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Cyberbullying and Cyber Aggression

Peter K. Smith
GOLDSMITHS COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON, ENGLAND

Abstract

This chapter outlines the history of research in cyberbullying and cyber aggression, and some major publications. The chapter then discusses types of cyber aggression and cyberbullying, and features that tend to make it distinctive from “traditional” (noncyber) forms; and considers definitional issues that arise. This is followed by an overview of some main findings: incidence, who does it and where it happens, age and gender differences, other predictors of involvement in cyberbullying, the impact of cyberbullying, coping strategies, prevention and intervention procedures, and concluding with implications for research and practice.

Aggression refers to intentional behavior that hurts or harms another person. Bullying refers to aggression, where there is also an imbalance of power, and repetition of the act (Olweus, 1999); or a “systematic abuse of power” (Smith & Sharp, 1994). Cyber aggression and cyberbullying correspondingly refer to aggression and bullying carried out via electronic media—mobile phones and the Internet. As such, they are mainly phenomena of the 21st century. They have emerged with the rapid diffusion of mobile phones, and use of the Internet, internationally; most rapidly and thoroughly in the industrialized countries, and most notably in middle childhood and adolescence, with young people being the “digital natives,” growing up with these new communication technologies.

For example, Rideout, Foehr, and Roberts (2010) studied representative U.S. samples of 8- to 18-year-olds in 1999, 2004, and 2009. The average number of hours spent in a typical day on a computer was 0.27 in 1999, 1.02 in 2004, and 1.29 in 2009. Time spent talking on mobile phones was 0.33 hours in 2009, and time spent texting on mobile phones was 1.33 hours (in 1999 there was no question on mobile phones at all, and in 2004 only one about talking on mobile or landline phones).

In this chapter, I will set the scene by outlining the history of research in this area, and some major publications so far. Next, I will mention some main types and forms of cyber aggression and cyberbullying, and discuss features that tend to make it distinctive from “traditional”
(noncyber) forms. This leads to a consideration of definitional issues that arise. I then overview some main findings: incidence, who does it and where it happens, age and gender differences, other predictors of involvement in cyberbullying, the impact of cyberbullying, coping strategies, and prevention and intervention procedures. The chapter concludes with implications for research and practice.

**History of Research on Bullying**

As a research endeavor, the study of cyberbullying is a rapidly developing research program that has, in part, developed from the previous research program on “traditional” bullying. Bullying can occur in many contexts, in childhood and adult life (Monks et al., 2009). However, the earliest sustained work, and the largest volume of work, has concerned school bullying. Research on school bullying can be thought of as having gone through four waves, of which cyberbullying is the fourth (Smith, 2010). The first wave: Origins 1970–1988 saw the origins of systematic study, mainly in Scandinavia; notably Olweus’ book Forskning om skolmobbning (Aggression in Schools: Bullies and Whipping Boys, 1973/1978). Through the 1980s, Olweus developed a self-report questionnaire to assess bullying, and, in parallel with the first Norwegian National Anti-Bullying campaign in 1983, a school-based intervention program, the original Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (1983–1985). Reports of reductions in bullying of around 50% encouraged researchers and inspired the next wave of research. The second wave: Establishing a research program: 1989–mid-1990s saw many books and journal articles appearing, and surveys in other countries beyond Scandinavia. Besides self-report surveys, some studies started to use peer nominations methodology. Some intervention campaigns took place. There was a broadening of researcher’s definition of aggression (and thus bullying), to include indirect and relational bullying (such as rumor spreading, social exclusion). Also, work on bullying was becoming international; contacts were taking place between researchers in Europe, North America, and Australasia, and in Japan (where studies on ijime—the Japanese term closest to bullying—dated back in a previously separate tradition to the 1980s). The third wave: An established international research program mid-1990–2004 saw research on traditional bullying becoming an important international research program. Surveys and interventions took place in many countries (see 21 country reports in Smith et al., 1999; and 11 country reports on interventions in Smith, Pepler, and Rigby, 2004). A notable methodological step was the introduction of participant roles in bullying, from Salmivalli’s work in Finland (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, Osterman, & Kaukiainen, 1996). The fourth wave: Cyberbullying 2004—on, followed on from increasing awareness of cyberbullying, and press reports, mainly dating from around 2000–2001.

Academic publications in the cyberbullying area have increased very rapidly in the last five years. Notable publications are the book by Willard (2006), a special issue of the Journal of Adolescent Health (2007), the books by Shariff (2008), Kowalski, Limber, and Agatston (2008), and Hinduja and Patchin (2008a), a special issue of the Zeitschrift fur Psychologie/Journal of Psychology (2009), and books by Bauman (2010), Mora-Merchan and Jäger (2010), and Li, Cross, and Smith (2012). Further special journal issues are in press (Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling), or in progress (in European Journal of Developmental Psychology; Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology; Journal of Educational Computing Research; Emotional & Behavioural Difficulties). Previous reviews include Dooley, Cross, Hearn, and Treyvaud (2009), Smith and Slonje (2010), and Tokunaga (2010). Collaborative research networks include a COST Action IS0801 on Cyberbullying (Smith & Sittichai, 2009; Cyberbullying, n.d.), and an International Cyber Bullying Think Tank (University of Arizona, n.d.) funded by National Science Foundation.

There are other strands to research in this area, apart from the origins in bullying research. These include researchers studying the effects of ICT and the Internet on human behavior, and
Cyberbullying and Cyber Aggression

specifically safety issues around Internet use; see for example Ybarra and Mitchell (2004). In Europe, the EUKidsOnline projects (I and II; Livingstone & Haddon, 2009) are providing cross-national information on opportunities and risks in children using the Internet, and cyberbullying features within this. Another source of input is from legal experts, who are examining rights and responsibilities of ICT users and monitoring the outcomes of legal cases (e.g., regarding defamation, privacy, harassment, etc.) in this relatively new domain (Gillespie, 2006; Shariff, 2009).

Types and Forms of Cyberbullying and Cyber Aggression

There are various methods of cyberbullying and cyber aggression or harassment. Starting with text messages and e-mails (Rivers & Noret, 2010), these have proliferated. Li (2007) distinguished e-mail, chatroom, and mobile phone bullying. Smith et al. (2008) used seven main media described by secondary school pupils: bullying by mobile phone calls, text messages, picture/video clip bullying, e-mails; chatroom, instant messaging, and websites.

Hinduja and Patchin (2010) used a 9-item cyber victimization scale, covering similar media. In South Korea, cyberbullying in Internet game contexts has been found to be a very common form (Tippett & Kwak, 2012).

Looking at the types of action, Willard (2006) described seven categories: flaming, online harassment; cyberstalking, denigration (put-downs), masquerade, outing, and exclusion. These are to some extent independent of the media used. Rivers and Noret (2010) have described the content of abusive text messages and e-mails, in an English sample. Their 10 main categories are: threat of physical violence, abusive or hate-related, name calling (including homophobia), death threats, ending of platonic relationship(s), sexual acts, demands/instructions, threats to damage existing relationships, threats to home/family, and menacing chain messages.

These lists of types of cyberbullying and aggression are not exhaustive, and as technology develops, new forms of cyberbullying emerge. The advent of smart phones that can access the Internet is making the earlier distinction between mobile phone and Internet bullying, less obvious. These bullying contexts are not restricted to young people, any more than is traditional bullying and aggression, and some forms have been mainly described in adults; for example, cyberbullying or “griefing” in virtual worlds (Coyne, Chesney, Logan, & Madden, 2009).

Distinctive Features of Cyberbullying and Cyber Aggression

Although there are many similarities between traditional bullying and cyberbullying, the latter clearly tends to have some particular distinguishing characteristics. These can be important in considering the likely impact of cyberbullying and the coping strategies that will be most effective. A number of commentators have discussed such distinctive features of cyberbullying, as compared to traditional forms of bullying (Dooley, Pyzalski, & Cross, 2009; Smith et al., 2008; Tokunaga, 2010; Vandebosch & van Cleemput, 2008). These include the following seven features of cyberbullying:

1. It depends on some degree of technological expertise. Although it is easy enough to send e-mails and text messages, more sophisticated attacks such as masquerading (pretending to be someone else posting denigrating material on a website) require more skill.
2. It is primarily indirect rather than face-to-face. Thus there is some “invisibility” of those doing the bullying. A perpetrator may try to withhold identification in text or Internet postings, to maintain anonymity.
3. Relatedly, the perpetrator does not usually see the victim’s reaction, at least in the short term. On the one hand, this can enhance moral disengagement from the victim’s plight.
(Hymel, Rocke-Henderson, & Bonanno, 2005) and thus might make cyberbullying easier; without such direct feedback there may be fewer opportunities for empathy or remorse. On the other hand, many perpetrators enjoy the feedback of seeing the suffering of the victim, and would not get this satisfaction so readily by cyberbullying.

4. The variety of bystander roles in cyberbullying is more complex than in most traditional bullying. There can be three main bystander roles rather than one: the bystander is with the perpetrator when an act is sent or posted; the bystander is with the victim when it is received; or the bystander is with neither, but receives the message or visits the relevant Internet site.

5. Relatedly, one motive for bullying is thought to be the status gained by showing (abusive) power over others in front of witnesses (Salmivalli et al., 1996). The perpetrator will often lack this in cyberbullying, unless steps are taken to tell others what has happened or publicly share the material.

6. The breadth of the potential audience is increased. Over time, cyberbullying can reach particularly large audiences in a peer group compared with the small groups that are the usual audience in traditional bullying. For example, when nasty comments are posted on a website, the audience that may see these comments is potentially very large.

7. It is difficult to escape from cyberbullying—there is “no place to hide.” Unlike traditional forms of bullying, where once the victim gets home they are away from the bullying until the next day, cyberbullying is more difficult to escape from; the victim may continue to receive text messages or e-mails, or view nasty postings on a website, wherever they are.

These are important distinctions that may impact particularly on both the motives for (cyber) bullying, and the impact such acts have on the (cyber) victim. However, they should not be overstated; some forms of traditional bullying (e.g., rumor spreading) are not face-to-face, for example. A case can be made that these are differences in degree rather than differences in kind (Pyzalski, 2011).

**Definitions of Cyberbullying and Cyber Aggression**

An early definition of cyberbullying (Belsey, 2004) is “the use of information and communication technologies … to support deliberate, repeated and hostile behavior by an individual or group that is intended to harm others” (p. 3). Of the two distinguishing criteria for traditional bullying, this definition includes the criterion of repetition, but not imbalance of power. A similar definition in this respect was used by Sourander et al. (2010). Another definition that follows the Olweus approach in traditional bullying (Smith et al., 2008) is that cyberbullying is “An aggressive, intentional act carried out by a group or individual, using electronic forms of contact, repeatedly and over time against a victim who cannot easily defend him or herself” (p. 376). Li (2007) used a similar definition. Tokunaga (2010) lists these and other definitions, which vary as to whether repetition and imbalance of power are included, and also in other respects (e.g., types of bullying mentioned).

There are problems with defining cyberbullying as analogous to traditional bullying (Dooley, Pyzalski, & Cross, 2009; Vandebosch & van Cleemput, 2008). Regarding repetition, in traditional bullying, the acts or behaviors of the bully should be of a repetitive nature (more than just once). But due to the nature of cyberbullying, the act or behavior may repeat itself without the contribution of the cyberbully. For example, taking an abusive picture or video clip on a mobile phone may have occurred only once; but if the person receiving the image forwards it to anyone else, it could be argued that this falls under the category of repetition. Or, if something abusive is uploaded onto a webpage, every hit on that page could count as a
repetition. Consequently, the use of repetition as a criterion for serious bullying may be less reliable for cyberbullying.

There are also problems with the imbalance of power criterion. In traditional bullying, this is usually taken as being in terms of physical strength or psychological confidence in a face-to-face confrontation, or in terms of a number of perpetrators against one victim. These are not so clear in cyberbullying, which is not face-to-face. There may, nevertheless, be an imbalance of power either through the anonymity of the perpetrator(s), if present; or if the perpetrators are known, then relative (physical, psychological, or numerical) strength offline may still be a factor in the victim’s perception of the situation. In some cases, greater technological expertise could also contribute to an imbalance of power.

Nevertheless, a number of studies are on cyber aggression or harassment; that is to say, they focus on negative acts through ICT, irrespective of repetition or imbalance of power. For example, Law, Shapka, and Olson (2010) explicitly used an “online aggression” scale with 16 items. Some studies are on cyberbullying and employ similar items of mobile phone or Internet aggression, together with a repetition scale; for example, Calvete, Orue, Estévez, Villardón, and Padilla (2010) used a Cyberbullying Questionnaire (CBQ) with 16 items (never/sometime/often), and Cassidy, Jackson, and Brown (2009) used an 18-item scale (never/occasionally/often). But, in these and similar studies, analysis often focuses on those “involved”; that is, not replying never, which may of course mean just once or twice. Hinduja and Patchin (2010, p. 211) noted that their 10 cyberbullying and victimization items “might better be characterized as ‘online harassment’” but restricted analysis to repeated incidents. Conversely, Wang, Iannotti, and Nansel (2009) explicitly examined only once or twice or more because “it is not uncommon in the literature of cyberbullying to count a single incident as an experience of cyber bullying” (p. 370); although this study did include imbalance of power in the definition.

There is thus some diversity and perhaps confusion in the literature on defining cyberbullying and cyber aggression. It is also an issue as to whether children/young people themselves use or recognize the term cyberbullying, or indeed what terms they do use (Grigg, 2010).

Incidence of Cyberbullying

Given the diversity in definition and measurement, it is not surprising that the reported incidence of cyberbullying varies quite widely. In general, studies have used anonymous self-report questionnaires assessing incidence of being a victim and/or perpetrator of different types of cyberbullying. A few examples from more recently published studies are considered here. Marsh, McGee, Nada-Raja, and Williams (2009), in New Zealand secondary school students aged 15 years, found that 7.9% of boys and 13.8% of girls received nasty text messages sometimes or more this year at school; and 6.9% of boys and 7.0% of girls did this to others (these figures being generally lower than for four types of traditional bullying that were also assessed). Calvete et al. (2010) surveyed 12- to 17-year-old Spanish adolescents. From 16 items, the most frequently perpetrated were deliberately excluding someone from an online group (18.1% sometimes, 2.1% often) and writing embarrassing jokes, rumors, gossip, or comments about a classmate on the Internet (18.3% sometimes, 1.8% often). Hinduja and Patchin (2010) asked about experiences of online harassment (cyberbullying and victimization) in U.S. middle school students (Grades 6 to 8) over the last 30 days. Some 22% had cyberbullied in some way two or more times, and some 29% had been cyberbullied two or more times (corresponding figures for traditional bullying were bullied others 34% and victimized 44%).

A cross-national study of 12- to 15-year-olds in Italy, Spain, and England, compared mobile and Internet cyberbullying over the last two months, using an Olweus-type definition (Genta et
al., 2012). Percentages for severe (two or three times a month or more) mobile bullying ranged (across the three countries) from 0.9% to 2.7%, and Internet bullying from 1.0% to 1.6%; for mobile victim from 0.5% to 2.2%, and Internet victim from 1.3% to 2.6%. Generally, figures were somewhat larger in Italy and least in Spain.

There is clearly a very wide range of incidence figures reported. Many factors may be responsible for this. One is the definition of cyberbullying or cyber aggression used—does it include repetition, and/or imbalance of power? Rates of cyber aggression can be expected to exceed cyberbullying, more strictly defined. Second, what behaviors are sampled? Marsh et al. (2009) only assessed text message bullying, and Rivers and Noret (2010) only text message and e-mail bullying. Others have used a much broader range. Third, studies have varied in the time period used as a reference; for example, the period can be the last month or last couple of months (e.g., Hinduja & Patchin, 2010), or the entire year (Marsh et al., 2009), or if it ever happened (Calvete et al., 2010). Fourth, the nature of the sample is obviously an important factor. This may vary by country or culture, age, gender, and other demographic characteristics. Most studies have had samples from a number of schools, but some studies have investigated only Internet-using participants (Hinduja & Patchin, 2008b; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004). Finally, the date of a survey is important in such a fast developing and changing area. Rivers and Noret (2010) have documented some increase (especially in girls), then a leveling off, of text and e-mail bullying in English 11- to 13-year-olds between 2002 and 2006. There is some evidence that bullying through websites, and specifically through social networking sites, has recently become a common form as social networking escalates in popularity in the adolescent years (Patchin & Hinduja, 2010).

Who Does It and Where It Happen?

Sometimes victims of cyberbullying do not know who the perpetrator is. For example, Vandebosch and van Cleemput (2008) found that half of victims did not know who the bully was. Smith et al. (2008) reported that about 1 in 5 of victims did not know who the bully was; when victims did know, for 58% the perpetrators were from the same school. Furthermore, whereas traditional bullying was mainly reported as being initiated in school, for cyberbullying most was initiated outside school. Many schools place restrictions on mobile phone and Internet use within the school premises. But even though cyberbullying may escape school boundaries, it will often be fellow pupils who are involved in the bullying.

Age and Gender Differences

We know little about when children start cyberbullying, and most studies have focused on the middle or secondary/high school age ranges. There have been some variations in reports, but the review by Tokunaga (2010) argued that there is a curvilinear relationship, with the greatest incidence at seventh and eighth grades (around 13 to 15 years). This appears to be consistent with much of the literature, and suggests a slightly later age peak than is found for traditional bullying.

The area of gender differences is more complex, and has been accurately described as “fraught with inconsistent findings” (Tokunaga, 2010, p. 280). Examples can be found of boys being more involved than girls (e.g., Calvete et al., 2010); few or no significant differences (e.g., Smith et al., 2008); and girls being more involved than boys (e.g., Rivers & Noret, 2010). Overall, there may be relatively greater involvement of girls in cyberbullying, just as there is in relational bullying, when compared to traditional physical (mainly boys) or verbal bullying; consistent with seeing cyberbullying as more similar to relational bullying.
Both age and gender differences may vary by different media of cyberbullying, cultural background, and historical time; for example, in recent years girls in some countries, including the U.K., are particularly involved in social networking sites such as Facebook, and thus more at risk of cyberbullying involvement in that medium (National Family Week Survey, 2010).

Other Predictors of Involvement in Cyberbullying

Who gets involved in being a cyber bully or cyber victim? One well-established predictor is involvement in traditional bullying. Many studies have found substantial overlap between involvement in traditional bullying and cyberbullying, for example, Hinduja and Patchin (2008b), Li (2007), Vandebosch and van Cleemput (2008), Smith et al. (2008), Marsh et al. (2009), and Rivers and Noret (2010). A related predictor is involvement in other antisocial behaviours; Ybarra and Mitchell (2004) reported that youth with problem behaviors were almost four times more likely to say they were an Internet aggressor or aggressor/target versus those who reported victimization only or not involved.

Ybarra and Mitchell (2004) suggested that some cyberbullies may be traditional victims who, being unable to retaliate face-to-face, may do so by electronic means as a form of compensation. This was not confirmed by Vandebosch and van Cleemput (2008), but partially supported by Smith et al. (2008) who found a trend for traditional bully victims to also be cyberbullies. The hypothesis that traditional victims and perhaps especially bully victims are at risk of moving into the world of cyber bullying deserves further study.

Another predictor of cyberbullying involvement is time spent with ICT, and relevant skills. Both Hinduja and Patchin (2008b) and Smith et al. (2008) found that more time spent on the Internet was a correlate of being a cyber victim. Vandebosch and van Cleemput (2008) found that pupils with more advanced Internet skills were more likely to have experience with deviant Internet and mobile phone activities.

Some studies have examined family and parental factors. Ybarra and Mitchell (2007) related Internet harassment to greater caregiver-child conflict, and Wang et al. (2009) found that lower parental support of adolescents predicted greater involvement in all kinds of bullying, including cyber. Law et al. (2010) linked adolescent online aggression to lack of communication with parents, but it was unrelated to attempts to limit time on the Internet, or sites visited.

The Impact of Cyberbullying

Although some of the distinctive features of cyberbullying (such as breadth of audience, and difficulty of escape) might suggest a greater negative impact of cyberbullying, this needs to be counterbalanced by the fact that it is, ultimately, a virtual world. Smith et al. (2008) investigated whether pupils in general perceived cyberbullying to have less, equal, or more of a negative impact compared to traditional bullying. This varied across media, with picture/video clip bullying especially perceived as having a greater negative impact than traditional bullying; but generally there was a range of opinion, with some pupils replying that cyberbullying has the same effect on the victim (“I think they are equally as bad”; “they both can hurt”), could be worse (“loads of people can see it if it’s on the Internet”; “it’s constant all the time, really hard to escape”), or could be less harmful (“you can be more damaged by face-to-face bullying than cyber bullying, that’s just words”; “a text is easier to ignore than something that happened in a specific place”).

Whatever the relative impact of cyberbullying compared to traditional bullying, it is certainly hurtful. For example Ybarra, Mitchell, Wolak, and Finkelhor (2006) found that 65% of the
victims of cyberbullying felt worried or threatened by the incident, whilst 38% felt distressed. In a study of Austrian adolescents, Gradinger, Strohmeier, and Spiel (2009) found that being a cyber victim was significantly associated with both depressive and somatic symptoms. The association was about the same strength as for traditional victims; but combined victims (both traditional and cyber) were especially at risk. Hinduja and Patchin (2010) found that being a victim of cyberbullying was significantly associated with suicidal thoughts; although again at a comparable level to the association with traditional bullying.

Coping Strategies and Prevention and Intervention Procedures

Victims often need to seek help in order to deal with bullying, and we know from studies of traditional bullying that many victims are reluctant to do this. This also appears true of cyberbullying. When victims of cyberbullying do tell someone, it appears to be most often friends, followed by parents, with teachers told rather infrequently (Smith et al., 2008). Given the generational gap in use and awareness of new technologies, young people may feel that teachers and parents are less aware of the issues involved.

There are now many sources of advice, for children and young people, parents, and schools. These include actions young people can take themselves (such as reporting abuse, keeping evidence), information on legal rights and recourse, and information on websites and on schemes such as cybermentors. Many countries are now developing guidance on cyberbullying specifically, and/or Internet safety more generally. Curriculum materials and interventions are being developed. These are at an early stage, and a review of three short-term classroom-based interventions by Mishna, Cook, Saini, Wu, and MacFadden (2009) found rather little evidence of effectiveness. However, intervention programs to reduce traditional bullying have been found to reduce bullying by around 20%–23% and victimization by around 17%–20% (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011), and we can hope for similar success as cyberbullying interventions are developed and assessed. An EU-funded project has provided a training manual on cyberbullying, for trainers dealing with different target groups such as pupils, parents, teachers or whole schools, and these are available online as a user-friendly eBook in English, German, Spanish, Bulgarian, and Portuguese versions (Jäger, 2009).

Implications for Research

It is clearly important to include cyberbullying in current questionnaire and nomination instruments. While some surveys just assess cyberbullying as a global entity, different kinds of cyberbullying have some different characteristics, so for many purposes it will be important to distinguish different types of cyberbullying.

An interesting aspect is the importance of historical factors in work on cyberbullying. Awareness of cyberbullying in the media and in research studies is only some 10 years old, and yet even this period has seen shifts in popular ICT use from text messages and e-mails, to instant messaging, chatrooms, and most recently social networking sites. Further developments are inevitable. Thus, it is particularly important to know the dates of studies and surveys—something that is not routinely done, and absent in many published studies. This needs to change.

Historical changes provide a challenge for researchers, especially those doing longitudinal studies. Rivers and Noret (2010) provided longitudinal data on cyberbullying from 2002 to 2005, but asked, “How often have you received any nasty or threatening text messages or emails?”; this is now only a fraction of all cyberbullying. The shift from older mobile phones to smart phones having access to the Internet also blurs the distinction between mobile and Internet-based cyberbullying that many earlier studies have made.
There are also some opportunities for researchers in this area. The wide disciplinary base (including psychology, sociology, technology and media studies, legal studies) may prove helpful in using a range of both quantitative and qualitative methodologies, and broadening the context of study across settings (most cyberbullying by children is not in school but in many other outside settings), and developmentally (cyberbullying may have more age permeability than traditional bullying). It may also give a needed boost to theory development (Tokunaga, 2010). The use of young people as researchers might be considered (Jennifer & Cowie, 2009). Traditionally children/young people give their opinions via questionnaires, interviews, focus groups; but they could be involved further, helping gather data in a project, being involved in the planning and implementation of a project, or even designing a project. Such approaches may be especially useful for cyberbullying, where young people are the “digital natives.”

Conclusion

While the challenges posed by cyberbullying are rather new, both researchers and practitioners are now becoming alerted to the issue, and based on the previous experience of general antibullying work gathered over the last 20 to 25 years, it can be hoped that the response to cyberbullying will have positive effects. Suggestions for young people, parents, and school personnel are offered in Table 8.1.

Table 8.1 Summary Table of Implications for Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Be aware of your rights and your responsibilities when using mobile phones and the Internet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Behave responsibly and do not give out personal details unnecessarily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Make use of advice and support through parents, teachers, websites, and helplines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Discuss both general rights and responsibility issues, but also specifically those around use of ICTs, with your children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Good communication about issues, and a good relationship generally, is likely to be preferable to instituting many controls and restrictions, which may get resented or circumvented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For schools and other institutions hosting children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cyberbullying should be included explicitly in antibullying policies (perhaps linked to a separate policy or policy section regarding appropriate use of mobile phones, and computers, within school). Personnel need up-to-date awareness raising and training on the nature and forms that cyber bullying and aggression can take; and in the legal issues around these actions. Teacher training materials for antibullying work should cover these aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Antibullying materials used in the classroom need to embody examples of cyberbullying as well as traditional bullying. Some traditional methods for reducing bullying will be useful for cyberbullying, including general relationships education, embodying respect for others, rights of others, asserting one’s own rights in nonaggressive ways, conflict management skills. But, some more specific interventions will be helpful for cyberbullying, including guidance on liaison with mobile phone companies, and Internet service providers; and the legal rights and responsibilities of all concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Schools can also provide information and guidance for parents; the parent generation is generally less knowledgeable about new technological communication methods than young people; in that respect, it is young people who are the “experts.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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