cannot easily defend themselves - using mobile phones or the internet.
Challenges in defining cyber-bullying: using traditional criteria in cyber domain

**Imbalance of power:** normal ‘physical strength’ or ‘numbers’ do not apply – BUT greater ICT skills, and anonymity (or if not anonymity, then conventional criteria may still be relevant)

**Repetition:** a single perpetrator act may be viewed or passed on many times by others – so different aspects of repetition in cyberbullying.
Prevalence in different countries

- Cyber-victimisation rates ranging between 1% and 72% (Kowalski et al. 2014; Tokunaga, 2010; HBSC 2013/14)
- Most 20%-40% (Aboujaoude et al., 2015), average of 24% (Hinduja & Patchin, 2012)
- Lower rates for thoroughly designed survey studies: 3-4% (HBSC 2013/14), or 6% (Livingstone, Haddon, Görzig, & Ólafsson, 2011) or 9% (NCES, 2013)
- around 20% for *one-off* occurrences and around 5% for *repeated* incidences (Smith, 2015)
- Issue of repetition in definition and measurement
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN COUNTRIES
Cyber-bullying Victimisation

EU KIDS ONLINE (2010)
- Prevalence estimates range from 2% to 14% across 25 countries
  (Livingstone, Haddon, Görzig & Ólafsson, 2011)
- Country-level explains c. 7% of variance in cyberbullying prevalence
  (Görzig & Machackova, 2015)

How can those cross-cultural differences in cyber-bullying be explained?
What are some of the methodological challenges?
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DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CROSS-NATIONAL SURVEYS

Two sources of large-scale survey data on cyber victim rates, cross nationally, all using pupil self-report:

- **EU KIDS ONLINE** given in 25 European countries in 2010.
- **HEALTH BEHAVIOUR IN SCHOOL-AGED CHILDREN (HBSC)** given every 4 years in about 42 countries; cyber questions included in latest, 2013-14, survey.

- [n.b. GLOBAL SCHOOL HEALTH SURVEY (GSHS), TRENDS IN INTERNATIONAL MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE STUDY (TIMSS), and OECD/PISA (2015) all give victim rates, but not specifically cyber victim.]
EU KIDS ONLINE
(VERSION FOR 11-16 YEARS OLD)

Examples of surveys questions

SECTION B

EVERYONE ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS

PLEASE READ: Sometimes children or teenagers say or do hurtful or nasty things to someone and this can often be quite a few times over a period of time, for example. This can include:

- teasing someone in a way this person does not like
- hitting, kicking or pushing someone around
- leaving someone out of things

When people are hurtful or nasty to someone in this way, it can happen:

- face to face (in person)
- by mobile phones (texts, calls, video clips)
- on the internet (e-mail, instant messaging, social networking, chatrooms)

112. Has someone acted in this kind of hurtful or nasty way to you in the PAST 12 MONTHS?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

A  Yes  [ ]  Answer question on next page
B  No  [ ]
C  Don't know  [ ]
D  Prefer not to say  [ ]

113. How often has someone acted in this kind of way towards you in the PAST 12 MONTHS?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

A  Every day or almost every day  [ ]
B  Once or twice a week  [ ]
C  Once or twice a month  [ ]
D  Less often  [ ]
E  Don't know  [ ]

115. At any time during the last 12 months has this happen on the internet?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

A  Yes  [ ]
B  No  [ ]
C  Don't know  [ ]

Answer questions on next page
Go straight to section C
We say a student is being bullied when another student, or a group of students:
- say or do nasty and unpleasant things to him or her
- when a student is teased repeatedly in a way he or she does not like
- when he or she is deliberately left out of things

But it is not bullying when two students of about the same strength or power argue or fight. It is also not bullying when a student is teased in a friendly and playful way.

‘How often have you been a victim of cyberbullying through someone sending mean instant messages, wall-postings, emails and text messages, or had created a website that made fun of you?’

Example of survey question incl. *time frame*:

Item box 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MQ41</th>
<th>How often have you been bullied at school in the past couple of months?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have not been bullied at school in the past couple of months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It has only happened once or twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 or 3 times a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>About once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several times a week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing EU Kids Online and HBSC

Correlations across 21 countries, for cyber victim rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11 years</th>
<th>13 years</th>
<th>15 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n.b. correlations within HBSC across ages, and gender, are mostly around 0.6, 0.7 (range 0.37 to 0.88)
METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES IN COMPARING DIFFERENT SURVEYS – how can we explain the discrepancies?

Definition of bullying
Types of bullying assessed
Different versions by age
Frequency criteria and time reference period
Single item or scale
Year of survey
Group survey or face-to-face
Sample characteristics – age, gender, national representation, use of internet
Non-response rates
Linguistic issues – translation of ‘bullying’
Linguistic issues

- **bullying** in English-speaking countries: intent to harm repeated, imbalance of power
- **mobbing/mobbning** in Scandinavian countries
- **pesten** in Netherlands
- **schikanieren** in Germany
- **gemein sein** in Austria
- **ijime** in Japan
- **wang-ta** in South Korea
- **qifu** in China (Mandarin)

Note: Neither of these two expressions in German are equivalent to “bullying”
Non-response rates & Survey procedures

Have you acted in a way that might have felt hurtful or nasty to someone else in the PAST 12 MONTHS?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don't know ☐

Prefer not to say ☐

Answer questions on next page

Go straight to section D

$r = .58^*$

$r = -.45^*$
Country variations in population profiles

Country variations in educational level of household
## EXPLANATIONS OF CROSS-NATIONAL DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL VALUES</strong></td>
<td>Hofstede, Gelfand, Schwartz etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION SYSTEM</strong></td>
<td>levels by age, grade retention, class groupings, school &amp; class size, structure of school day, break times and supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNOLOGICAL INFRASTRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td>penetration of mobile phones, smart phones and internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGULATORY FRAMEWORK</strong></td>
<td>school policies, legal aspects, anti-bullying initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIO-ECONOMIC STRATIFICATION</strong></td>
<td>GDP, socioeconomic inequality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Analysis
- **Socio-economic stratification**
- **Regulatory framework**
- **Technological infrastructure**
- **Education system**
- **Cultural values**

Country as unit of analysis
Socio-economic Stratification: Crime, GDP, Life Expectancy & Density

Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics

European Regions (NUTS)

ESS Round 5 (2010), NUTS 2

- Unavailable contextual data: Austria, Cyprus, Estonia, Ireland, Lithuania, Slovenia, Turkey

- 18 countries, 179 regions
- 15,813 participants (49.5% female; Age: M = 12.43 years, SD = 2.28)

(Görzig, Milosevic & Staksrud, in press)
Socio-economic stratification

Regression – Step 1 (regional predictors only)
(Scale: odds Ratios-1; controls: age, gender, SES)

Country level

Cyber-victimisation

- Crime
- GDP
- Life expectancy
- Population density

Face-to-face victimisation

- Crime
- GDP
- Life expectancy
- Population density

$P < .05$  $p < .10$  $p > .10$
Correlations with Cyber-victimisation by Region and Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUTS (n=194)</th>
<th>COUNTRY (n=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECURITY</strong></td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRADITION</strong></td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>-0.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF-DIRECTION</strong></td>
<td>0.13†</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIMULATION</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEDONISM</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACHIEVEMENT</strong></td>
<td>-0.13†</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlations of cyber victim rates with Hofstede categories

Hofstede (1980; Hofstede et al., 2010) proposed 6 main dimensions of cultural values:

- PDI: power distance
- IND: individualism-collectivism
- MAS: masculinity-femininity
- UAI: uncertainty avoidance
- LTO: long-term orientation
- IVR: indulgence vs restraint
Correlations (n =23, 24 for EUKids; n=33, 35 for HBSC: B, G)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hofstede</th>
<th>EUKids</th>
<th>HBSC11</th>
<th>HBSC13</th>
<th>HBSC15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDI</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAI</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTO</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVR</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.75**</td>
<td>-.60**</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Hofstede & Schwartz compared across surveys, 2010/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHWARTZ</th>
<th>EUKids</th>
<th>EUKids</th>
<th>HBSC11</th>
<th>HOFSTEDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>0.05, -0.07</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
<td>0.13† 0.13</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>-0.13† -0.31</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>-0.19* -0.33</td>
<td>-0.43*</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>-0.25* -0.41*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>0.14* 0.29</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.75**</td>
<td>-0.49**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Cross-survey differences?**

**Congruence**

**Conceptual differences?**
Summary

- Cyberbullying built on a previous research tradition in bullying, but definitional issues.
- Important cross-national differences in cyberbullying rates
- Differences between EU Kids online and HBSC on country differences
- Challenges in comparing countries
- Range of possible explanations
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