Tampere University

Nhat Trang Anh Nguyen

FINNISH EU KIDS ONLINE 2019: YOUTH EXPERIENCES OF CYBERBULLYING AND ONLINE HATE SPEECH.

ABSTRACT

Nhat Trang Anh Nguyen: Finnish EU Kids Online 2019: Youth experiences of cyberbullying and online hate speech.
Master's Thesis
Tampere University
Digital Literacy Education
December 2019

This study implements quantitative research method with the focus on data analysis of the EU Kids Online 2019 Survey. It investigates youth experiences of cyberbullying that include reception of cyberbullying and practice of cyberbullying, mainly based on gender and age. This study also demonstrates which cyberbullying techniques are commonly performed by young people. It attempts to give comparison of cyberbullying experiences between male and female youths, as well as youths from younger age groups and older age groups. This study also aims to explore the link between cyberbullying and online hate speech.

This study highlights the findings that in the case of Finland, girls report more frequently being cyberbullying victims and less frequently to cyberbully than boys, however, in terms of intensity, boys may suffer from cyberbullying more intensely; older youths report more frequently being cyberbullying victims and also more frequently being cyberbullying perpetrators. This study also suggests that flaming, harassment and exclusion are the most common cyberbullying techniques among Finnish youths. Finally, this study argues that online hate speech and cyberbullying potentially share a parallel relationship.

Keywords: cyberbullying; online hate speech; discrimination; youth; youth experiences; Finland.

The originality of this thesis has been checked using the Turnitin OriginalityCheck service.

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

The Internet is capable of enhancing young people's social interaction, preventing loneliness and stimulating collaborative learning practices, however is also full of harms (Beran & Li, 2005; Ong et al., 2011; Kowalski et al., 2012). In 2017, over 70 per cent of youths (15 to 24 years old) in the world have been accessing the internet compared with only less than 50 per cent of the whole population (UNICEF, 2017). According to EU Kids Online research (2017), one in three global internet users is a youth under 18 years old. In spite of this significant online participation of children, not a lot of actions have been taken to protect them from the threats of digitalisation and to improve child safety in online environments.

According to several EU Kids Online studies (Livingstone et al., 2015; Vincent et al., 2015; Zaman and Nouwen, 2016; Georgiev et al., 2017; Hajdinjak et al., 2017; Kanchev et al., 2017; Bedrošová et al., 2018; Mascheroni and Ólafsson, 2018; Ní Bhroin and Rehder, 2018; Ponte and Batista, 2019), there has been an increase in European children and adolescents' use of mobile phones to access the internet. Surfing the internet with a smartphone allows young people to have extra freedom and privacy from parental monitoring, opposite to home computers which are more likely to be placed in shared environments and controlled by parents. Parents hence are less likely to acknowledge what their children are doing on the internet and are hence less likely to be able to guide children with online risks and threats (EU Kids Online, 2019. See more: http://globalkidsonline.net/updates/).

One of the serious threats which youths have to face when going online is cyberbullying (European Parliament, 2016). In the last decade, cyberbullying cases have significantly increased as a result of technological development. At the time, over one million people in the world become cybercrime victims every

day, including cyberbullying victims (European Parliament, 2016). The 2014 EU Net Children Go Mobile Report (Mascheroni and Cuman, 2014) shows that over 10 per cent among nearly 4000 European youths aged 9 to 16 years old have been cyberbullied, this ratio in 2010 was just over 5 per cent. Likewise, several 2011 EU Kids Online reports (Hasebrink et al., 2011; Livingstone et al., 2011) claim that nearly 10 per cent of over 25000 youths between 9 to 16 years old had been cyberbullied throughout Europe and nearly 5 per cent had bullied others. According to an EU Kids Online study in 2012 (Livingstone et al., 2012), 5 per cent of Finnish youths from 9 to 16 years old have had to experience cyberbullying.

Despite the relative newness of the topic, it has been explored extensively with specific attention to children and adolescent groups. The topic of cyberbullying has usually been investigated either as part of a wider prospect of researches on children and youths' media and internet use, or researches that solely base on the concept of cyberbullying.

Cyberbullying is a growing concern as the use of the internet is growing among youths. Technological development can be one of the reasons that cause the transformation of 'traditional' bullying from physical into virtual. The Internet has become an appealing platform for social activities and interactions, a place that allows any kind of behaviours with total anonymity. As a result, cyberbullying can have serious effects to its victims ranging from mental problems such as anger, isolation, distress, depression, anxiety to more devastating consequences such as suicides (Hinduja & Patchin 2010; Balakrishnan 2015).

Cyberbullying can be seen as a 'dangerous' activity as anyone can perform it without the need for confrontation with the victims. There is no need for physical strength, one simply needs to own a mobile phone or computer and a determination to bully (King, 2006). Bullying, in general, is said to result in life-long memories for its victims, with no exception to cyberbullying – an emerging phenomenon which has recently been paid significant attention to by the media as well as by academic representatives (Kowalski et al., 2012).

Several studies demonstrate comparison between traditional bullying and cyberbullying, emphasising that anonymity of the Internet can be seen as the biggest challenge. Cyberbullying, thus, can be considered even more harmful and cruel than traditional bullying (Pörhölä et al., 2010; Huhtala & Herkama 2012). Cyberbullying is different from traditional bullying in many ways, one of which is the distinctive challenges in coping with it, especially for concerning adults such as parents and teachers (Kowalski et al., 2012). However, problems may arise from the fact that parents of many children nowadays did not belong to the digital generation, whilst their children have been growing up with technologies, hence create a certain difficulty between parents and children in perceiving the opportunities and risks brought by the Internet (Kowalski & Fedina, 2011).

A notion that is closely linked to the concept of cyberbullying is online hate speech. The notion of online, as well as offline, hate speech is a popular topic which has been investigated intensively by a lot of authors, however, there have only been several researches that study the relation between online hate speech and cyberbullying (Keen and Georgescu, 2016; Assimakopoulos et al., 2017). Although they are not the same thing, these two concepts share various features in common that strongly relate and the ways they exist are sometimes intertwined especially in contemporary time, hence it can be challenging to distinguish between the two (Assimakopoulos et al., 2017).

The objective of this study is to explore youth experiences of cyberbullying, drawing on influencing socio-demographic factors such as age and gender, using the case study of Finnish EU Kids Online 2019. The study is going to concentrate on identifying cyberbullying techniques that are practised and received among Finnish youths from 9 to 17 years old. The study also attempts to potentially investigate further into the link between cyberbullying and online hate speech.

This research's analysis will mainly base on data collection of EU Kids Online 2019. EU Kids Online is a global research network that currently includes 33 countries. Its aim is to organise and generate examination of children's use of modern media in Europe and other countries, with specific attention on evidence

about the factors that constitute online opportunities, risk and safety (EU Kids Online, 2019. See more: http://globalkidsonline.net/eu-kids-online/).

The next chapter will critically review existing researches discussing the concept of youth, cyberbullying and online hate speech. This theoretical framework will help readers understand the critical contexts regarding these notions as well as demonstrating the details within the literature from which further investigation and new insights can take place.

The study will continue to discuss the research design which employs quantitative research method and data collection from EU Kids Online 2019. This will be followed by an in-depth data analysis which will showcase the findings. The study will then go on to analyse the findings and discusses the connection between the findings and the existing theoretical framework. Finally, the conclusion will recap the study in general and evaluate the findings within the field.

2 YOUTH, CYBERBULLYING AND ONLINE HATE SPEECH

2.1 Youth as a concept

'Youth' has always been an everchanging notion which is made by many and many aspects of principles of contemporary political, social and ethical issues (Bordieu, 1978). Youth can be seen as a creation of modernity, a type of social structure with its own social connotation (Jones, 2009). This sub-section aims to define youth, or young people, as a concept with specific relation to this research of youth experiences with cyberbullying and hate speech.

The Oxford English Dictionary (1983) defines youth as the period after childhood and before adulthood or 'young people considered as a group'. Jones (2009) demonstrates that it seems to be difficult to find accurate definition for depicting individuals in transformation between childhood and adulthood. Several terminologies which have been used previously include "youths, young people, young adults, youngsters, kids, adolescents, teenagers, or through neologisms such as 'kidults' or 'post-adolescents'" (Jones, 2009:59).

Jones (2009) also notes that youth can be linked to the period between finishing school and entering adulthood, hence from around between 15 years old to mid-20s, although this range is constantly increasing. Within this period, young individuals are neither children – vulnerable group that requires extra care, nor adults – group that holds legal social responsibilities, but incomplete human beings, hence flawed by nature (Jones, 2009).

The United Nations (2013) states that the meaning of youth can alter given different circumstances, particularly with differences in specific factors such as economic, socio-cultural and demographic contexts. However, the UN still

defines youth as people aged between 15 and 24, with the explanation that this range appears relatively suitable for UN statistical use. The UN also acknowledges that this range can vary and differ from other age groups outlined by Member States such as 18 to 30 years old. Youth indicates a period of conversion from childhood's dependence to the independence of adulthood and age appears to be the easiest approach to conceptualise youth, especially with references to education and occupation, as youth can be associated to individuals between the period of leaving basic education and entering working life (United Nations, 2013. See more: https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/documents/youth/fact-sheets/youth-definition.pdf).

In her study of cyberbullying among youth in twenty-five different European countries, Görzig (2011) indicates that the age range of young people in her research is from 9 to 16 years old. The same applies for several other EU Kids research papers (Livingstone et al. 2015). This age range seems to vary, however not too significantly. Stald and Haddon (2008) base on a Eurobarometer survey to keep the definition of 'children' and 'young people' from 6 to 18-year-olds. In this study, youths as respondents are from age group of 9 to 17-year-olds.

Bourdieu (1978) argues that biological and social age are different notions, and whilst age is a biological factor, it is manipulated by society. Conceptualising youth as social culture, Nayak and Kehily (2013) argue that youth is a form of social construction and the moral values surrounding it can be related to gender, class and place. This viewpoint associates with Parsons (1961) and Eisenstadt (1973)'s vision which also suggests that youth build their own social construction by which young people are able to surpass the status attributed via social class status of their family, instead accomplish their self-status within their own status scheme using their own aims and ethics.

This way, young people form a new 'age class' that is fairly independent from the classification system constructed by adults (Musgrove 1964; Jones 2009). Musgrove (1964) discusses that this separation of youth leads to their irresponsible behaviours due to the lack of social responsibilities they own. Jones

(2009) emphasises that differences in class, race and gender can create significantly different types of youth experiences along their route to adulthood.

Drawing on youth as identity, Jones (2009) states that youth is a critical period of identity formation during which youth are detached from their families and generate self-development through interactions with new social relationships. Youth in late modernity can be considered a transformation from private to public spheres, and from attribution to accomplishment regarding social status, values and identity (Jones, 2009). In this study, this notion can be seen as a starting point of understanding youth since cyberbullying and hate speech commonly take place on social media and in public acts which intervene the private sphere of youth.

A research question for this study can be posed here: how do youth experiences of cyberbullying, including cyberbullying reception and practice, vary in response to these factors of age and gender?

2.2 Cyberbullying as a concept

Cyberbullying can be defined as any behaviour acted through the internet and/or other mediums such as mobile phones, social media platforms, chatting apps, emails, personal blogs by individuals or groups of individuals that repetitively transfers hostile or aggressive messages with the intention of imposing distress or harm on others (Patchin & Hinduja, 2006; Willard, 2007; Tokunaga, 2010; Kowalski et al., 2012). Olthof et al. (2011) emphasises that cyberbullying can be seen as a strategic activity of an individual aiming to dominate one or some other individuals.

Cyberbullying can contain various non-physical attacks, such as texting offensive messages through mobile phone, chatting apps and email, sexting, spreading negative rumours on social media, making mean comments, showing aggressive or threatening attitude online… all with the purpose to cause harm or humiliation to someone (Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007; Balakrishnan, 2015; Keen

and Georgescu, 2016). There can be various reasons for a youth to practise cyberbullying: the desire to hurt or humiliate someone; personal aggressive enegery; some may even get pleasure from cyberbullying. Youths can even send hurtful or threatening messages to others when being bored as they consider it fun without thinking of its consequences (Kowalski et al., 2012).

2.3 Cyberbullying techniques

Willard (2007) specifies more by categorising cyberbullying into: Flaming – online fights using hostile curses and languages; Slandering or denigration – spreading negative rumours about someone; Harassing – constantly sending harmful messages to someone; Impersonation – pretending to be another person and faking messages to harm someone; Outing and Trickery - publicly uploading or sharing private chats or images of someone; Exclusion – intentionally excluding a person from specific online groups; Cyberstalking - repeatedly sending disturbing messages which can contain harmful threats or involve blackmailing and extortion.

2.3.1 Flaming

Willard (2007) defines flaming as intense, usually short-lived arguments which happen between two or more individuals, sometimes with bystanders who try to either evoke or douse them. Flaming commonly consists of disrespectful, aggressive and vulgar language, sometimes even insults and threats. This cyberbullying form usually occurs in public interaction contexts such as chat forums, online groups and online games (Willard, 2007). Threatening and vulgar messages can also be sent directly to the targets (Nieminen and Pörhölä, 2011).

Willard (2007) demonstrates that flaming can be seen as a short-lived occurrence between individuals that are generally considered to be of equal level regarding social power. An appropriate question concerning whether this action should be labelled as an act of bullying can be raised here, since this viewpoint

is different from common description of bullying as including repeated interactions between individuals from dissimilar levels of social power (Willard, 2007).

Public interaction and communication environments in this case vary depends on how they actually allow, encourage or forbid flaming. Sometime internet users involve in 'baiting', which means uploading posts and messages with the purpose of generating an online debate (Willard, 2007).

2.3.2 Harassment

Willard (2007) states that harassment is the act of sending repeatedly and ongoingly insulting messages to a person of target. Harassing messages are commonly sent via personal communication devices such as texts, instant messages and emails. Harassment, like flaming, can also happen in public interaction settings, however is longer-lived and contains multiple repetitive offensive messages, with the intention to make the victims constantly receive attack whenever they turn on their devices or go online (Willard, 2007).

Willard (2007) makes it clear about the 'one-sidedness' that differentiates harassment from flaming. It means that the harassment is generally a one-sided type of cyberbully – one person does the online attack, the person of target commonly just tries to stop the communication, meaning he or she has to defend by himself or herself.

Harassment can also sometimes happen by proxy (Willard, 2007). A lot of teenagers appear to have built wide online connection channels with strangers and these online contacts can get involved in the harassment even without knowing the target.

2.3.3 Denigration

Denigration, or slandering, can be defined as spreading negative, harmful or untrue rumours and speeches about a target (Willard, 2007). These offensive messages can be posted on the internet or spread to others with the intention to intrude relationships or destroy reputation of the target. In this case, the target is not the one who directly receives the insulting materials, but the other bystanders. However, the cyberbully may also send denigrating messages about a target to an online group where the target is a participant. One of the common forms of denigration is the act of uploading on public group or spreading digital pictures that have been photoshopped to display a false, usually embarrassing, image of the target (Willard, 2007).

According to Willard (2007), denigration is the technique of cyberbullying most frequently adopted among students. Hinduja and Patchin (2015) claim that rumours which are spread online usually reach a much wider range of audience in a short period of time compared with offline rumours.

2.3.4 Impersonation

Impersonation, or masquerading, occurs when a cyberbully attains access to impersonate the target online and upload negative information that brings shame to the target or disrupt the target's social relationships. This can take place on the target's own social page, website, blog or any other form of online platform. Usually, the sharing of passwords, which is common among female teenagers, is the key for the cyberbully to access to the target's online account and impersonate (Willard, 2007).

2.3.5 Outing and Trickery

Willard (2007) demonstrates outing as publicly uploading, sharing or forwarding private chats or images, especially ones that include sensitive, usually embarrassing personal information. An example of outing can be when a

cyberbully victim sends a text message or an email that contains sensitive personal information to a cyberbully, this text message or email gets forwarded to other people by the cyberbully.

Trickery can be seen as a part of outing. A cyberbullying victim can be tricked into trusting that a conversation or sharing of personal information is private, when the cyberbullying perpetrator commonly tricks the victim to disclose some embarrassing personal stories that will then be spread to others or utilised as a threat against the victim (Willard, 2007).

2.3.6 Exclusion

Like its name, exclusion depicts the act of intentionally excluding a target from an online group, making the target an outcast. Humans have the basic need to belong and feel accepted by certain groups. Children themselves have their own acknowledgement of the concept of being 'inside' or 'outside', both offline and online. Exclusion therefore can have intense emotional impact and may take place in online environments such as gaming groups, group chats and any online communication platform (Willard, 2007; Kowalski et al., 2012).

An example of exclusion can be on social media sites such as Facebook, the cyberbullying victim may be excluded from a group whose members are all of the classmates except for the victim (Huhtala, 2013).

2.3.7 Cyberstalking

Cyberstalking is a repetitive act of sending nasty and disturbing messages which contain harmful threats that can be extremely offensive and intimidating, or involve blackmailing and extortion (Willard, 2007). Cyberstalkers may also attempt to denigrate their victims and ruin their social or professional reputations as well as relationships (Willard, 2007; Kowalski et al., 2012).

Willard (2007) notes that there is a blurry line between harassment and cyberstalking, however it is possible to indicate that when a victim starts to fear for his or her own well-being and safety, this border has been crossed.

Cyberstalking can be direct or indirect (Willard, 2007). Direct cyberstalking mostly takes place in personal communication settings. The cyberstalker may use anonymous communication tools with the purpose to hide his or her identity. Indirect cyberstalking involves communications sent to other people with the attempt to denigrate the victim. This activity overlaps with denigration and impersonation (Willard, 2007).

Bullying aggression is commonly divided into three different types: Physical – involves physical actions such as beating, kicking, pushing; Verbal – name-calling, teasing, insulting; Psychological and emotional (or Indirect relational aggression) – gossiping, spreading rumours, controlling social relationships, social exclusion and extortion (Nansel et al. 2001; Willard, 2007). From these, Willard (2007, p.30) categories cyberbullying into two types: Direct verbal bullying which contains flaming, harassment and cyberstalking; and Indirect relational aggression which contains denigration, outing and trickery, exclusion, impersonation and cyberstalking. Nansel et al. (2001) argue that these different categories of bullying can lead to gender differences: for boys, direct bullying and verbal bullying can be seen as more common for both offline bullying and online bullying; girls seem to use more indirect bullying techniques due to discreet reasons.

Willard (2007) notes that the most common online activity of girls is communication and the most common online activity of boys is gaming. This author argues that cyberbullying initially exists in online communication settings, hence the assumption that girls are often seen as more involved in cyberbullying activities than the boys.

A research question that can be drawn from this section is: which types among these cyberbullying techniques are being performed and received by Finnish youths? Also, in correspondence with Willard (2007), Jones (2009) and Nansel et al. (2011) arguments' that differences in age and gender can create significantly different types of youth experiences of cyberbullying, another question we can have here is: to what extent do differences in socio-demographic factors such as gender and age among Finnish youths have impact on their experiences of cyberbullying?

2.4 Cyberbullying platforms

Cyberbullying can take different forms depending on the platform where it is taken place. Kowalski et al. (2012) and several other scholars list out the common cyberbullying platforms as below:

2.4.1 Instant messaging

Instant messaging refers to the real-time online communication between two or more individuals (Kowalski et al. 2012, 70). Nowadays, the most popular instant messaging applications among youths can be Whatsapp and Snapchat (eBrand, 2016; Noppari, 2014). Whatsapp is commonly used for private messages among friends or groups of acquaintances (Noppari, 2014). With SnapChat, images and texts are combined in the messages and this application also enables private chatting.

The common technique of cyberbullying through instant messaging is sending nasty and threatening messages to the targets. Impersonation and spreading intimate, personal information from another person is also possible with instant messaging (Kowalski et al. 2012).

2.4.2 Emails

Email is one of the most used means of digital communication (Kowalski et al. 2012). The use of emails is rather low among youths, however, this has still been

used as a platform for cyberbullying. The reason can be due to the easiness to reach many targets with the touch of a button (Kowalski et al. 2012). Cyberbullying perpetrators can also use someone else's email to sign in, for instance, porn or malicious websites and the victim starts receiving harassing emails (Kowalski et al. 2012).

2.4.3 Social networking sites

In this modern time, there are hundreds of social media sites with millions of online users (Kowalski et al., 2012). Youths usually use social media platforms depends on what their friends are using. The use of Facebook, for instance, has been decreasing among youth users these past years with the possible reason being the increase in parents' use of this social networking site (Noppari, 2014). Instagram on the other hand has been one of the most favourite apps of youths for several years (eBrand, 2016).

Social media encourages people to share more about their own lives and their interests to other people. This, however, has its advantages and disadvantages. For example, positive comments from other users can boost one's self-esteem, but negative comments can do the opposite (Kowalski et al., 2012).

A popular activity among youths using social networking sites is posting and sharing photos (Uusitalo et al., 2011). Uusitalo et al. (2011) argue that young social media users should be aware of the potential consequences of publicly publishing such materials online. Social networking sites, therefore, create various obstacles which youths have to face such as invasion of privacy and fear of being critised by other users (Uusitalo et al. 2011).

Creation of online communities and groups that spread rumours and gossip is a common form of cyberbullying that takes place on social networking sites (Kowalski et al. 2012).

Some researches (Kotilainen & Suoninen, 2013; Suoninen, 2013; Noppari, 2014) have pointed out significant gender differences regarding the use of social media: young girls usually report to be more active as social media users compared to young boys. They also start to use social media at younger ages that their male counterparts. Both boys and girls use social networking sites such as Facebook mostly to chat with friends. Girls seem to be more careful and cautious as they often set their Facebook profiles private and only accept friend requests from acquaintances. Boys' Facebook profiles are often set public and strangers' friend requests are often accepted by them (Suoninen, 2013).

Behaviours of young boys and girls in online communities are also different (Noppari, 2014). The girls usually show decency with comments that encourage and cheer each other up, while the boys' language use can sometimes be rough and violent (Noppari, 2014).

2.4.4 Online games

Many online games have their own chat feature. Chatting in online games commonly includes discussion of particular focus subjects, with possible existence of profile pictures and gamers can use a different identity from their real-life self (Willard, 2007; Kowalski et al., 2012).

There are multiple opportunities for cyberbullying such as agressively cursing at each other through texts or rudely shutting others out of the chat. Boys are said to be much more attracted to and active in online gaming platforms compared to girls, especially with games that involve competition and virtually fighting agaisnt other users (Willard, 2007; Suoninen, 2013). In online games, cyberbullying can also take the form of exclusion when a gamer is left out of the game or is not given a valuable position on purpose (Kowalski et al., 2012).

2.5 Involved parties in cyberbullying

According to an EU Kids Online study of 9-16-year-old online users in 25 European countries by Görzig (2011), over 90 per cent of 9-16-year-old online users in Europe have never been bullied nor been bullied online. The study argues that those who have bullied others or been bullied by others online tend to be more psychologically vulnerable or have a vulnerable socio-demographic background.

Görzig (2011) demonstrates that bullying and having been bullied online mostly have parallel correlation. In her research, approximately 60 per cent of youths who practice bullying have suffered bullying from others. Bullying and being bullied mostly come about in similar modes (Görzig,2011). Among youths who have bullied others offline, nearly 60 per cent have been bullied, although only 10 per cent were bullied online. Among those who have bullied others online, about the same number have been bullied, but 40 per cent have been bullied online (Görzig, 2011).

Being cyberbullied is one of the many risks that cause possible harms to youths when using the Internet. In some cases, bullying arises from youth's availability through peer-to-peer interactions and, often enough, the threats come from peers (Görzig, 2011).

Among youths who are involved in online bullying, girls, younger children and youths from lower socio-demographic background report more frequently being bullying victims and less frequently to bully others than boys, older children and youths from higher socio-demographic background (Görzig, 2011). This suggests that youths from more 'vulnerable' socio-demographic background are more likely to report experiencing cyberbullying victim roles rather than perpetrator roles (Görzig, 2011).

To study the connection between online bullying and psychological vulnerability, Görzig (2011) uses three measures: psychological difficulties; sensation seeking; social exclusion or ostracism.

For psychological difficulties category, Görzig demonstrates that the three bullying groups display higher psychological difficulties in comparison with youth group who neither having bullied nor having been bullied online. Young people who are both online bullies and online bullying victims show higher psychological difficulties than those who are only bullies, not bully victims (Görzig, 2011).

For the measure of sensation seeking, the three bullying groups present higher sensation seeking in comparison with those who have neither bullied nor been bullied online. Young people who have bullied others or have bullied and have been bullied show higher rate of interest to seek sensation than people who are just bully victims, not bullies (Görzig, 2011).

Measure of ostracism shows that youths who have been bully victims or both bullies and victims have higher rate of ostracism than those who are neither. Bully victims also have higher rate of ostracism than bullies (Görzig, 2011).

These findings propose that mental difficulties can be linked with both cyberbullying and its victimisation, sensation seeking with online bullying and ostracism with cyberbullying victimisation (Görzig, 2011). Besides, Görzig (2011) also claims that youths who are involved in online bullying show an overall higher level of psychological vulnerability than those who are not involved in online bullying.

With these findings, Görzig (2011) suggests that those who can be identified as vulnerable in general, online and offline, should be among priorities when it comes to future policy development.

Görzig (2011) also attempts to address the connection between online bullying and offline bullying. Among all bullying groups (bullies, victims, and both) the percentage of youths who own a social media account and of those making strangers' contact online is higher for online bullying than for offline bullying. For both of these social media activities, the rate differences are highest for those

who have been involved in both actions of bullied others and being bullied by others (Görzig, 2011).

Görzig (2011) emphasis the possibility that being bullied by others online can be the responsive reaction to having bullied others online and vice versa, bullying others online can be the reaction to being bullied by others online. Although it is unclear which is the cause and which is the consequence, offering more support for youths who are victims of bullying might simultaneously reduce the existence of online bullying. Likewise, attempt to prevent children from involving in online bullying activities might decrease the chance that they themselves will be online bullying victims (Görzig, 2011).

From this chapter, another research problem we can set for this study is: How is socio-demographic background framing those Finnish young people who have involved in cyberbullying activities? What are the possible comparing outcomes of the frequency of youths report being cyberbullying victims between girls and younger children and boys and older children in the case of Finland?

2.6 Online hate speech and the link with cyberbullying

A notion that is closely linked to the concept of cyberbullying and has been intensively investigated in existing researches is online hate speech. Although they are not the same thing, these two concepts share multiple similarities and the ways they occur are sometimes intertwined especially in this modern time, hence it can be challenging to distinguish between the two (Assimakopoulos et al., 2017).

Hate speech can be defined as negative speech or expression that are used with the purpose to insult and denigrate someone or a group of people often based on the foundation of (assumed) participation in a social group detected by characteristics such as race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, gender, age, disabilities, physical appearance and more (Assimakopoulos et al., 2017; Curtis, 2019). All forms of hate speech expression therefore "spread, incite, promote or

justify racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism or other forms of hatred based on intolerance, including: intolerance expressed by aggressive nationalism and ethnocentrism, discrimination and hostility against minorities, migrants and people of immigrant origin." (Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers, 1997. Available at: https://rm.coe.int/1680505d5b).

European Union Law (2008) defines hate speech in terms of punishable criminal offences as "public incitement to violence or hatred directed against a group of persons or a member of such a group defined on the basis of race, colour, descent, religion or belief, or national or ethnic origin; the above-mentioned offence when carried out by the public dissemination or distribution of tracts, pictures or other material; publicly condoning, denying or grossly trivialising crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes as defined in the Statute of the International Criminal Court (Articles 6, 7 and 8) and crimes defined in Article 6 of the Charter of the International Military Tribunal, when the conduct is carried out in a manner likely to incite violence or hatred against such a group or a member of such a group." (European Union Law, 2008. Available from: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=LEGISSUM:l33178).

Hate speech can be seen as a serious issue and can commit a violation of human rights. Hate speech online is just as serious as its offline form but can be considered more challenging to detect and solve. Hate speech is usually generated by negative stereotypes which believe that some particular groups or individuals are inferior, different in a negative way and do not deserve certain level of social respect. If undetected, hate speech online can emerge to the offline world, provoking more serious racial tension and various types of discrimination and attack (Keen and Georgescu, 2016).

Hate speech, in its worst displays, can be considered a form of discrimination and invasion of human rights. It "alienates, marginalises, and undermines personal dignity, often of those who are already vulnerable in other ways." (Keen and Georgescu, 2016, p.157). Hate speech is almost always derived from racist or discriminatory stances, if not already possesses

discrimination in itself. Discrimination can be defined as opposition of equality among humans, it happens when someone's rights are harmed only due to how they are perceived by other people. Abusing an individual or a group of people either offline or online just because of their 'foreignism', disabilities, gender, sexual orientation or any other attributes as such, is considered discrimination (Keen and Georgescu, 2016).

Keen and Georgescu (2016) argue that discrimination often naturally involves racism, which is derived from stereotypes and prejudice. Racism takes place when discriminatory attitudes or abusive behaviours are executed towards an individual or a group of people because of their assumed 'alienness' or 'inferiority'. It is critical to be aware that 'race' in this case implies social classification, not biological classification (Keen and Georgescu, 2016). Stereotypes can be defined as shared, generalised views or beliefs about certain social groups and may be positive, negative or neutral. Stereotypes can turn toxic when they are placed rigidly to individuals and are taken advantage of as an excuse for unfair treatment towards an individual or a group of people (Keen and Georgescu, 2016). A prejudice can be considered a specific class of stereotype that encompasses a judgement. When a stereotype or prejudice takes the focus on someone's nationality, race, ethnicity or skin colour, it is likely to be viewed as racist, weather it is positive or negative (Keen and Georgescu, 2016).

Keen and Georgescu (2016) argue that online hate is expressed through more than just texts. The Internet nowadays enable us to communicate in various ways with numerous systems such as social media platforms and online game networks, most often anonymously. These visual forms of online hate speech are often seen to have more significant impact on conscious and subconscious manners (Keen and Georgescu, 2016). Online hate hence can be spread via different communication forms from texts to images and videos. Niemen and Pörhölä (2011) specifically highlight a strong association between online hate speech and flaming.

According to Keen and Georgescu (2016), online hate may be targeted at community groups that are already in vulnerable state somehow, such as

disabled people, asylum seekers, refugees or religious minorities. However, there also has been an increase in online hate speech targeting individuals. The consequence of online hate speech can be suicides of its victims. Hate speech can be seen as a threat towards safety and self-esteem of its victims (Keen and Georgescu, 2016).

Online hate speech is disseminated and intensified by underrating its upsetting effects on people, and by two 'myths' about the online world's virtual social interaction: anonymity and impunity; these allow perpetrators to abuse more freely (Keen and Georgescu, 2016; Assimakopoulos et al., 2017). Actions performed on the internet can eventually be tracked back to its creator, depends on willing of the law enforcement. However, the impression is still there that one can share hate speech content online without leaving a trace and this encourages the act much more than if the perpetrators are aware of the risk of their identities being revealed. The perpetrators of online hate speech may know that what they are doing is illegal, but they are assured that no such thing will happen to them. This kind of impunity is also a myth as either offline or online hate speech can lead to serious prosecution in many member states (Keen and Georgescu, 2016; Assimakopoulos et al., 2017).

Keen and Georgescu (2016) stress that although all forms of hate speech may be bad and negative to some extent, the 'hate degree' is different case by case, meaning one case can be worse than another, for instance, if it seems more offensive, damaging and inflammatory, or has the possibility to affect a wider range of audience. The 'degree' of hate speech expressions can depend on: the content and tone of expression; the intent of the perpetrators; the victims or potential victims; the context; the effect or potential effect (Keen and Georgescu, 2016).

Regarding the victims or potential victims of online hate speech, Keen and Georgescu (2016) emphasise that some specific groups or individuals may be considered more vulnerable than others with particular criticisms, possibly due to the way they are normally viewed by society or the way they are illustrated by the media, or their personal situations that do not allow them to sufficiently defend

themselves. Examples of potential targets of hate speech can be Muslims in a country where the majority of citizens is non-Muslim or Christians in a country where the majority of citizens is non-Christian. Children are also seen as a vulnerable group that requires special attention and protection. Nevertheless, anyone in society can be a target of hate speech, even if they do not belong to the commonly-seen victim categories (Keen and Georgescu, 2016).

Drawing on the relation between online hate speech and cyberbullying, Keen and Georgescu (2016) clarify that cyberbullying can be seen as a power relation aimed against a specific individual, while hate speech is often seen to direct abusiveness and hatred against a particular group of people. However, both are forms of hostility, offence and humiliation. Cyberbullying, according to Keen and Georgescu (2016), is when the targets of online hate speech is individualized.

Online hate speech and cyberbullying occur on the same online platforms. Both activities employ harassing and offending communication. Their victims are usually considered different due to various reasons, including their race, ethnicity, disability, religion or other attributes. In many cases, cyberbullying and hate speech are combined which can cause serious damages, for example, cyberbullying that bases on the victims' ethnic background, religion or sexual orientation (Keen and Georgescu, 2016).

Assimakopoulos et al.'s (2017) strongly argue that hatred and hostility towards certain social groups, which live under the shadow of both offline and online hate speech, can prevail itself in different forms of representation of intolerance and violence, such as that of cyberbullying. Assimakopoulos et al.'s study (2017) shows that the expression of hate is intimately connected to the experience of cyberbullying, and an individual's personal identity is often taken advantage of by the perpetrators as a tool to practise cyberbullying.

A research question that can be raised from here is: What is the relationship between online hate speech and cyberbullying? To what extent is it represented in the case of Finnish EU Kids 2019?

3 METHODOLOGIES

3.1 Research questions

This study attempts to answer these research questions: how do youth experiences of cyberbullying vary in response to the socio-demographic factors of age and gender? What are the outcomes of comparison of the frequency of youths report being cyberbullying victims and perpetrators between girls and younger age groups and boys and older age groups in the case of Finland?

Which types among the cyberbullying techniques are being performed and received by Finnish youths?

How are online hate speech and cyberbullying linked together? To what extent is it displayed in the case of Finnish EU Kids 2019?

3.2 Research methods

My methodological approach will be quantitative method with the use of statistical data and analysis.

Quantitative research determines numerical practice to the object under study. The concentration of quantitative research is to seek the typical, the average, the trend that can later be represented to large populations (VanderStoep and Johnston, 2009).

Quantitative methods were historically linked to a worldview called 'positivism'. A positivist approach possesses certain presumptions about truth and reality. It is critical to note that quantitative social scientists have challenged and nowadays eliminated some of the assumptions of positivism (VanderStoep and Johnston, 2009).

In quantitative research, phenomena are represented numerically; analysis is done by descriptive and inferential statistics; scope of inquiry is shown by specific questions or hypotheses. A primary advantage of quantitative research can be: large sample, statistical validity, correctly reflects the population, while its primary disadvantage is said to be: superficial perception of participants' thoughts and emotions (VanderStoep and Johnston, 2009; Teo, 2013).

The selection of applying qualitative or quantitative research method should depend on the research questions. If what the researcher desires is a large, accurate sample that will generalize to the larger population, quantitative research would be a preferable option compared to qualitative research (VanderStoep and Johnston, 2009; Davis and Hughes, 2014).

In quantitative research, methods are usually described in great details so that other researchers are able to replicate the studies; if several researchers obtain the similar results, they then have the confidence that they have met accuracy (Teo, 2013; Nardi, 2018).

A quantitative research assignment should follow a set of prescribed sequential procedures: specifying a research question, discovering theoretical basis of the topic, identifying independent and dependent variables, generating hypotheses, choosing or producing measurement procedures for each variable, selecting a sample, developing assessment tools, collecting data, coding data, and analysing data (Gorard, 2001; Nardi, 2018).

I decided to undertake quantitative research as I believe this method is the most appropriate approach for addressing my research topic by enabling me to discover repetitive patterns amongst a large population of Finnish youths. Quantitative method is extremely relevant and necessary for my study which aims to identify the trends among youth experiences of cyberbullying and hate speech; from here I can go on to produce hypotheses and analyse data to answer my research questions.

3.3 Research design and sampling procedure

My research methods mainly focus on data analysis of the EU Kids Online 2019 Survey. The EU Kids Online network's goal is to constantly offer empirical evidence on children's and young people's online experiences and related opportunities and risks.

This survey has been set up along the following principles of EU Kids Online: national teams arrange funding and data collection at the national level; the general methodological approach for national surveys follows the guidelines as specified below for sampling, questionnaire, translation, data management, data analysis and reporting; in order to ensure international comparisons are attained a solid base, the national sampling procedures and questionnaires need to be approved by the EU Kids Online Management Group; the network will set up a centralised service for merging national data sets and displaying comparative data analyses. As a first step, EU Kids Online organisation has built a system and SPSS datafile which can be used to merge all national datasets.

The online surveys in Finland have been conducted in between 13th January 2019 to 27th April 2019. The sampling was based on NUTS2 and NUTS3 classification. The basic unit was school class and the classes were selected by the contacts possessed by University of Tampere. Representative sampling was through Finnish comprehensive schools that covers almost 98% of the youths on the age range and sampling method was geographically weighted random sample among these schools. Excluded units were some private schools based on certain ideologies such as religion, pedagogy or other different curricula.

There were 2400 received surveys in total and at least 1321 of them were partially answered. The participating students were from 9 to 17 years old who used the internet at least once in the past three months.

The survey considered 4th to 9th graders in Finland, typically 9-10 to 15-16 years old. However, the ages may vary, the students can be younger or older, for instance some students had skipped or doubled a year. The survey started

initially in 2018 when default year of birth for 4th graders was 2008. The data for this study mainly showcase youths from 11 to 16 years old. When analysing age, the findings and discussion chapter will refer to the students mainly as older age groups (14 to 16-year-olds) and younger age groups (11 to 13-year-olds).

The non-users and the parents were not interviewed. Country specific questions were not added. The functionality of the translation has been tested among 3 class teachers and the functionality of the actual Survey Tool has been tested by 8 university students and the research team. The data entry was performed in schools with computers by the respondents.

3.4 Entities involved

Survey adaption was conducted by translator and research team – 4 people in total. The surveys have Finnish, Swedish and English versions. Cross checking has been implemented in order to ensure accuracy of translation.

3.5 Questionnaires

The EU Kids Online 2019 questionnaires include: Core questions that must be used by everyone who collects data for the EU Kids Online 2019 survey; Extended Core questions that are important, but optional, due to the overall length of the questionnaire versus the wish to include modules; Optional questions; and Topical Modules from which researchers can select questions that are relevant to their own areas.

The data selected for this study is based on youths' responses of particular questions that belong to EU Kids 2019 Core questions, Optional questions and EU Kids 2019 Module questionnaire: Cyberhate, discrimination and violent extremism (Appendix 1). I chose these questions because they provide the information that helps answering my research questions of how youths have been experiencing cyberbullying and hate speech. In specific, the questions selected from the Core questionnaire benefit my research a lot while studying factors surrounding cyberbullying such as cyberbullying techniques; whilst the questions

selected from the Module questionnaire especially focus on cyberhate and online discrimination which contribute to my study of online hate speech.

The modules have been conducted as instructed and approaches of explaining the questions as well as other issues were left to respective teachers as respondents answered the questions during school days.

3.6 Data presentation and analysing methods

The data used in my study are descriptive statistics, which helps depict, display and summarize data in a useful way such that, for example, outstanding patterns might emerge from the data. Descriptive statistics offer a quick approach to produce comparisons between different data sets and to detect, for example, the smallest and largest values and trends or changes over a specific period of time. Clarity can be guaranteed with descriptive statistics as this method enables clarification of large volumes of data, there are no uncertainties about the results. Descriptive statistics also employ graphical and visual representation of data such as tables, pie charts, histograms and bar graphs (Shi and McLarty, 2009). I chose to use tables to present my data as I think it is suitable for the comparison of two or more variables. The use of tables helps the readers understand complex findings and the importance of the data used (Gorard, 2001; Teo, 2013).

My data anylysis focuses on both categorical variables (such as gender: boy/girl; year of birth: 2002 – 2008) and numerical variables (such as number of respondents; quantities and percentages). Here frequency tables are used as they can effectively show how many participants fall into each category (Gorard, 2001). My data presentation mainly implements percentages, frequency and cross-tabulation as I think these are the best tools for comparison of variables in my study.

3.7 Ethics and Safety

Ethical approval was not needed as the Finnish schools grant access for researchers by parental consents collected at the beginning of school year.

Regarding ethics and safety, informed consent, anonymity, confidentiality and safeguarding while avoiding the participants from any potential harm have been ensured by EU Kids Online organisation (Appendix 2).

3.8 Main limitations

Sampling is limited by class differences. In specific, all students who received the survey did not answer it or not all the questions. Moreover, the survey method can cause bias to the elder age groups (upper comprehensive school students).

The next chapter is going to display the questions and responses as means for data analysis and findings.

4 FINDINGS

In this chapter, I will present analysis of my data and discuss my findings in order to answer my research questions.

The main themes which I have identified within my data are:

1. Youth experiences of cyberbullying
2. Cyberbullying in relation to online hate speech

Along these two main themes, I will analyse the data that focuses on the sub-themes: youth experiences of cyberbullying based on gender and age; cyberbullying victims and cyberbullying perpetrators; cyberbullying techniques and platforms.

4.1 Youth experiences of cyberbullying

4.1.1 Cyberbully and being cyberbullied

According to the data, regarding gender, responses to the question "In the past year, have you ever treated someone else in a hurtful or nasty way via a mobile phone or internet, computer, tablet, etc.?" show that 13.9% (37/267) of the Finnish boys in the study have cyberbullied others. For the same question, this number of the Finnish girls is slightly less: 13.1% (40/306). It is important to note that the boys have practised cyberbullying more intensely in terms of frequency.

Regarding age, responses to this question show that the older age groups of 2003, 2004, 2005 (14 to 16-year-olds) have practised cyberbullying considerably more than the younger age groups of 2006, 2007, 2008 (11 to 13-year-olds) with the percentages of 14.6% (14/96), 17% (32/188) and 14.5% (18/124) respectively. It is important to note that the older age groups, especially

2004 and 2005 (14 and 15-year-olds) are the ones who have practised cyberbullying more intensely in terms of frequency.

Regarding gender, responses to the question "In the past year, has anyone ever treated you in a hurtful or nasty way via a mobile phone or internet, computer, tablet, etc.?" show that 14.4% (41/284) of the Finnish boys in the study have been cyberbullied. For the same question, this number of the Finnish girls is almost doubled: 26.3% (37/267). It is important to note that the boys have received cyberbullying more intensely in terms of frequency.

Regarding age, responses to this question show that the older age groups of 2003 and 2004 (15 and 16-year-olds) have received cyberbullying the most with 28.3% (28/99) and 25.2% (52/206) respectively. The other age groups have received cyberbullying approximately equally with the average ratio of 12.8%. It is important to note that the older age groups of 2003, 2004 and 2005 (14 to 16-year-olds) are the one who have received cyberbullying more intensely in terms of frequency.

Table 1 shows that in the past year, among 454 Finnish youths that responded to this question, about 27.5% have been treated in a hurtful or nasty way by someone via mobile phone or internet, computer, tablet etc., and about 17% have treated someone else in a hurtful or nasty way via mobile phone or internet, computer, tablet etc.

TABLE 1. *In the past year, has anyone ever treated you in such a hurtful or nasty way/have you ever treated someone else in a hurtful or nasty way? If yes, how often has it happened via a mobile phone or Internet, computer, tablet, etc.?*

	How often you have been treated in a hurtful or nasty way online by someone		How often you have treated someone else in a hurtful or nasty way online	
	Q[1]	P[2]	Q	P
A few times	76	60.8%	51	66.2%
At least every month	23	18.4%	12	15.9%

[1] Q: Quantity
[2] P: Percentage

At least every week	11	8.8%	4	5.2%
Daily or mostly daily	15	12%	10	13%
Total	125	100%	77	100%

Among youths who have been treated in a hurtful or nasty way online by someone, more than 60% have been treated this way 'A few times', 18.4% have been treated 'At least every month', while the last 20.8% have suffered from this more often: 'At least every week' or 'Daily or almost daily.'

Among youths who have treated someone else in a hurtful or nasty way online, 66.2% have done this 'A few times', 15.9% have done it 'At least every month', while the last 18.2% have done it more often: 'At least every week' or 'Daily or almost daily.'

4.1.2 Cyberbullying platforms and techniques

Table 2 clearly shows that these Finnish youths mostly have had to face nasty behaviours on social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter (47.3%), by messages sent to them on their phones (38.9%) and by mobile phone calls (21.4%); followed by instant messaging (19.8%) and media-sharing platforms such as YouTube (7.6%).

It is definitely critical to note that among these youths, the numbers of girls who have received cyberbullying on a social networking site, by messages sent to their phones, by mobile phone calls and on a media-sharing platform all surpass the numbers of boys who have; especially for social networking sites and messages sent to phones with about half the number of the girls, whilst for the boys these are much smaller numbers.

The boys only surpass the girls with instant messaging platform, and with online games and emails, but not so dramatically.

TABLE 2. *When you were treated in such a hurtful or nasty way online or via a mobile device, has it happened through any of the following? Data based on gender.*

	Boy 44		Girl 87		Total 131	
	Q	P	Q	P	Q	P
By mobile phone calls	7	15.9%	21	24.1%	28	21.4%
By messages sent to me on my phone	10	22.7%	41	47.1%	51	38.9%
On a social networking site	17	38.6 %	45	51.7 %	62	47.3 %
On a media-sharing platform	3	6.8 %	7	8 %	10	7.6 %
By instant messaging	16	36.3 %	10	11.5 %	26	19.8 %
In an online game	1	2.3 %	0	0 %	1	0.7 %
Via email	1	2.3%	0	0%	1	0.7%

Table 3 shows age groups who have received cyberbullying the most in each platform. It is relatively clear to see that the dominant groups are youths who were born in 2003, 2004 and 2005 (14, 15 and 16-year-olds).

TABLE 3. *When you were treated in such a hurtful or nasty way online or via a mobile device, has it happened through any of the following? Data based on age.*

	Age groups					
	Q	P	Q	P	Q	P
By mobile phone calls	2004		2005		2003	
	16	29.6%	4	17.4%	4	13.8%
By messages sent to me on my phone	2004		2005		2003	
	22	40.7%	8	34.8%	8	34.5%
On a social networking site	2003		2004		2005	
	19	65.5%	26	48.1%	11	47.8%
On a media-sharing platform	2006		2004		2005	
	1	14.3%	6	11.1%	2	8.7%
In an online game	2008		2005		2004	
	4	30.8%	5	21.7%	11	20.4%
Via email	2004					

	2	3.7%

Table 4 and 5 show that among cyberbullying techniques, a majority of Finnish youths have received nasty or hurtful messages (71%), followed by having been excluded from an online group or activity (48.5%), and having been threatened on the internet (32.7%).

The girls seem to receive more nasty or hurtful messages, while the boys seem to experience more of nasty or hurtful messages being spread around, being left out and being threatened online.

TABLE 4. *Have any of these things happened to you in the last year*? Data based on gender.

	Boy		Girl		Total	
	Q / Total	P	Q / Total	P	Q / Total	P
Nasty or hurtful messages were sent to me	18 / 28	64.3%	48 / 65	73.8%	66 / 93	71%
Nasty or hurtful messages were passed around or posted where others could see	11 / 29	37.9%	13 / 68	19.1%	24 / 97	21.6%
I was left out or excluded from a group or activity on the internet	17 / 31	54.8%	31 / 68	45.6%	48 /99	48.5%
I was threatened on the internet	12 / 27	44.4%	20 / 71	28.2%	32 / 98	32.7%
I was forced to do something I did not want to do	3 / 29	10.3%	8 / 69	11.6%	11 / 98	11.2%
Somebody used my personal information in a way I didn't like	19 / 238	8%	18 / 299	6%	37 / 537	6.9%
Somebody used my password to access my information or to pretend to be me	12 / 236	5.1%	11 / 312	3.5%	23 / 548	4.2%
Somebody created a page or image about me that was hostile or hurtful	4 / 237	1.7%	5 / 313	1.6%	9 / 550	1.64%
Someone found out where I was because they tracked my phone or device	12/233	5.2%	21 / 299	7.0%	33 / 532	6.2%

TABLE 5. *Have any of these things happened to you in the last year?* Data based on age.

		2002	2003	2004	2006	2007	2008	Total
Nasty or hurtful messages were sent to me	Q/R[3]	1/1	18 / 26	35 / 46	4 / 6	5 / 5	6 / 12	69 / 96
	P	100 %	69.2 %	76.1 %	66.7 %	100 %	50%	71.8 %
Nasty or hurtful messages were passed around or posted where others could see	Q/R	1 / 2	4 / 27	15 / 49	0 / 5	2 / 5	3 / 12	25 / 100
	P	50%	14.8 %	30.6 %	0%	40%	25%	25%
I was left out or excluded from a group or activity on the internet	Q/R	1 / 2	11 / 27	22 / 49	3 / 6	7 / 7	5 / 11	49 / 102
	P	50%	40.7 %	44.9 %	50%	100 %	45.5 %	48%
I was threatened on the internet	Q/R	0 / 2	11 / 27	15 / 48	2 / 6	3 / 6	2 / 12	33 / 101
	P	0%	40.7 %	3.1%	33.3 %	50%	16.7 %	32.7 %
I was forced to do something I did not want to do	Q/R	0 / 2	1 / 26	8 / 49	0 / 6	0 / 6	2 / 12	11 / 101
	P	0%	3.8%	16.3 %	0%	0%	16.7 %	10.9 %
Somebody used my personal information in a way I didn't like	Q/R	0 / 5	12 / 129	19 / 211	3 / 62	2 / 41	2 / 96	38 / 544
	P	0%	9.3%	9.0%	4.8%	4.9%	2.1%	7%
Somebody used my password to access	Q/R	0 / 5	6 / 134	7 / 219	5 / 63	1 / 42	5 / 95	24 / 558
	P	0%	4.5%	3.2%	7.9%	2.4%	5.3%	4.3%

---

[3] Quantity of youths who answered 'Yes'/Total number of responses

my informatio n or to pretend to be me								
Somebody created a page or image about me that was hostile or hurtful	Q	0 / 5	3 / 134	5 / 221	2 / 64	0 / 42	0 / 94	10 / 560
	P	0%	2.2%	2.3 %	3.1%	0%	0%	1.8%
Someone found out where I was because they tracked my phone or device	Q	0 / 5	14 / 127	17 / 211	1 / 63	1 / 43	3 / 92	36 / 541
	P	0%	11 %	8.1%	1.6%	2.3 %	3.3 %	6.7%

According to Table 5, among all the age groups, the most common cyberbullying techniques they have experienced is the act of sending nasty or hurtful messages which reached 71.8%. A surprisingly significant amount of youths has stated that they have experienced 'Nasty or hurtful messages were sent to me': 100% for 2007 (12-year-olds), 76.1% for 2004 (15-year-olds), 69.2% for 2003 (16-year-olds), 66.7% for 2006 (13-year-olds) and 50% for 2008 (11-year-olds).

Being 'left out or excluded from a group or activity on the internet' is also common with 48% youths: 100% for 2007 (12-year-olds), 50% for 2002 and 2006 (17 and 13-year-olds), almost 50% for 2008, 2004 and 2003 (11, 15 and 16-year-olds); followed by being 'threatened on the internet' with 32.7% youths: 50% for 2007 (12-year-olds), 40.7% for 2003 (16-year-olds), 33.3% for 2006 (13-year-olds).

Another remarkable point to note is among 25% youths who experienced 'Nasty or hurtful messages were passed around or posted where others could see', there are 50% of youths born in 2002 (17-year-olds), 40% for 2007 (12-year-olds) and 30.6% for 2004 (15-year-olds).

4.2 Cyberbullying in relation to hate speech

4.2.1 Online hate speech reception

Table 6 shows how many participating Finnish youths have received hateful or degrading messages or comments online against themselves or their community (this could for example be against Muslims, migrants, Jews, etc.) in the past 12 months, in terms of gender.

In total of 545 responses, 8.5% of the participating male youths and 9.1% of the participating female youths answered 'Yes' to this question. Although this means the girls report more often being electronically sent hate speech victims than boys, the difference between these two percentages do not contrast dramatically.

Table 7 shows that regarding age, there is significance in numbers of youths from 14 to 16 years old who have received online hate speech in the past 12 months.

However, it is also important to notice that drawing on ratio, 2003, 2007 and 2005 (16, 12 and 14 years old) respectively are age groups that have the highest percentages of students having been cyberbullied: 12.7%, 11.1% and 10.4% respectively.

TABLE 6. *In the past 12 months, have you ever received hateful or degrading messages or comments online, against you or your community? (This could for example be against Muslims, migrants, Jews, etc.)? Data based on gender.*

	Boy		Girl		Total	
	Q	P	Q	P	Q	P
Yes	21	8.5%	27	9.1%	48	8.8%
No	226	91.5%	271	90.9%	497	91.2%
Total	247	100%	298	100%	545	100%

TABLE 7. *Amount of participating Finnish youths who have received hateful or degrading messages or comments online, against them or their community in the past 12 months.* Data based on year of birth.

		2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Total
Yes	Q	0	13	14	13	2	4	3	49
	P	0%	12.7%	8.5%	10.4%	4.4%	11.1%	4%	8.9%
No	Q	4	89	150	112	43	32	72	502
	P	100%	87.3%	91.5%	89.6%	95.6%	88.9%	96%	90.1%
Total		4	102	164	125	45	36	75	551

4.2.2 Frequency of online hate speech reception

Table 8 shows that in the past 12 months, among participating Finnish youths who have received hateful or degrading messages or comments online against themselves or their community, around 57.9% of the boys and 77.8% of the girls have experienced it 'A few times'; while about 15.6% of the boys and 14.8% of the girls have experienced it more often: 'At least every week' or 'Daily or almost daily.'

In addition, it is worthy to take notice that the percentage of boys who have received cyberbullying 'At least every month' (26.3%) is remarkably higher than the percentage of girls who have (7.4%).

TABLE 8. *In the past 12 months, how often did this happen?* Frequency of cyberbullying reception based on gender.

	Boy		Girl		Total	
	Q	P	Q	P	Q	P
A few times	11	57.9%	21	77.8%	32	53.1%
At least every month	5	26.3%	2	7.4%	7	20.9%
At least every week	1	5.3%	3	11.1%	4	16.9%
Daily or mostly daily	2	10.5%	1	3.7%	3	9%
Total	19	100%	27	100%	46	100%

Regarding age, it is worthy to note that youths born in 2003, 2004 and 2005 (14, 15 and 16-year-olds) are the ones who received hateful or degrading

messages or comments online against themselves or their community the most frequently (Table 9).

However, in terms of intensity, the data shows that more than 70% of these students have received cyberbullying 'A few times', mostly consisted of the older age group of 2003 (58.3%), 2004 (61.5%) and 2005 (84.6%). Youths born in these three years also lead in the next category of having been cyberbullied 'At least every month'.

Youths from younger age groups (2006, 2007 and 2008) who have been cyberbullying victims can be seen to have not suffered from it too intensely as they mostly encountered it 'A few times' in the past 12 months.

TABLE 9.   *In the past 12 months, how often did this happen?* Frequency of cyberbullying reception based on year of birth.

		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Total
A few times	Q	7	8	11	1	4	2	33
	P	58.3%	61.5%	84.7%	50%	100%	66.7%	70.2%
At least every month	Q	2	3	2	0	0	0	7
	P	16.7%	23.1%	15.3%	0%	0%	0%	14.9%
At least every week	Q	3	0	0	0	0	1	4
	P	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33.3%	8.5%
Daily or almost daily	Q	0	2	0	1	0	0	3
	P	0%	15.4%	0%	50%	0%	0%	6.4%
Total	Q	12	13	13	2	4	3	47

4.2.3 Online hate speech reception platforms

According to Table 10, it is vital to note that a relatively significant percentage of youths have answered 'On a social networking site' (35.4%), followed closely by 'On a media-sharing platform' (33.3%), 'In an online game' (27%), 'By instant messaging' (25%).

Despite being a smaller ratio, it is still worthy to notice that 6.3% of total participating students selected 'An online community that hates specific people'.

Table 10 also shows that these Finnish girls have received online hate speech more than the Finnish boys do on three platforms: social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter, media-sharing platforms such as YouTube, and by instant messaging. The Finnish boys have received online hate speech much more than their female counterparts in online games, and slightly more in online communities that hate specific people.

TABLE 10. *When you were treated in this way online or via a mobile device, has it happened through any of the following ways?*

	Boy		Girl		Total	
	Q	P	Q	P	Q	P
On a social networking site	6	28.6%	11	40.7%	17	35.4%
On a media-sharing platform	6	28.6%	10	37%	16	33.3%
By instant messaging	4	19%	8	29.6%	12	25%
In an online game	10	47.6%	3	11.1%	13	27%
In an online community that hates specific people	2	9.5%	1	3.7%	3	6.3%
By emails	1	4.8%	0	0	1	2%
By voice messages	1	4.8%	2	7.4%	3	6.3%
By SMS	1	4.8%	1	3.7%	2	4.2%

4.2.4 Possible causes of online hate speech reception

Among the possible causes given in the survey, it is important to note that a majority of youths selected 'Physical appearance' (20.8%), followed by 'Religion' (12.5%), 'Nationality' (10.4%) as causes of their experiences of receiving online hate speech in the past 12 months.

For the girls, the most common reasons for receiving online hate speech are physical appearance (29.6%), nationality (11.1%) and religion (7.4%).

For the boys, the most common reasons for receiving online hate speech are religion (19%), skin colour (14.3%), and nationality, origin, speaking language, physical appearance equally with 9.5% each.

TABLE 11. *Why do you think this happened? Was it because of…*

	Boy 21		Girl 28		Total 49	
	Q	P	Q	P	Q	P
Your nationality	2	9.5%	3	11.1%	5	10.4%
Your origin	2	9.5%	1	3.7%	3	6.3%
The language you speak	2	9.5%	1	3.7%	3	6.3%
Your skin colour	3	14.3%	1	3.7%	4	8.3%
Your physical appearance	2	9.5%	8	29.6%	10	20.8%
Your religion	4	19%	2	7.4%	6	12.5%
Some other reasons	13	61.9%	13	41.2%	26	54.2%

4.2.5 Online hate speech practice

Table 12 shows how many participating Finnish youths have practised online hate speech in the past 12 months, in terms of gender.

In a total of 544 responses, only 3.9% Finnish youths responded 'Yes' to this question, in which there are 5% of the male students and 3% of the female students.

TABLE 12. *In the past 12 months, have you ever sent hateful or degrading messages or comments online, against someone or a group of people (This could for example be against Muslims, migrants, Jews, etc.)? Data based on gender.*

	Boy		Girl		Total	
	Q	P	Q	P	Q	P
Yes	12	5%	9	3%	21	3.9%
No	227	95%	296	97%	523	96.2%
Total	239	100%	305	100%	544	100%

Among them, youths who were born in 2004 and 2005 (14 and 15-year-olds) are the ones who have practised cyberbullying the most in the past 12 months, while none was born in 2007 or 2008 (11 and 12-year-olds).

TABLE 13. *Amount of participating Finnish youths who have sent hateful or degrading messages or comments online, against someone or a group of people in the past 12 months.* Data based on year of birth.

		2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Total
Yes	Q	1	2	10	6	2	0	0	21
	P	20%	1.9%	6.3%	4.8%	4.2%	0%	0%	3.8%
No	Q	4	102	149	118	45	36	75	529
	P	80%	98.1%	93.7%	95.2%	95.8%	100%	100%	96.2%
Total		5	104	159	124	47	36	75	550

4.2.6 Frequency of online hate speech practice

Among students who have sent hateful or degrading messages or comments online against someone or a group of people, 79% have done it 'A few times' in the past 12 months; while about 21% have done it more often (Table 14).

It is especially important to note that female students in this case who have practised cyberbullying all have done it 'A few times', not any more frequently. This aspect is slightly different with the male students, in which 66.7% of them have practised cyberbullying 'A few times' but 33.3% have done it more frequently: especially, 16.7% have practised cyberbullying 'Daily or mostly daily'.

TABLE 14. *In the past 12 months, how often did this happen?* Data based on gender.

	Boy		Girl		Total	
	Q	P	Q	P	Q	P
A few times	8	66.7%	7	100%	15	79%
At least every month	1	8.3%	0	0%	1	5.3%
At least every week	1	8.3%	0	0%	1	5.3%
Daily or mostly daily	2	16.7%	0	0%	2	10.5%
Total	12	100%	7	100	19	100%

Regarding age, Table 15 shows that most of the students who have sent hateful or degrading messages or comments online have done it 'A few times'. A small number of students who have done it more often ('At least every month'; 'At least every week'; 'Daily or almost daily') belong to the 2004 (15-year-olds) group.

TABLE 15. *In the past 12 months, how often did this happen?* Data based on year of birth.

Frequency		2003	2004	2005	2006	Total
A few times	Q	2	6	6	1	15
	P	100%	66.7%	100%	50%	79%
At least every month	Q	0	1	0	0	1
	P	0%	11.1%	0%	0%	5.25%
At least every month	Q	0	1	0	0	1
	P	0%	11.1%	0%	0%	5.25%
Daily or almost daily	Q	0	1	0	1	2
	P	0%	11.1%	0%	50%	10.5%
Total	Q	2	9	6	2	19

4.2.7 Online hate speech practice platforms

Table 16 demonstrates an important point that for more than half of these students, their cyberbullying actions have taken place on a media-sharing platform, with approximately equal numbers of boys and girls.

The second most common way of sending hateful and degrading messages among these Finnish students is 'By instant messaging', which the girls (44.4%) have used slightly more often than the boys have (30.8%).

Social networking sites are also common, with an interesting note that while only 15.4% of the boys have utilised this platform, 44.4% of the girls have practised cyberbullying via a social networking site. Vice versa, while only 11.1% of the girls have practised cyberbullying 'In an online game', the percentage of the boys using this channel is 30.8%.

TABLE 16. *When you sent such messages online or via a mobile device, has it happened through any of the following ways?*

	Boy		Girl		Total	
	Q	P	Q	P	Q	P
On a social networking site	2	15.4%	4	44.4%	6	27.3%
On a media-sharing platform	7	53.8%	5	55.6%	12	54.5%
By instant messaging	4	30.8%	4	44.4%	8	36.4%
In an online game	4	30.8%	1	11.1%	5	22.7%
In an online community that hates specific people	1	7.7%	1	11.1%	2	9.1%
By emails	1	7.7%	0	0%	1	4.5%
By voice messages	1	7.7%	0	0%	1	4.5%

Although it is not a high amount, it is still worthwhile to note that 9.1% of these students have practised cyberbullying 'In an online community that hates specific people', in which there is 7.7% of the boys and 11.1% of the girls.

4.2.8 Possible causes of online hate speech practice

According to Table 17, among the given causes of cyberbullying practising, 'The language they speak' is the most common response by 8.3% of the students, followed by 'Their nationality', 'Their skin colour' and 'Their physical appearance'. The causes that have been selected the least are 'Their origin' and 'Their religion'.

TABLE 17. *Why did you do this? Was it because of…*

Quantity	Boy 12		Girl 9		Total 21	
	Q	P	Q	P	Q	P
Their nationality	2	9.5 %	0	0%	2	4.2%
Their origin	1	4.8 %	0	0%	1	2.1 %
The language they speak	3	14.3%	1	3.7%	4	8.3 %
Their skin colour	2	9.5%	0	0%	2	4.2 %
Their physical appearance	2	9.5%	1	3.7%	2	4.2 %
Their religion	1	4.8%	0	0%	1	2.1 %
Some other reasons	7	33.3%	3	11.1%	10	20.8 %

An interesting point to note is that apart from 'Some other reasons' (11.1%), the girls only practised cyberbullying due to physical appearance (3.7%) and the language spoken by the ones being cyberbullied (3.7%).

For the male students, the dominant cause is also the language (14.3%); followed by nationality (9.5%), skin colour (9.5%) and physical appearance (9.5%); lastly, origin (4.8%) and religion (4.8%). In general, the participating Finnish male youths seem to have been carrying out cyberbullying activities due to all these causes.

5 DISCUSSION

5.1 Youth experiences of cyberbullying

Cyberbullying can be defined as any behaviour acted through the internet and/or other mediums such as mobile phones, social media platforms, chatting apps, emails, personal blogs by individuals or groups of individuals that repetitively transfers hostile or aggressive messages with the intention of imposing distress or harm on others (Patchin & Hinduja, 2006; Willard, 2007; Tokunaga, 2010; Kowalski et al., 2012).

Cyberbullying can contain various non-physical attacks, such as texting offensive messages through mobile phone, chatting apps and email, sexting, spreading negative rumours on social media, making mean comments, showing aggressive or threatening attitude online… all with the purpose to cause harm or humiliation to someone (Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007; Balakrishnan, 2015; Keen and Georgescu, 2016).

In the EU Kids Online 2019 questions selected for this section, the general cyberbullying activities are mentioned as treatments that are shared in a 'hurtful or nasty way online or via a mobile device/ via a mobile phone or internet, computer, tablet, etc.'.

The cyberbullying platforms in the questions are: 'By mobile phone calls', 'By messages sent to me on my phone', 'On a social networking site', 'On a media-sharing platform', 'By instant messaging', 'In an online game' and 'Via email'.

The cyberbullying techniques in the questions include: 'Nasty or hurtful messages were sent to me', 'Nasty or hurtful messages were passed around or posted where others could see', 'I was left out or excluded from a group or activity on the internet', 'I was threatened on the internet', 'I was forced to do something I did not want to do', 'Somebody used my personal information in a way I didn't like', 'Somebody used my password to access my information or to pretend to be me', 'Somebody created a page or image about me that was hostile or hurtful', 'Someone found out where I was because they tracked my phone or device'.

5.1.1 Youth experiences of cyberbullying based on gender

It is vital to note that the number of Finnish youths who have experienced cyberbullying in 2019 has increased compared with this number in 2012, although not significantly.

Among youth who are involved in cyberbullying activities, Görzig (2011) argues that youths who are more 'vulnerable' such as girls and younger youths can be seen as being cyberbullying victims more often than less 'vulnerable' group such as boys and older groups. In the case of Finnish youths, the girls report more often being cyberbullying victims than the boys with an impressive excessive ratio. This justifies Görzig's argument (2011) that girls tend to receive cyberbullying more than their male counterparts do. However, drawing on frequency of youth reception of cyberbullying, although the Finnish girls seem to be cyberbullying victims more often compared with their male counterparts in terms of overall amount, it seems like among the ones who actually receive cyberbullying, the boys may suffer from it somewhat more frequently and intensely.

The findings also demonstrate that Finnish boys bully others online more than the girls do, even though the numbers do not differ dramatically. This hence reflects Görzig's perspective (2011) that male youths are likely to practise cyberbullying more than their female counterparts do. It is important to note that regarding frequency, the Finnish boys also cyberbully others more intensely.

5.1.2 Youth experiences of cyberbullying based on age

In the case of Finnish youths in this study, the older groups including 15 and 16-year-old youths tend to be the ones who receive more cyberbullying. This slightly differs from Görzig's demonstration (2011) that youths who are older tend to receive less cyberbullying. However, it is important to note that the amount of younger youths who have received cyberbullying are relatively equal and only a little lower than the amount of older youths who have. It is also helpful to note that with a relatively higher amount regarding ones being cyberbullying victims, 12-year-old Finnish youths can be considered as a group that requires more attention in terms of cyberbullying reception, next to the older age groups.

The older youths from 14 to 16 years old not only receive more cyberbullying but also receive cyberbullying more frequently and intensely. Youths from younger age groups (11 to 13-year-olds) who have been cyberbullying victims can be seen to have not suffered from it too intensely.

Regarding youths who have actively bullied others online, 14 and 15 and 16-year-old youths are the ones who have practised cyberbullying the most in the past 12 months, while there is none 11 or 12-year-olds in this category. This proves Görzig's argument (2011) that older youths are likely to be more active in cyberbullying activities, meaning they play the role of cyberbullying perpetrators more often compared with younger youths.

5.2 Cyberbullying platforms and techniques

In this study, Finnish youths seem to be practising various types of cyberbullying techniques: flaming, harassment, exclusion, denigration, outing and trickery, cyberstalking and impersonation. These include all the techniques demonstrated by Willard (2007) and will be discussed below, in order of highest frequency to lowest frequency in the case of Finnish youths:

5.2.1 Flaming

Flaming includes intense, usually short-lived arguments which happen between two or more individuals, sometimes with bystanders who try to either evoke or douse them. Flaming commonly consists of disrespectful, aggressive and vulgar language, sometimes even insults and threats. This cyberbullying form usually occurs in public interaction contexts such as chat forums and online games (Willard, 2007).

A significant amount of Finnish youths participating in the study stated that they had been sent nasty or hurtful messages or had even been threatened on the Internet. These two phenomena both belong to the category of flaming which can be seen as one of the most common cyberbullying techniques practised by Finnish youths. A remarkable point to note here is the girls seem to receive more nasty or hurtful messages, while the boys seem to be threatened more. Regarding age, all the age groups seem to share a significantly high ratio of having experienced flaming, especially youth born in 2007, 2004, 2003 and 2006 (12, 15, 16 and 13-year-olds).

5.2.2 Harassment

Harassment is the act of sending repeatedly and ongoingly insulting messages to a person of target. Harassing messages are commonly sent via personal communication devices such as texts, instant messages and emails. Harassment, like flaming, can also happen in public interaction settings, however is longer-lived and contains multiple repetitive offensive messages, with the intention to make the victims constantly receive attack whenever they turn on their devices or go online (Willard, 2007).

Findings of this study show that harassment is also a common cyberbullying technique performed by Finnish youth. Depends on the frequency and the settings, being sent nasty or hurtful messages and being threatened on the Internet can both belong to the category of harassment, next to flaming.

Although the numbers of Finnish boy and the numbers of Finnish girls who have experienced online harassment are relatively equal, the girls still seem to suffer from it slightly more.

5.2.3 Exclusion

Exclusion depicts the act of intentionally excluding a target from an online group, making the target an outcast. Exclusion therefore can have intense emotional impact and may take place in online environments such as gaming groups, group chats and any online communication platform (Willard, 2007; Kowalski et al., 2012).

It is important to note that this form is among the most common cyberbullying techniques used by Finnish youths with nearly half of the students stated that from which they have suffered from: 'I was left out or excluded from a group or activity on the Internet'. The number of Finnish boys and the number of Finnish girls who have received exclusion are relatively equal, although it is interesting to note that the boys have experienced exclusion slightly more.

5.2.4 Denigration

Denigration can be defined as spreading negative, harmful or untrue rumours and speeches about a target (Willard, 2007). These offensive messages can be posted on the internet or spread to others with the intention to intrude relationships or destroy reputation of the target. In this case, the target is not the one who directly receives the insulting materials, but the other bystanders. However, the cyberbully may also send denigrating messages about a target to an online group where the target is a participant. One of the common forms of denigration is the act of uploading on public group or spreading digital pictures that have been photoshopped to display a false, usually embarrassing, image of the target (Willard, 2007).

According to this study's findings, a number of Finnish youths stated that they had experienced 'Nasty or hurtful messages were passed around or posted where others could see' and 'Somebody created a page or image about me that was hostile or hurtful'. Between these two phenomena, the act of posting and spreading nasty or hurtful messages are more common among Finnish youths than the act of creating hostile or hurtful materials about someone.

With Finnish youths, the use of denigration is less popular compared to Willard's assumption (2007) that denigration is the technique of cyberbullying most frequently adopted among students. However, the age groups 2002, 2007 and 2004 (17, 12 and 15-year-olds) still have experienced from denigration in considerably noteworthy percentage. It is also good to note that the Finnish boys seem to suffer from denigration more than their female counterparts do.

5.2.5 Outing and Trickery

Willard (2007) demonstrates outing as publicly uploading, sharing or forwarding private chats or images, especially ones that include sensitive, usually embarrassing personal information. Trickery can be seen as a part of outing. A cyberbullying victim can be tricked into trusting that a conversation or sharing of personal information is private, when the cyberbullying perpertrator commonly tricks the victim to disclose some embarrasing personal stories that will then be spread to others or utilised as a threat against the victim (Willard, 2007).

Several Finnish youths in this study claimed that somebody used their personal information in a way they did not like. This action belongs to the category of outing and trickery. A slightly higher number of Finnish youths stated that they had been forced to do something they did not want to do, this also falls on the category of outing and trickery and seemingly to be even in a more serious level. The number of Finnish boys and the number of Finnish girls in this study who have suffered from outing and trickery are relatively equal. Regarding age, the age groups of 2003, 2004 and 2008 (11, 15 and 16-year-olds) report to have suffered the most from outing and trickery.

5.2.6 Cyberstalking

Cyberstalking is a repetitive act of sending nasty and disturbing messages which contain harmful threats that can be extremely offensive and intimidating, or involve blackmailing and extortion (Willard, 2007). Cyberstalkers may also attempt to denigrate their victims and ruin their social or professional reputations as well as relationships (Willard, 2007; Kowalski et al., 2012).

A number of Finnish youths in this study claimed that 'Someone found out where I was because they tracked my phone or device'. This belongs to the category of cyberstalking.

Willard (2007) also notes that there is a blurry line between harassment and cyberstalking, so the act of threatening someone online ('I was threatened on the internet') can also be a technique of cyberstalking, next to flaming and harassment, depends on the situation.

This study's findings show that the number of Finnish girls who have faced cyberstalking activities is slightly more than the number of Finnish boys who have. The age group that have experienced cyberstalking the most is 2004 (15-year-olds). However, it is important to acknowledge the implication shown from the findings that cyberstalking is one of the least common cyberbullying techniques executed by Finnish youths.

5.2.7 Impersonation

Impersonation occurs when a cyberbully attains access to impersonate the target online and upload negative information that brings shame to the target or disrupt the target's social relationships. This can take place on the target's own social page, website, blog or any other form of online platform. Usually, the sharing of passwords, which is common among female youths, is the key for the cyberbully to access to the target's online account and impersonate (Willard, 2007).

Impersonation can be seen as the least common cyberbullying techniques practised by Finnish youths as only a small percentage of them stated that 'Somebody used my password to access my information or to pretend to be me'.

Regarding cyberbullying platforms, the Finnish girls tend to receive cyberbullying more by messages sent to their phones, by mobile phone calls, on media-sharing platforms such as YouTube, and especially on social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter. The Finnish boys tend to receive cyberbullying more by instant messaging, in online games and via email.

According to Kowalski et al. (2012), negative comments or messages and creation of online communities and groups that spread rumours and gossip are two common forms of cyberbullying that takes place on social networking sites. With instant messaging, the cyberbullying techniques that commonly occur are harassment, flaming and impersonation. In online games, flaming and exclusion usually happen; and mostly with emails, harassment is common.

If Kowalski et al.'s theory (2012) on cyberbullying platforms is applied here, these findings may imply that the Finnish girls are more likely to be cyberbullied with the techniques of denigration and harassment; while the Finnish boys are more likely to be cyberbullied with the techniques of flaming, harassment, exclusion and impersonation. This argument is slightly different from the one above with reference to Willard (2007). However, it is important to note that in the findings, the numbers of Finnish boys who claimed that they had been cyberbullied 'By instant messaging', 'In an online game' and 'Via email' are quite small, which may imply that these boys may have not suffered from as many techniques.

5.3 Cyberbullying in relation to hate speech

Hate speech can be defined as negative speech or expression that are used with the purpose to insult and denigrate someone or a group of people often based on the foundation of (assumed) participation in a social group detected by characteristics such as race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, gender, age, disabilities and more (Keen and Georgescu, 2016; Curtis, 2019).

In the EU Kids Online 2019 questions selected for this section, the general online hate speech activities are mentioned as 'hateful or degrading messages or comments online, against someone or a group of people (This could for example be against Muslims, migrants, Jews, etc.)'.

The online hate speech platforms in the questions are: 'On a social networking site', 'On a media-sharing platform', 'By instant messaging', 'In an online game', 'In an online community that hates specific people', 'By emails' and 'By voice messages'.

The possible causes for the occurrence of online hate speech in the questions include: nationality, origin, the spoken language, skin colour, physical appearance and religion.

5.3.1 Youth experiences of online hate speech based on gender

The numbers of Finnish youths who have received and practised online hate speech are much lower than the numbers of Finnish youths who have received and practised cyberbullying.

In the case of Finnish youths, the girls report more often being targets of online hate speech than the boy, although the statistical difference here is clearly not much. However, drawing on frequency of youth reception of online hate speech, it seems like among the boys may suffer from it somewhat more frequently and intensely.

It is especially important to note from the findings that, regarding frequency, the Finnish girls who have practised online hate speech all have done it only on very rare occasion, not any more frequently. This aspect is slightly different with the Finnish boys, in which more than half of them have practised online hate speech a few times, but several have done it more frequently, some have even sent online hate speech to others daily or almost daily.

From the arguments above, it can be seen that in this study, youth experiences of online hate speech seem to also reflect Görzig's theory on cyberbullying (2011) that boys can be more often seen as cyberbully perpetrators, and the girls can be more often seen as cyberbully victims, however with a new insight that the male youths may not only practise and receive online hate speech more but also practise and receive it more intensely. This may show the potential parallel relation between cyberbullying and online hate speech.

5.3.2 Youth experiences of online hate speech based on age

In the case of Finnish youths in this study, the older groups including 14 to 16-year-old youths tend to be the ones who receive more cyberbullying. The 14 to 16-year-old youths not only receive more online hate speech but also receive cyberbullying more frequently and intensely. Youths from younger age groups (11 to 13-year-olds) who have been cyberbullying victims can be seen to have not suffered from it too intensely.

Regarding youths who have actively practised online hate speech, 14 and 15-year-old youths are the ones who have practised cyberbullying the most in the past 12 months, however they mostly have only done it a few times.

From the arguments above, it can be seen that in this study, youth experiences of online hate speech seem to also reflect Görzig's theory on cyberbullying (2011) that older youths are likely to be more active in cyberbullying activities, meaning they play the role of cyberbullying perpetrators more often

compared with younger youths. Like the youth experiences of cyberbullying discussed above, the findings of online hate speech also slightly differs from Görzig's demonstration (2011) that youths who are older tend to receive less cyberbullying. This may show the potential parallel relation between cyberbullying and online hate speech.

5.3.3 Online hate speech platforms

The findings in this study support Keen and Georgescu' s demonstration (2016) that online hate is expressed through more than just texts, but also through various ways including social media platforms and online game networks. In the case of Finnish youths, online hate speech mostly happens on social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter, media-sharing platforms such as YouTube and Instagram, online games, and instant messaging. Although occurring with lower frequencies, hate speech also exists in online communities that hate specific people and is spread by voice messages, SMS and emails.

An interesting point to note is that regarding practice of online hate speech, the girls remarkably surpass the boys on the platforms of instant messaging and on social networking sites; while the boys significantly surpass the girls on the platform of online games. Regarding reception of online hate speech, the girls also surpass the boys on the platforms of social networking sites, media-sharing platforms and instant messaging; while, again, the boys surpass the girls on the online gaming platform. This may imply that the girls seem to practise online hate speech more on communication platforms, while the boys seem to practise online hate speech more on gaming platforms. This argument can be seen as derived from Willard's viewpoint (2007) that girls are more active with online communication activities and boys are more active with online gaming activities.

5.3.4 Causes of online hate speech

The categories of nationality, origin, the spoken language, skin colour, physical appearance and religion which were given in the EU Kids Online 2019 questions can all be seen as belong to the causes of online hate speech (Council of Europe, 1997; European Union Law, 2008; Keen and Georgescu, 2016; Curtis, 2019).

It is important to note that while the girls only practise online hate speech with the focus on the language spoken by their targets and their physical appearances, the boys seem to both practise and receive online hate speech because of all the given causes in relatively equal percentages. This may imply that for the Finnish boys, there are a wider range of possible reasons to execute online hate speech compared to their female counterparts who only do this because of a few specific reasons.

6 CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to explore youth experiences of cyberbullying based on influencing socio-demographic factors such as age and gender, using the case study of Finnish EU Kids Online 2019. The study focused on identifying cyberbullying techniques that have been practised and received among Finnish youths from 9 to 17 years old. The study also attempted to investigate further into the link between cyberbullying and online hate speech.

There is a number of existing researches on the topic of cyberbullying in European countries and also in Finland, however an aspect that has not been investigated in depth by the majority of existing literature is the cyberbullying techniques practised by youths as well as socio-demographic factors such as age and gender that may have effect on it. My research therefore aimed to explore this insight further with specific data from the EU Kids Online 2019 questionnaires.

Online hate speech is a notion that has an intimate connection with cyberbullying and is also a popular topic in the recent years. However, apart from existing researches that investigate online hate speech as a concept itself or issues surrounding it, not many scholars have studied deeper into the link between online hate speech and cyberbullying. My study's next aim, hence, was to explore this matter in more depth.

My data analysis highlights the findings that in the case of Finland, girls report more frequently being cyberbullying victims and less frequently to cyberbully than boys; however, in terms of intensity, boys may suffer from cyberbullying more intensely; older youths report more frequently being cyberbullying victims and also more frequently being cyberbullying perpetrators.

My study also argues that Finnish youths have been practising the cyberbullying techniques of flaming, harassment, exclusion, denigration, outing and trickery, cyberstalking, impersonation. Amongst these techniques, flaming, harassment, exclusion and denigration are the common techniques performed by Finnish youths, while outing and trickery, cyberstalking and impersonation are less common.

Flaming, harassment, denigration together with outing and trickery seem to be relatively equally experienced by both Finnish boys and girls in the study; while the boys seem to experience more of exclusion, and the girls seem to experience more of cyberstalking.

Drawing on online hate speech, this issue happens among Finnish youths mostly on social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter, media-sharing platforms such as YouTube and Instagram, online games, and instant messaging. Although occurring with lower frequencies, hate speech also exists in online communities that hate specific people or is spread by voice messages, SMS and emails. In this study, the Finnish boys seem to practise online hate speech more due to the fact that they commonly found more reasons to.

Although not so significant, my study seems to prove that at least in the case of Finnish EU Kids Online 2019, online hate speech and cyberbullying potentially share a parallel relationship.

There are multiple intertwining connections between cyberbullying and hate speech and it is clearly difficult to distinguish between these two phenomena. However, this study seems to show that clarification of cyberbullying techniques and reasons for the online hate speech perpetration can partly help distinguish between these two concepts. This study therefore may suggest that cyberbullying and online hate speech should be included in the national curriculum for in-school youths in order to improve their perception of these two important matters.

With additional time and resources, it would be beneficial to carry out this study also in qualitative research methods in order to investigate deeper into

youth experiences of cyberbullying and hate speech, for instance, personal experiences and stories will provide much more in-depth insights surrounding this topic; or more detailed hypotheses can be studied such as cyberbullying among peers.

7 EVALUATION

Some limitations with using data from EU Kids Online 2019 questionnaire that may have affected this study: the details are a little too general and not detailed enough to investigate certain desired aspects of cyberbullying such as clear identification of specific cyberbullying techniques; whether these students have been bullied by peers or strangers online and vice versa; whether students who are practising cyberbullying have also been cyberbullied and vice versa.

Except for comparison between age and gender, the questionnaire is also not fully capable of providing information for consideration of psychological states and socio-demographic background (except for age and gender) which can affect Finnish youths' experiences of cyberbullying. The data is therefore unfortunately not sufficient enough to prove Görzig's viewpoint (2011) on parallel correlation between bullying and having been bullied online.

Regarding methodologies, sampling is limited by class differences. In specific, all students who received the survey did not answer it or not all the questions. Moreover, the survey method can cause bias to the elder age groups (upper comprehensive school students).

The Finnish youths who took part in the study may have also been unclear about the differences between cyberbullying and online hate speech, which can mean the results are not entirely correct.

8 LITERATURE

Assimakopoulos, S., Baider, F. H. and Millar, S. (2017) *Online hate speech in the European Union: A discourse-analytic perspective.* Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Balakrishnan, V. (2015) "Cyberbullying among young adults in Malaysia: The roles of gender, age and Internet frequency". In: *Computers in Human Behavior 46 (2015) 149–157*.

Bedrošová, M., Hlavová, R., Macháčková, H., Dědková, L., & Šmahel, D. (2018). *Czech children on the internet: Report from a survey at primary and secondary schools.* Project EU Kids Online IV – the Czech Republic. Brno: Masaryk University.

Beran, T. and Li, Q. (2005) "Cyber harassment: A study of a new method for an old behavior." In: *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 32, 265-277.

Bourdieu, P. (1978) 'La jeunesse n'est qu'un mot.' Interview with Anne-Marie Métailié, reprinted in: *Les jeunes et le premier emploi.* Paris: Association des Ages, pp. 520-30.

Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers, *Recommendation No. (97) 20 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on "Hate Speech"* (1997). Available at: https://rm.coe.int/1680505d5b

Curtis, W. M. (2019) "Hate Speech". In: *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*, 01/2019.

Davis, M. B. and Hughes, N. (2014) *Doing a successful research project: using qualitative or quantitative methods.* London: Red Globe Press.

Ebrand Suomi Oy & Oulun kaupungin sivistys- ja kulttuuripalvelut (2016) *SoMe ja nuoret 2016. Kyselytutkimus nuorten sosiaalisen median käytöstä.* Saatavana: http://www.ebrand.fi/somejanuoret2016/ [Viitattu 23.03.2017]

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1973) 'From generation to generation', reprinted in H. Silverstein (ed.) *The sociology of youth: Evolution and revolution.* New York: Macmillan.

EU Kids Online (2019) Available at: globalkidsonline.net

European Parliament (2016) *Directorate-general for internal policies: Cyberbullying among young people.* Brussels: Policy department C for Citizens' rights and constitutional affairs.

European Union Law (2008) Available from: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=LEGISSUM:l33178

Georgiev, E., Hajdinjak, M., Kanchev, P. and Apostolov, G. (2017) *Parental support for development of children's digital skills.* Bulgarian Safer Internet Centre. EU Kids Online.

Gitte, S. and Haddon, L. (2008) *Cross-cultural contexts of research: factors influencing the study of children and the internet in Europe.* EU Kids Online, Deliverable D2. EU Kids Online Network, London, UK. ISBN 9780853283560. Available at: http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/24380/

Gorard, S. (2001) *Quantitative methods in educational research: the role of numbers made easy.* London: Continuum.

Görzig, A. (2011) *Who bullies and who is bullied online? A study of 9-16 year old internet users in 25 European countries.* EU Kids Online network, London, UK.

Hajdinjak, M., Kanchev, P., Georgiev, E. and Apostolov, G. (2017) *Online experiences of children in Bulgaria: risks and safety.* Bulgarian Safer Internet Centre. EU Kids Online.

Hasebrink, U., Görzig, A., Haddon, L., Kalmus, V. and Livingstone, S. (2011) *Patterns of risk and safety online: in-depth analyses from the EU Kids Online survey of 9- to 16-year-olds and their parents in 25 European countries.* EU Kids Online network, London, UK. Available at: http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/39356/

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2010) "Bullying, cyberbullying, and suicide." In: *Archives of Suicide Research, 41, 206–221.*

Huhtala, N. (2013) Verkkokiusaaminen lasten ja nuorten nettimaailman haasteena. Teoksessa Kupiainen, R., Kotilainen, S., Nikunen, K. & Suoninen, A. (toim.) *Lapset netissä – Puheenvuoroja lasten ja nuorten netin käytöstä ja riskeistä.* Helsinki: Mediakasvatusseuran julkaisuja 1/2013, 44-53.

Jones, G. (2009) *Youth.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kanchev, P., Hajdinjak, M., Georgiev, E. and Apostolov, G. (2017) *Are Digital Natives Digitally Literate? Insights from a national representative survey.* Bulgarian Safer Internet Centre. EU Kids Online.

Keen, E. and Georgescu, M. (2016) *Bookmarks: a manual for combating hate speech online through human rights education (Revised Edition)* Ukraine: Council of Europe.

King, L. (2006) *No hiding from online bullies.* Retrieved September 16, 2006, from http://www.news-leader.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?Date=20060815.

Kotilainen, S. and Suoninen, A. (2013) Tyttöjen ja poikien nettikulttuurit mediakasvatuksen haasteena. Teoksessa Kupiainen, R., Kotilainen, S., Nikunen, K. & Suoninen, A. (toim.) *Lapset netissä – Puheenvuoroja lasten ja nuorten netin käytöstä ja riskeistä.* Helsinki: Mediakasvatusseura, 16-24.

Kowalski, R. M. and Fedina, C. (2011) "Cyberbullying in ADHD and Asperger Syndrome populations." In: *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 5, 1202-8.

Kowalski, R. M., Limber, S., Agatston, P. W. (2012) *Cyberbullying: Bullying in the Digital Age.* 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Görzig, A., and Ólafsson, K. (2011) *Risks and safety on the internet: The perspective of European children: Full Findings.* LSE, London: EU Kids Online. Available at www.eukidsonline.net

Livingstone, S., Mascheroni, G., Dreier, M., Chaudron, S. and Lagae, K. (2015) *How parents of young children manage digital devices at home: the role of income, education and parental style*. EU Kids Online: London, UK.

Mascheroni, G., & Cuman, A., (2014) *Net Children Go Mobile: Final Report (with country fact sheets).* Deliverables D6.4 and D5.2. Milano: Educatt. Available from: http://netchildrengomobile.eu/reports/

Mascheroni, G. and Ólafsson, K. (2018) *Access and use, risks and opportunities of the internet for Italian children.* EU Kids Online. Available from: http://www.lse.ac.uk/media-and-communications/assets/documents/research/eu-kids-online/reports/Executive-summary-Italy-june-2018.pdf

Meulen, M. (2011) "Bullying as strategic behavior: Relations with desired and acquired dominance in the peer group." In: *Journal of School Psychology Volume 49, Issue 3*, June 2011, Pages 339-359.

Musgrove, F. (1964) *Youth and the social order.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Nansel, Tonja R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, Ramani S., Ruan, W. June, Simons-Morton, B. and Scheidt, P. (2001) Bullying behaviors among US Youth. Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. In: *JAMA, The Journal of the American Medical Association 285 (16)*

Nardi, P. M. (2018) *Doing Survey Research: A Guide to Quantitative Methods.* New York: Routledge.

Nayak, A. and Kehily, M. J. (2013) *Gender, Youth and Culture: Young Masculinities and Femininities.* Palgrave Macmillan: Hampshire.

Ní Bhroin, N. and Rehder, M. M. (2018) *Digital Natives or Naïve Experts?*
Exploring how Norwegian children (aged 9-15) understand the Internet. EU Kids Online.

Nieminen, H. and Pörhölä, M. (2011) *Lasten ja nuorten verkkokiusaamisen tutkimushaasteita. Prologi - Puheviestinnän vuosikirja 2011.* Jyväskylä: Prologos ry.

Noppari, E. (2014) *Mobiilimuksut – Lasten ja nuorten mediaympäristön muutos, osa 3.* Tampere: Journalismin, viestinnän ja median tutkimuskeskus COMET.

Olthof, T., Goossens, F. A., Vermande, M. M., Aleva, E. A. & van der

Parsons, T. (1961) 'The school class as a social system'. In: A. H. Halsey, Floud, J. and Anderson, C. Amold (eds.) *Education, Economy and Society.* New York: Free Press Glencoe.

Patchin, J. W. and Hinduja, S. (2006) "Bullies Move Beyond the Schoolyard: A Preliminary Look at Cyberbullying." Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204006286288

Ponte, C. & Batista, S. (2019) *EU Kids Online Portugal: Uses, competences, risks and internet mediation reported by Portuguese children (9-17 years old). Executive Summary.* EU Kids Online & NOVA FCSH.

Raskauskas, Juliana,Stoltz, Ann D. (2007) "Involvement in traditional and electronic bullying among adolescents." In: *Developmental Psychology, Vol 43(3), May 2007, 564-575.*

Shi, R. and McLarty, J. W. (2009) 'Descriptive Statistics'. In: *Annals of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology*, 2009, Volume 103, Issue 4. Available from:

https://www-sciencedirect-com.libproxy.tuni.fi/science/article/pii/S1081120610608150

Suoninen, A. (2013) *Lasten mediabarometri 2012 – 10-12-vuotiaiden tyttöjen ja poikien mediankäyttö.* Helsinki: Nuorisotutkimusverkosto.

Teo, T. (ed.) (2013) *Handbook of Quantitative Methods for Educational Research.* Rotterdam: Sense Publisher.

The Oxford English Dictionary (1983) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tokunaga, R. S. (2010) "Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of research on cyberbullying victimization." In: *Computers in Human Behavior, 26,* 277–287. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2009.11.014.

UNICEF (2017) The State of the World's Children 2017: Children in a Digital World. New York: Division of Communication, UNICEF.

United Nations (2013) *Definition of Youth.* Available from: https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/documents/youth/fact-sheets/youth-definition.pdf

Uusitalo, N., Vehmas, S. & Kupiainen, R. (2011) *Naamatusten verkossa – Lasten ja nuorten mediaympäristön muutos, osa 2.* Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto, Journalismin tutkimusyksikkö.

VanderStoep, S. W. and Johnston, D. D. (2009) *Research methods for everyday life: blending qualitative and quantitative approaches.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint.

Vincent, J. (2015) *Mobile opportunities: exploring positive mobile opportunities for European children.* POLIS, The London School of Economics and Political Science: London, UK.

Willard, N. E. (2007) *Cyberbullying and cyberthreats: Responding to the challenge of online social aggression, threats, and distress.* Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Zaman, B. and Nouwen, M. (2016) Parental controls: advice for parents, researchers and industry. EU Kids Online: London, UK.

Selected questions from EU Kids Online 2019 questionnaires

Core questions and Optional questions

1. In the PAST YEAR, has anyone EVER treated you in such a hurtful or nasty way?

☐ No

☐ Yes

☐ I don't know

☐ Prefer not to say

2. In the PAST YEAR, how often did this happen in any of the following ways? PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ON EVERY LINE

	Never	A few times	At least every month	At least every week	Daily or almost daily	I don't know	Prefer not to say
a) In person face-to-face (a person who is together with you in the same place at the same time)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Via a mobile phone or internet, computer, tablet, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Some other way	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. When you were treated in this way online or via a mobile device, has it happened through any of the following?

☐ By mobile phone calls

☐ By messages sent to me on my phone

☐ On a social networking site (e.g., Facebook, Twitter)

☐ On a media sharing platform (e.g. YouTube.)

☐ In an online game

☐ Via e-mail

☐ Some other way

☐ I don't know

☐ Prefer not to say

**4. Have any of these things happened to you in the last year?
PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ON EVERY LINE**

	No	Yes	I don't know	Prefer not to say
a) Nasty or hurtful messages were sent to me	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Nasty or hurtful messages were passed around or posted where others could see	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) I was left out or excluded from a group or activity on the internet	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) I was threatened on the internet	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) I was forced to do something I did not want to do	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) Other nasty or hurtful things happened to me on the internet	☐	☐	☐	☐

5. In the PAST YEAR, have you EVER TREATED someone else in a hurtful or nasty way?

☐ No

☐ Yes

☐ I don't know

☐ Prefer not to say

6. In the PAST YEAR, how often have you TREATED someone else in any of the following ways? PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ON EVERY LINE

	Never	A few times	At least every month	At least every week	Daily or almost daily	I don't know	Prefer not to say
a) In person face-to-face (a person who is together with you in the same place at the same time)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Via a mobile phone or Internet, computer, tablet, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Some other way	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

7. In the PAST YEAR, has any of the following happened to you on the internet?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ON EVERY LINE

	No	Yes	I don't know	Prefer not to say
a) Somebody used my personal information in a way I didn't like	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) The device (e.g., phone, tablet, computer) I use got a virus or spyware	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) I lost money by being cheated on the internet	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Somebody used my password to access my information or to pretend to be me	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Somebody created a page or image about me that was hostile or hurtful	☐	☐	☐	☐

f) I spent too much money on in-app purchases or in online games

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

g) Someone found out where I was because they tracked my phone or device

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

Module questions: Cyberhate, discrimination and violent extremism

In this survey, cyberhate refers to online contents that target individuals or communities on identified or supposed characteristics based on religion, origin, colour of skin or culture. Discrimination is about people feeling they are treated unfairly because of their physical or personal characteristics. This could be for example because of their physical appearance, their religion, where they come from or how they speak.

1. In the PAST 12 MONTHS, have you EVER received hateful or degrading messages or comments online, against you or your community? (This could for example be against Muslims, Migrants, Jews, etc.)?

☐   No
☐   Yes
☐   I don't know
☐   Prefer not to say

2. In the PAST 12 MONTHS, how often did this happen?

☐   A few times
☐   At least every month
☐   At least every week
☐   Daily or almost daily
☐   I don't know
☐   Prefer not to say

3. Why do you think this happened? Was it because of…

☐   Your nationality
☐   The language you speak
☐   Your origin

- [ ] Your skin colour
- [ ] Your physical appearance
- [ ] Your religion
- [ ] Some other reason
- [ ] The language you speak
- [ ] I don't know
- [ ] Prefer not to say

4. When you were treated in this way online or via a mobile device, has it happened through any of the following ways? TICK ALL THAT APPLY

- [ ] On a social networking site (e.g., Facebook, Twitter)
- [ ] On a media-sharing platform (YouTube, Instagram, Flickr, Viber, Snapchat, etc.)
- [ ] By messaging (Facebook, MSN, WhatsApp, Skype etc.)
- [ ] In an online game
- [ ] An online community that hates specific people
- [ ] By emails
- [ ] By voice messages (mobile phone)
- [ ] By SMS
- [ ] Some other way
- [ ] I don't know
- [ ] Prefer not to say

5. In the PAST 12 MONTHS, have you EVER sent hateful or degrading messages or comments online, against someone or a group of people? (This could for example be Muslims, Migrants, Jews, etc.)?

- [ ] No
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] I don't know
- [ ] Prefer not to say

6. In the PAST 12 MONTHS, how often did this happen?

- [ ] A few times
- [ ] At least every month

- ☐ At least every week
- ☐ Daily or almost daily
- ☐ I don't know
- ☐ Prefer not to say

7. When you sent such messages online or via a mobile device, has it happened through any of the following ways? TICK ALL THAT APPLY

- ☐ On a social networking site (e.g., Facebook, Twitter)
- ☐ On a media-sharing platform (YouTube, Instagram, Flickr, Viber, Snapchat, etc.)
- ☐ By instant messaging (Facebook, MSN, WhatsApp, Skype etc.)
- ☐ In an online game
- ☐ An online community that hates specific people
- ☐ By emails
- ☐ By voice messages (mobile phone)
- ☐ By SMS
- ☐ Some other way
- ☐ I don't know
- ☐ Prefer not to say

8. Why did you do this? Was it because of…

- ☐ Their nationality
- ☐ The language they speak
- ☐ Their origin
- ☐ Their skin colour
- ☐ Their physical appearance
- ☐ Their religion
- ☐ Some other reason
- ☐ I don't know
- ☐ Prefer not to say

Technical Report: EU Kids Online 2019

1   Introduction

1.1   The research context

The surveys was conducted online survey in spring 2019. Due to limited resources this was chosen as suitable infrastructure was available and personnel for that available. Sampling was through Finnish comprehensive schools that covers almost 98 % of the people on the age range.

The modules chosen were Core and Broaden Core and modules Cyberhate, eHealth, and Digital Citizenship.

The modules were conducted as instructed and decisions on explaining the questions etc. were left to respective teachers as respondents answered the questions during the school days.

1.2 The study at a glance

In this section please give the following information:

- The study was run between January 13 to April 27th
- It was online survey
- Who was responsible for the study: Jussi Okkkonen, jussi.okkonen@tuni.fi
- What sampling method was used? Geographically weighted random sample among Finnish schools.
- How many subjects were interviewed and of what age? Ca 2400 received survey and 1321 at least partially answered. Age range was from 9 years to 17 years old.
- Were the non-users interviewed? No
- Were the parents interviewed? No
- Which survey modules were included? Core and Broaden Core and modules Cyberhate, eHealth, and Didgital Citizenship
- Whether some country specific questions were added? No

- Whether pilot testing was run and what was its purpose? Is the data from the pilots available? The functionality of the translation was tested among three class teachers and the functionality of the actual Survey Tool –tool was tested by 8 university students as well as by the research team.

- How was the data entry performed? In school with computer by the respondents

- Whether the data provided to the data management group was cleaned beforehand and who performed the cleaning (please provide contact details)? Juho Hella, juho.hella@tuni.fi

1.3 Entities involved

In this section please provide information regarding the entity/entities responsible for the study at its various stages:

- Survey adaptation (question choice, translation, cognitive testing, ethical approval etc.)

- The adaptation was conducted by translator and the research team. Finnish, Swedish (in Finnish Swedish) and English versions were put up. The ethical approval was not needed per se as the schools in Finland grant access for researchers by parental consent collected in the beginning of the school year.

- Sampling

The sampling was based on NUTS2 and NUTS3 classification. The basic unit was school class. Classes were chosen by the contacts possessed by University of Tampere. It covers most of the Finnish comprehensive school units. Finnish system of comprehensive schools covers 96 % of all pupils in target group of the survey. The excluded units are some private schools based on certain ideology such as religion, pedagogy, or other different curricula.

- Fieldwork: N/A

- Data entry and data cleaning: N/A

1.4 Main limitations

Please describe the most important limitations of your study. This may include:

- Limits on sampling and sample realization: Sampling is limited by the in-class differences. I.e. all who received the survey did not answer it or not all questions. Moreover, the survey method cause bias to older age groups (upper comprehensive school students).

2   Survey and Piloting

In this section please provide details regarding the survey adaptation and piloting.

2.1   Questionnaire adaptation

See table EUKOL matrix.xls

2.2   Translation

Please write about the process of survey translation and testing (if it was done). This can include information on:

- What language/languages was the survey translated to? Finnish and Finnish Swedish
- How many people were involved in the translation process? 4
- Was there any procedure used to ensure accuracy of the translation? What was it? Cross-checking
- What important decisions regarding wording (e.g. the form of I don't know answer, translation of difficult words, using different wording for younger and older children) were made? None

3   Methodology

In this section please provide details regarding the methodology used in your country.

3.1   The survey mode

Please describe in detail how the study was done. The information you might want to include is:

- The interview format (CAPI, PAPI, administrated individual interview, classroom survey, or else): Online survey in class
- The tools used (e.g. online survey tools): SurveyTool by Tampere university

3.2 Sampling procedure

Please describe how the sampling was organized. You might want to include information about:

- The size of the sample/samples: ca 2400 pupils were on the classes the request was sent
- The sampling frame/frames including information about the registers used and their reliability: up-to-date contact information of Finnish comprehensive schools possessed by Tampere university completed with online search if request to answer was unreceived.
- The sampling method/methods: random sample of the body of email addresses
- Information about the non-response rate and how it was approached: none response rate was approached by sampling new classes to fill the gaps in respective NUTS areas
- Information regarding the inclusion of the nonusers in the sample: N/A

4   *Data and weights*

In this section please provide details regarding the dataset preparation that was conducted before the data was handed over to the data management group including preparation of weights.

4.1   Data entry and editing

Please specify:

- How was the data entered? By class room computers
- What quality checks were put in place? N/A
- What data cleaning procedures were undertaken before the data was sent to the data management group? Some outliers were sorted out
- Were some unexpected problems with the dataset found at this stage (e.g. wrong coding, missed questions, bad routing, inappropriate multi-coding etc.)? No

4.2   Important distributions

In this section please provide comparisons of distributions of chosen important basic variables such as education, age, gender, geographical location etc. for:

- Unweighted sample
- Weighted sample (if you prepared some weights)

The comparisons should be done with regard to the representative data from reliable external source (e.g. national statistics bureau). Thus, provide also basic statistics concerning distributions from this source.

Please provide conditional distributions whenever possible (e.g. age by gender).

What would you say is your sex or gender?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	A boy	425	47,2	48,1	48,1
	A girl	459	51,0	51,9	100,0
	Total	884	98,2	100,0	
Missing	I don't know	7	,8		
	Prefer not to say	9	1,0		
	Total	16	1,8		
Total		900	100,0		

The age distribution (born 2002-2008) was even 20 % in upper comprehensive school, and 10 % in lower comprehensive school.

In what year were you born?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2002	6	,7	,7	,7
	2003	166	18,4	18,4	19,1
	2004	264	29,3	29,3	48,4

2005	200	22,2	22,2	70,7
2006	93	10,3	10,3	81,0
2007	57	6,3	6,3	87,3
2008	114	12,7	12,7	100,0
Total	900	100,0	100,0	