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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 against someone who cannot easily defend themselves, or ‘a systematic abuse of power’.

➢ **CYBERBULLYING** as ‘an aggressive, intentional act carried out by a group or individual, using mobile phones or the internet, repeatedly and over time against a victim who cannot easily defend him or herself’
Traditional and cyber bullying

Traditional or offline bullying
Physical / verbal / social exclusion / rumour spreading

Cyber or online bullying
Mobile phones, internet
Terminology (1)

[Cyber]bullying/aggression/victimization?
Finkelhor et al. (2012) argued that the term *bullying* is overused, and urged a broader focus on *victimization*.

Bauman et al. (2013) suggested a focus on *cyber-aggression* rather than *cyberbullying*.
In practice this is what many studies measure.
Terminology (2)

Some researchers have used general terms such as cyber victimization (Law, Shapka, & Olson, 2010) or online harassment (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010). Vandebosch and van Cleemput (2009) used the term POP (potentially offensive internet and mobile phone practices). However, much research has used the term cyberbullying.
Cyberbullying: origins are before 2000

*but* most press reports and awareness of the issue date from this century, starting with text message bullying - but now, many forms.

Text message bullying: Wendy sends nasty text messages to Linda every break time
KINDS OF CYBER-AGGRESSION/
CYBERBULLYING

Many kinds including
• attacks and threats
• denigration (put-downs)
• flaming (online verbal fights)
• cyberstalking (persistent online intimidation)
• exclusion (from an online group)
• masquerade (pretending to be someone else to send/post material to damage someone)
• outing (sharing embarrassing information or images of someone)
• putting up false profiles and distributing personal material against someone’s wishes.
Cyberbullying: Differences from traditional bullying

- It depends on some degree of technological expertise
- It is primarily indirect rather than face-to-face; there is some “invisibility” of those doing the bullying
- The perpetrator does not usually see the victim’s reaction, at least in the short term
- The variety of bystander roles in cyberbullying is more complex
- The breadth of the potential audience is increased
- It is difficult to escape from.
Figure 1 - Number of cyber bullying articles by year of publication
Figure 2. Continent of lead author by grouped years

Continent of lead authors:
- Blue: North America
- Green: Europe
- Gold: Asia
- Purple: Australasia

Grouped years: 2000-2011

Count
Topics covered in 454 empirical articles 2000-2015

- Definitional or measurement issues (7%)
- Longitudinal data (5%)
- Qualitative data (7%)

- Prevalence rates (38%)
- Age differences (16%)
- Gender differences (36%)
- Cross-national comparisons (3%)
- Minority groups (6%)
- Other predictors of involvement (57%)

- Peer groups, Social dynamics, Bystanders (20%)
- Outcomes of involvement (46%)
- Teachers (6%)
- Parents (12%)
- Siblings (2%)
- Legal issues (2%)
- Coping strategies (8%)
- Resources and interventions (9%)
Some reviews


Some books on cyberbullying

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.
Empirical data on criteria used by young people

A 6-country cross-national study [including Sweden] by Menesini et al. (2012, 2013) gave 11-17 year olds scenarios to judge whether they were cyberbullying, or not.

Most important criterion: imbalance of power

Next: intentionality, and anonymity of the perpetrator as a substitute for imbalance of power;

Less important: repetition, and also the public/private nature of the context.
Challenges in measuring cyber-bullying

Measurement procedures need to be clearly specified. Systematic reviews of 44 cyberbullying instruments by Berne et al. (2013) and Frisén et al. (2013) found that many did not give adequate definitions (only 13/44 mentioned imbalance of power) and few reported their reliability or validity. Reference periods and cutoff points varied.
Similar findings from Vivolo-Kantor et al. (2014).
Challenge of greater importance of historical factors

• Historical factors not unimportant in traditional bullying, e.g. changes in definition, but usually assess in decades.

• Much more important and rapid in cyberbullying

• Changes in technologies, and in popularity of technologies (e.g. texts → instant messaging → social networking sites).
Two examples of impact of historical change on research:

(1) Noret & Rivers (2006) provide the best longitudinal data on cyberbullying in England (over 11,000 pupils from 2002 to 2005), but used the question: ‘How often have you received any nasty or threatening text messages or emails?’ – these are now only a fraction of all cyberbullying.

(2) DAPHNE project (2007-2009) distinguished ‘mobile’ and ‘internet’ forms of cyberbullying – but now smart phones having access to the internet have confused this distinction.
Prevalence rates

Modecki et al. (2014) examined prevalence rates across 80 studies.

[Self-reports of peer bullying/victimization]

Cyberbullying less than traditional bullying. Mean rates:

- TB 35%
- TV 36%

Substantial overlap

- TB, CB \(r=0.47\)
- TV, CV \(r=0.40\)
Large variations in reported prevalence rates

Low rates reported in some studies:

Olweus (2012) during 2007 to 2010
U.S. around 4-5% for 8-19 year olds
Norway around 3-4%, for 9-17 year olds

Läftman et al. (2013) around 2% to 5% in
Large variations in reported prevalence rates

Hinduja and Patchin (2012) stated:
“Olweus’ findings that 4.1-5.0% of youth have been cyberbullied and 2.5-3.2% of youth have cyberbullied others are simply out of line with the weight of the available evidence”.

Their own studies suggested 20% of 11 to 18 year olds have been a victim of cyberbullying, and in a review of 35 published articles, they found on average 24% of pupils had been cyberbullied and 17% had cyberbullied others.

High rates of 35%-57% reported in mainland China by Zhou et al. (2013) from summer 2012.
Some reasons for variation in figures reported

- Frequency cut-off (just once or twice?)
- Time reference period (last month? ever?)
- Definitions that do or do not include repetition and/or imbalance of power
- Nature and age of the sample
- Emphasis on particular media or bullying practices
- Date of survey administration [often not stated!]

IN SUMMARY: occasional or one-off occurrences may be reported by over 20% of young people but serious or recent or repeated incidents are typically reported by only around 5%, less than for traditional bullying.
Cross et al. (2011): 7418 Australian pupils, 8-14 years, 106 schools, end 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Being cyber bullied (in preceding term)</th>
<th>Repeated</th>
<th>Any</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sent threatening emails</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent nasty messages on the Internet (MSN)</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent nasty text messages or prank calls to my mobile phone</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used my screen name or passwords, pretending to be me to hurt someone else</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent my private emails, messages, pictures or videos to others</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted mean or nasty comments or pictures on websites about me</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent mean or nasty messages or pictures about me to others’ mobile phones</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberately ignored or left out of things over the Internet</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EU Kids online: Risks and safety on the internet. Livingstone et al. (2011)

Surveys in spring/summer 2010. Random stratified sampling of some 1000 children, aged 9 to 16 years, in each of 25 European countries.

Percent been bullied in last 12 months:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Country differences inconsistent with HBSC data!]
Age and gender differences generally

• AGE: peak of involvement around 15 years – maybe a bit later than for traditional bullying.

• GENDER: inconsistent findings from different studies.

Some studies find girls relatively more involved in cyber than traditional bullying, e.g. Beckman et al. (2013) Sweden 13-15 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TB</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOYS</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIRLS</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender differences

Barlett & Coyne (2014) examined 122 gender effect sizes from 109 research articles, for cyberbullying perpetration. Overall, B>G, but varied by age –

- up to early adolescence G>B
- later adolescence B>G

May also depend on type of CB (social network sites? online gaming?). Girls may be relatively more interested in reputation damage as a means of bullying.
Predictors of involvement in cyber bullying

- Involvement in traditional bullying [many studies] and other antisocial behaviours (Mishna et al., 2012; Läftman et al., 2013).

- Time spent with ICT (Hinduja & Patchin, 2008; Smith et al., 2008; Tsitsika et al. 2015), more advanced Internet skills (Vandebosch & van Cleemput, 2008), risky social network practices (Peluchette et al., 2015).

- Family - greater caregiver-child conflict (Ybarra & Mitchell, 2007); lower parental support of adolescents (Wang et al., 2009); lack of communication with parents (Law et al., 2010); very restrictive supervision (Sasson & Mesch, 2014).

- Peer group – injunctive norms (Sasson & Mesch, 2014).
Lack of empathy

• Many studies show lack of empathy in traditional bullies (not victims).

• ‘Online disinhibition effect’ - the cyber bully cannot see the victim or his/her reactions – might mean empathy less important in cyberbullying – but studies in Italy (Renati et al., 2012) Singapore (Ang & Goh, 2010) and Turkey (Topcu & Erdur-Baker, 2012) found cyberbullies low on affective empathy.
Moral disengagement

- Moral disengagement – a process by which someone can bypass the normal kinds of reasoning which would hold us back from severely hurting another person.

- These ways can involve cognitive restructuring (seeing the attack as justified – ‘he deserved it’), minimising one’s agentive role (‘I didn’t start it’), disregarding or distorting the consequences (‘it was just for fun’), or blaming the victim (‘he started it’).
Moral Disengagement might be easier in cyberbullying (since bully does not see victim)?

• Gini, Pozzoli and Hymel (2013) reported a meta-analysis of 11 studies on traditional bullying and 4 on cyberbullying. The effect size relating Moral Disengagement to traditional bullying was $r=0.25$, and for cyberbullying, $r=0.31$.

• These associations were similar for boys and girls, but were significantly stronger for adolescents compared to younger children.
Dark triad personality traits

‘Dark Triad’ comprises Machiavellianism (cold manipulative behaviour), Narcissism (sense of entitlement and superiority), and Psychopathy (impulsive, thrill-seeking, low empathy, low anxiety). Can be measured at subclinical levels.

Gibb & Devereux (2014): 297 college students in USA. Cyberbullying perpetration predicted by being a cybervictim, and by psychopathy.

Pabian et al. (2015): 324 adolescents using Facebook, 14-18 years, Belgium. Facebook cyber-aggression was predicted by Facebook Intensity, and psychopathy.
Media influences

• Some studies have established links between violent media exposure, and involvement in bullying or cyberbullying.
• Calvete et al. (2010), in a study in Spain, and Fanti et al. (2012), in a study in Cyprus, both found links from violent media exposure (on television, internet, movies, video games), to both cyber bullying and cyber victimization.
EFFECTS: Gradinger, Strohmeier & Spiel (2009). DEP=depression, SOM=somatic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Austrian pupils 14-19 years</th>
<th>Not involved</th>
<th>Trad V</th>
<th>Cyber V</th>
<th>Tr+Cy V</th>
<th>Trad BV</th>
<th>Tr+Cy BV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EFFECTS:
Campbell, Spears, Slee, Butler & Kift (2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australian pupils</th>
<th>Not involved</th>
<th>Tr V</th>
<th>Tr BV</th>
<th>Cy V</th>
<th>Cy BV</th>
<th>Tr + Cy V</th>
<th>Tr + Cy BV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-19 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDQ</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Strengths &amp; difficulties questionnaire)</td>
<td>High score is worse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High score is worse
EFFECTS: Beckman (2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Swedish pupils 13-16 years</th>
<th>Not involved</th>
<th>Tr V</th>
<th>Cy V</th>
<th>Tr + Cy V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychosomatic problems</td>
<td>High score is worse</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US pupils 13-16 years</td>
<td>Not involved</td>
<td>Cy B</td>
<td>Cy V</td>
<td>Cy V BV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal ideation</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low grades</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US pupils 13-16 years</th>
<th>Not involved</th>
<th>Trad B</th>
<th>Trad V</th>
<th>Trad V BV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal ideation</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low grades</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EFFECTS: Vieno et al. (2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Italian pupils 12-14 years/odds ratios</th>
<th>Not involved</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TV: psychological</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV: psychological</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV: somatic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV: somatic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary ...

- effects of being a cyber victim are as bad, possibly worse, as for being a traditional victim
- being a victim of both traditional and cyber attacks is associated with particularly worse outcomes
- as is being a ‘bully-victim’.

But limitation of cross-sectional studies for determining cause-and-effect.
Longitudinal studies

VICTIMS:
Gámez-Guadix et al. (2013): Spanish adolescents. Being a victim of cyberbullying predicted an increase in depressive symptoms, and depressive symptoms predicted being a victim of cyberbullying; suggesting a ‘vicious cycle’.


PERPETRATORS:
Badaly et al. (2013): US adolescents. Popularity associated with increases in electronic aggression over time, and electronic aggression in turn increased popularity in girls (but not in boys).
Suicidal ideation, suicide

Both traditional and cyber victimization have been linked to suicidal ideation and actual suicide attempts or outcomes.

Five US studies: Hinduja & Patchin (2010), Hay & Meldrum (2010), Bauman, Toomey & Walker (2013), Kowalski & Limber (2013), Messias et al. (2014) found that being a victim of cyberbullying was significantly associated with suicidal thoughts, either at a comparable level to the association with traditional bullying, or greater.
Two of these studies found that supportive parenting, and/or pre-existing depression, were significant mediating factors between victimization and suicide attempts.

Many factors involved in actual suicides – (cyber)victim experiences at school appear to contribute to cases of suicidal ideation, and in a small number of cases to actual suicide; but it is very likely that pre-existing depression and/or family difficulties will be present as well.

This makes it difficult to say that a suicide is ‘caused’ by bullying, although in some cases it may appear to have a leading role.
Is cyberbullying getting worse?
[HBSC surveys suggest some decline in overall bullying rates in many countries]


Online harassment increased from 6% to 9% and then 11%, this being more marked for girls;

**US**: Growing Up with Media survey of 10-15 year olds in 2006, 2007, 2008: most rates of youth violent experiences online were stable over the 36 months.


**EUROPE**: EU Kids Online follow-up in 7 countries from 2010 to 2013/14 suggests “some rise in cyberbullying, especially for girls, though offline bullying is still greater”. [9%→12%]
## Coping Strategies: England data 2011 Cyberbullying victim reports %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Mobile Bullying</th>
<th>Internet Bullying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felt Helpless</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignored what was happening</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned mobile off</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped using internet</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told a friend</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told a parent</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told a teacher</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked the bully to stop</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocked them</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed mobile number</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported to mobile company/ISP</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliated</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coping strategies in mainland Chinese students c.16 years (Zhou et al., 2013).

Ignore/not react 46%
Talk about the experience/seek help 36%
[classmates/friends 66%, parents 29%, siblings 28%, teachers 3%]
Delete the materials 32%
Change online account 25%
Seek revenge 12%

Longitudinal study in Swiss schools, at 13 year olds (Machmutow et al., 2012).

Both traditional and cyber victimisation associated with higher levels of depression, and cyber victimisation predicted increases in depression by the second time point.

Over time, support seeking from peers and family was associated with reduced depression, while assertive coping strategies (such as finding and contacting the bully) were associated with increased depression.
Guidance/resources/interventions for cyberbullying

Generally, include cyberbullying explicitly in

- School policies
- Anti-bullying materials
- Teacher training materials for anti-bullying work
- Guidance for parents
- Guidance for children and young people

Many organisations/websites, e.g.:

Childnet International  http://childnet-int.org/
CyberTraining – A Research-based European Training Manual on Cyberbullying:  http://www.cybertraining-project.org
Digizen.org  http://old.digizen.org/cyberbullying/
Kids and Media  http://www.kidsandmedia.co.uk/european-training-courses-against-cyber-bullying/

and many others …
Content:

• Review of the evidence based on the research literature

• Key findings from content analysis of 54 guidelines

• Recommendations for proactive policies and practices, understanding and competences; collaborative partners; and social environment.

http://sites.google.com/site/costis0801/
Quality Circles

Quality Circles (QCs) are classroom-based problem-solving groups. They have a set of procedures to follow – group formation; data gathering; why-why, how-how etc; presentation of outcomes.

Can be used for many purposes including bullying and cyberbullying.

Paul et al. (2010, 2012) reported on the use of QCs in a UK secondary school in the context of understanding and reducing (cyber)bullying. QCs were an engaging process for pupils. Pupils suggested a range of solutions and the information gained was useful to staff in understanding how bullying was changing over time (e.g. new forms of cyberbullying) and gave some suggestions for intervention.
This was a new form of virtual peer support, started in 2008 by Beatbullying ([www.cybermentors.org.uk](http://www.cybermentors.org.uk)) who went into liquidation in November 2014.

It involved 2-day training workshops for Mentors who then went online.

Promising findings from initial work in UK DAPHNE project supported rollout and evaluation in 6 European countries – Czech Republic, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Romania, and Spain. Project started in late 2012 and (with some delays) proceeded OK up to summer 2014 – some good feedback on the concept, but evaluation unfinished due to collapse of Beatbullying and the cybermentors website.
Interventions for cyberbullying

Ang (2015):

- general empathy training and modifying beliefs supportive of aggression
- specific guidelines for internet behavior [reporting abuse, keeping evidence; information on legal rights; helpful websites]
- developing strong and positive parent-adolescent bonds [concerned involvement but without being overly restrictive]
- training for teachers
Some programs mainly target traditional bullying but have been found to impact positively on cyberbullying:

**AUSTRIA:** VISC Social Competence Program  
Gradinger, Yanagida, Strohmeier & Spiel (2016)

**FINLAND:** KiVa  
Salmivalli, Kärna, & Poskiparta (2011)

Some programs target both traditional and cyberbullying:

**ITALY:** NoTrap!  
Palladino, Nocentini, & Menesini (2016)  
[now in 3rd version]
Some programs mainly target cyberbullying:

AUSTRALIA: Cyber Friendly Schools Cross et al. (2016)

GERMANY: Media Heroes (Medienhelden) Schulze-Krumbholz et al. (2016)

NETHERLANDS: Online Pestkoppenstoppen Jacobs, Vollink, Dehue & Lechner (2014)

SPAIN: ConRed Del Rey, Casas & Ortega (2016)

[and see Special Issue of Aggressive Behavior, 42(2), March/April 2016]
Successful intervention requires changes in **perceptions** (for example of what bullying is)

**attitudes** (about bullying behavior and towards victims; reporting bullying and intervening),

**subjective norms** (how do others think or expect I should behave?)

**efficacy beliefs** (feeling confident that actions such as reporting or defending will be successful and not result in negative consequences)

→ changes in **behaviours** (bully and victim rates)

Targeting pupils, teachers, other school staff

→ changes in **school culture**
Summary

- Cyberbullying built on a previous research tradition in bullying, but definitional issues.
- Similarities and differences to traditional bullying
- Types changing rapidly; not declining like traditional bullying is.
- Much research on predictors of involvement.
- Many negative correlates of involvement; as much or maybe more than for traditional bullying.
- Some guidance and interventions, but need more development and evaluation.