



Co-funded by the European Union



THE LONDON SCHOOL
OF ECONOMICS AND
POLITICAL SCIENCE



UNIVERSITY OF
WEST LONDON



The Relevance of Cross-national and Cross-regional Contexts to Youth' Cyber-bullying Involvement

Findings from *EU Kids Online*

Anke Görzig, Tijana Milosevic & Elisabeth Staksrud


A socio-ecological framework of bullying



Socio-ecological framework of bullying (Swearer & Espelage, 2011)


■ Bullying behaviour

Linked with factors on different levels of the environment




Source: Swearer, S. M., & Espelage, D. L. (2011). Expanding the social-ecological framework of bullying among youth: Lessons learned from the past and directions for the future. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in North American schools* (2nd ed., pp. 1–10). New York: Routledge.


Positioning within the EU Kids Online Model



INDIVIDUAL LEVEL



SOCIAL LEVEL




COUNTRY LEVEL

Cyber-bullying in Context



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

- **How can those cross-cultural differences in cyber-bullying be explained?**
- **What is the importance of regional relative to national level contexts?**
- **What are some of the methodological challenges?**



Identifying contextual factors: Social inequality



Social Dominance Theory (cf. Pratto, Sidanius, & Levin, 2006)

- Power imbalances originates from multiple levels (e.g., cultural policies and practices, individual relations)

→ Bullying interrelated with power differences within society at large?

Individuals' cyber-bullying victimisation

- Poorer psychological outcomes, quality of social relationships and/or social inequality
- Being disabled or from a discriminated against group
- Being from a family which had relatively low socio-economic status or used minority languages at home

(Aboujaoude et al., 2015; Cappadocia, Craig & Pepler, 2013; Görzig, 2011; Livingstone, Görzig & Ólafsson, 2011; Tippett & Wolke, 2014; Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritsis, Beech, & Collings, 2013)

Contextual factors linked with social inequality



- **Economic performance**
 - Inequality *between* contexts, i.e. relative wealth

- **Life expectancy**
 - Inequality *within* contexts
 - Represents psychological and social differences

- **Crime rates**
 - Linked with social inequality on neighbourhood to national levels

- **Population Density (urbanicity)**
 - Increased levels of factors mentioned above (i.e., community violence, poverty and life expectancy)

Aims




To investigate....

...the role of cultural contexts on the regional and national levels to explain the prevalence of cyberbullying victimisation.

- a. Whether smaller, regional level contexts might be more relevant than the country level
- b. Socio-structural contextual explanatory factors that are connected with social inequality (e.g., crime rates, economic performance, life expectancy, population density)
- c. Explanatory factors are similar to those for traditional bullying victimisation

METHOD

Individual level data: EU Kids Online II



- Random stratified sample: ~ 1000 9-16 year old internet users per country; total of 25142 internet-users, 25 countries
 - Fieldwork in spring/summer 2010; child + parent interviews at home, face to face
 - Survey covered access, use, activities, risks (sexual images, sexual messages, bullying, meeting strangers), parental mediation, coping, vulnerability
- Cyber- and face-to-face bullying victimisation


Contextual level data: European Social Survey (ESS)



ESS Participation

All rounds to date

■ 5 rounds ■ 4 rounds ■ 3 rounds ■ 2 rounds ■ 1 round



- Bi-annual
- 2002, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010...
- Number of countries vary by round
- effective sample size: 1500 per country
- Attitudes, socio-demographic, economic, health, education...

Contextual level Variables



■ Economic performance

- GDP per capita at current market prices in Euros (source: Eurostat)

■ Life expectancy

- Average number of years that a newborn is expected to live if current mortality rates apply (source: Global Health Observatory)

■ Crime rates

- “Have you or a member of your household been the victim of a burglary or assault in the last 5 years?”
- Aggregated across countries and regions

■ Population Density (urbanicity)


- Average number of inhabitants per km² (source: Eurostat)

Linking European Regions: NUTS....



Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics

ESS Round 5 (2010), NUTS 2



- Italy: 2012, Romania: 2008
- UK: population density, life expectancy (2012), NUTS1
- France: life expectancy (2012)
- Germany: NUTS1
- GDP: Greece, Finland, Romania (2009)

- Unavailable contextual data: Austria, Cyprus, Estonia, Ireland, Lithuania, Slovenia, Turkey
- 18 countries, 179 regions
- 15,813 participants (49.5% female; Age: M = 12.43 years, SD = 2.28)

FINDINGS

Hierarchical multilevel logistic Regressions: Cyber- and face-to-face bullying Victimisation



Hierarchical model in 3 Steps

1. No contextual predictors (controls: age, gender, SES)
2. Regional predictors (crime, GDP, life expectancy, population)
3. National predictors (crime, GDP, life expectancy, population)

Regional level predictors explain:

- No regional variation (0.1%)
- 1/3rd of the national variation (2.4% of 6.6%)

Cyber-victimisation

Model	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Regional level	3.8%	3.7%	3.6%
Country level	6.6%	4.2%	3.2%
$\chi^2_{(4)}$		11.15(4)*	5.64(4)

Face-to-face victimisation

Model	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Regional level			
Country level			
$\chi^2_{(4)}$			

Hierarchical multilevel logistic Regressions: Cyber- and face-to-face bullying Victimisation



Hierarchical model in 3 Steps

1. No contextual predictors (controls: age, gender, SES)
2. Regional predictors (crime, GDP, life expectancy, population)
3. National predictors (crime, GDP, life expectancy, population)

Regional level predictors explain:

- No regional variation (0.1%)
- 1/3rd of the national variation (2.4% of 6.6%)

Cyber-victimisation

Model	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Regional level	3.8%	3.7%	3.6%
Country level	6.6%	4.2%	3.2%
$\chi^2_{(4)}$		11.15(4)*	5.64(4)

Face-to-face victimisation

Model	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Regional level	3.6%	3.6%	3.5%
Country level	4.5%	3.0%	2.3%
$\chi^2_{(4)}$		9.73(4)*	5.77(4)


Regional level predictors explain:

- No regional variation (0%)
- 1/3rd of the national variation (1.5% of 4.5%)

Hierarchical multilevel logistic Regressions: Cyber- and face-to-face bullying Victimisation



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



CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions: Contextual factors



- **Economic performance (inequality *between* contexts)**
 - Higher GDP – more cyber victims
 - Competitive society?
 - Technology access & use?

- **Life expectancy (inequality *within* contexts)**
 - Higher life expectancy – less bullying (cyber- and face-to-face)

- **Crime rates**
 - More crime – more bullying (cyber- and face-to-face)

- **Population Density (urbanicity)**
 - Higher density – fewer cyber victims
 - Urban areas: diversity, less stigma?
 - Rural areas: if access, more use?

General Conclusions



Country and regional level contexts

→ Regional variance is lower than differences between countries

- Investigation of smaller, more communal regions or neighbourhoods
- Variation in size/population of regions between countries

▪ Regional predictors explain 1/3rd of cross-country differences

→ Social inequality between regions related to cross-national differences

- National policies might impact on regional influences


Social inequality


▪ Relation between contextual level social inequalities and bullying in general

- Mixed findings for GDP and population density

Contextual levels explain 10% of variation in cyberbullying

▪ Selected regional social inequality indicators explain one quarter (2.4%)







Co-funded by the European Union



THE LONDON SCHOOL
OF ECONOMICS AND
POLITICAL SCIENCE



UNIVERSITY OF
WEST LONDON



THANK YOU!

Anke Görzig, Tijana Milosevic & Elisabeth Staksrud