

Output 1

Synthesis report: An inventory of approaches to prevent cyberbullying in the online society

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Introduction..... | 2 |
| Research methods | 4 |
| Desk research..... | 4 |
| Online survey | 6 |
| In-depth interviews..... | 8 |
| Summary methods..... | 9 |
| Desktop research of current situation in the six TABASCO countries: Legislation, official measures, private initiatives, press coverage | 10 |
| Introduction legislation, official measures, private initiatives | 10 |
| What legislation is currently targeting (cyber)bullying? | 10 |
| What does anti-(cyber)bullying legislation look like in practice? | 12 |
| Conclusion legislation, official measures, and private initiatives | 12 |
| Press coverage | 13 |
| Seriousness of the problem: Social media use and prevalence rates cyberbullying | 13 |
| Social media use in all countries..... | 13 |
| Prevalence rates of cyberbullying in all countries | 14 |
| Personal experiences (based on the interviews) | 16 |
| Remedies applied by schools, recommendations from science, approaches supported by authorities, recognized best practices | 17 |
| Involvement of local stakeholders in awareness and prevention of bullying..... | 18 |
| Involvement of general stakeholders in awareness and prevention of bullying | 19 |
| Comparison of approaches..... | 19 |
| Missing approaches: URGENT NEEDS | 20 |
| References..... | 21 |

INTRODUCTION

Bullying is a serious social problem that has been defined as “an aggressive, intentional act carried out by a group or individual, repeatedly and over time against a victim who cannot easily defend him or herself” (Smith et al., 2008, p. 376). In other words, bullying consists of multiple components, which are suggested to be (1) aggression, (2) intentionality, (3) repetitive nature, and (4) clear power imbalance (Dooley, Pyżalski, & Cross, 2009).

Additionally, due to the widespread use of smartphones and social media, next to traditional bullying, another type of bullying has surfaced. Cyberbullying is characterised by the use of information and communication technologies as a means to bully, in which the perpetrator is more likely to be anonymous while inflicting harm on the victim (Ciucci, Baroncelli, & Nowicki, 2014; Ang, 2016; Sticca, Ruggieri, Alsaker, & Perren, 2013).

The goal of TABASCO’s project research is to investigate (cyber)bullying in all involved countries. Our aim is to investigate how adolescents use social media and how social media use impacts their lives, in terms of potential risks such as cyberbullying. Our goal is not to profile victims, perpetrators, and/or bystanders, as a wealth of research is already available on this topic. However, cyberbullying is still a prevalent problem, so it is important to further investigate how we can prevent, diminish, and/or stop cyberbullying. Therefore, with TABASCO’s project research we aim to understand how cyberbullying is prevented in the countries involved, for instance, by looking at existing legislation.

The research was conducted in all partner countries of the current project and consisted of a mixed-method approach. First, desk research was performed in each country. The main objective of this first part was to investigate the involvement of non-school stakeholders (such as the government, police, institutions, charities, foundations, press) in awareness and prevention of cyberbullying. To this aim, partners in each country filled out a template with as many information as possible they could find on official websites and

documents (such as from the government, police, or agencies), and from their own network of teachers and external experts. Next, a quantitative online survey was administered in each country among adolescents aged 10 to 19 years old. The main objective of the survey was to understand the role of social media in adolescents' lives and their involvement in potential risks, such as cyberbullying. Finally, in-depth semi-structured interviews were administered to further understand their experiences with social media and with cyberbullying. Students shared personal stories on how they use social media, but also on their (if applicable) involvement in cyberbullying as a victim, perpetrator, and/or bystander. Both the online survey and in-depth interviews focused on social dimensions (who is involved), as motivational dimensions (why are adolescents involved).

The results of TABASCO's project research will be briefly summarized in the present report. National reports are available as well. In what follows, we will first provide some more information on the used methods to collect the data. Next, meaningful comparisons of the collected data between countries will be made. For collecting data, ethical considerations were carefully made, and ethical approval was provided by the Research Ethics and Data Management Committee of the Tilburg School of Humanities and Digital Sciences of Tilburg University.

RESEARCH METHODS

Desk research

All involved countries performed desk research by looking for (online) resources from governments, police, non-profit organizations, and so on, on the prevention of cyberbullying in their country. Desk research was performed in May-June 2021 by means of a template, consisting of seven sections.

First, information was collected regarding legislation. This section was about national laws and official regulations at lower level in each country. With legislation we mean specific bullying prevention laws or policies that are imposed by the government or other authorities (e.g., a gathering prohibition imposed by the police).

In a second section, information was collected regarding official contact point or hotlines. This section is about official contact points in each country. Official contact points or hotlines are places where individuals can report (cyber)bullying incidents (online or offline). Here, we do not refer to the reporting systems that are integrated in social media platforms or internet providers. Official contact points or hotlines differ from helplines, who provide counselling, referral and active listening, but who do not officially register the reported incident.

In a third section, we collected information on helplines. A child helpline is a telecommunication and outreach service, including the web, on behalf of children and adolescents. A child helpline provides direct services, including, but not limited to: counselling, referral and active listening. Helplines provide help, they are not official contact points or hotlines. Any platform that fits this description and addresses bullying is of interest. This also includes helplines that do not solely address bullying problems.

In the fourth section, data about information centers were collected. Information centers are places where individuals can find information about (cyber)bullying definitions, types, and coping strategies. These centers also commonly refer users to helplines or official contact points.

In the fifth section, information on national campaigns on (cyber)bullying were collected. National campaigns are (a series of) coordinated activities such as posters, public speaking, events, or other relevant communications that are designed to achieve a social goal. National campaigns specifically designed with regards to (cyber)bullying may aim to: (1) inform individuals about its prevalence, (2) promote certain helplines or contact points, (3) raise awareness of the topic, (4) start a conversation about the topic, or (5) engage in preventive actions to stop bullying.

In the sixth section, information about online communities in each country was collected. An online community is a place where peers can help and support each other in times of stress or difficulties. These communities differ from helplines, where professionals (or educated volunteers) interact with youngsters. Online communities can exist on for example social media or an online forum. To find information on online communities you can for example search popular social media in your country, such as Facebook, with search terms as “against bullying”, “bullying at school” or “bullying support group”.

In the seventh and last section, information was collected regarding press coverage on (cyber)bullying in each country. The term press coverage refers to all textual news articles and reports through video or audio, published by offline journalistic media (for example TV news, newspapers, magazines, radio) or online journalistic media (for example on news websites, apps, or social media). Criterion was that something related to (cyber)bullying was described. Information on press coverage was found on the websites of different news sources, such as newspapers or broadcasting channels. Oftentimes news sources have tagged

their news articles. To illustrate, on the websites of Dutch news sources, we could simply find an overview of all bully-related news articles by searching the tag “pesten” (bullying in Dutch).

Online survey

To explore the social media usage of adolescents and to what extent they experience or exert behaviour that may be classified as cyberbullying, a questionnaire has been developed. The questionnaire included items on the social media usage (e.g., frequency, social media platforms), the prevalence of cyberbullying, and sociodemographic characteristics.

An online questionnaire was administered via the online survey software tool Qualtrics in each country, targeting adolescents between the age of 10 and 19 years old. In each country, an identical questionnaire was administered, but translated by each partner to the language that is mostly spoken within their country (i.e. Dutch, Bulgarian, Romanian, Italian, Polish, and Portuguese). The questionnaire was designed by the team of Tilburg University, which consists of two senior researchers with each more than 10 years’ experience with online data collection, including sensitive topics such as antisocial behaviors. The questions were phrased in a simple manner, understandable for the target population. As for the response options, most questions included multiple-choice options to decrease the cognitive load and increase the response rate, which were mutually exclusive and exhaustive. The data were collected between January 25 and July 13, 2022.

The link to the questionnaire was spread by each partner in local schools. On the welcome page of the survey, information was shared about the goal of the study, the funder, the length of the survey (+- 15 minutes to complete) and ethical considerations such as confidentiality and the right to stop any time during the administration of the survey. At the end of the welcome page, students were asked to provide active consent to participate in the

study. If students agreed, they could navigate to the first set of questions. If students did not provide active consent, they were sent to the end of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire consisted of different parts. In the first part, students were asked about their social media use, such as the type of platforms they use and the time they spend on social media. The second part of the questionnaire consisted of questions to measure their recent involvement as a victim, perpetrator and/or bystander in (general) cyberbullying and in prejudice-based cyberbullying. More precisely, students were asked to indicate their involvement for different forms of (general) cyberbullying and prejudice-based cyberbullying in the past three months. These measurements were all based on validated scales (general cyberbullying, 6 items: Del Rey et al., 2015; prejudice-based cyberbullying, 14 items: Tomé-Fernandez et al., 2019). A differentiation was made between general cyberbullying forms (an example of an item is: Calling mean or hurtful names online) and prejudice-based cyberbullying or cyberbullying based on ethnicity, gender, sexual preference or other characteristics (an example of an item is: Excluding or ignoring because of being of another race or belonging to another religion or ethnicity). As the questions about cyberbullying can be seen as objectionable questions, these constructs are deliberately chosen to be at the middle of the questionnaire, as this placement may induce less reactance due to the previously answered questions (Toepoel, 2015). Additionally, the introduction of these questions reassured respondents by reminding them their answers are anonymous. The last part of the questionnaire consisted of questions measuring socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents, including age, identified gender, and ancestry. At the end of the survey, respondents were thanked for their participation in the study and were asked to share their e-mail address if they were willing to do a follow-up interview after the survey. The e-mail addresses were only used to recruit participants for the interviews. Personal and/or

identifiable information was deleted after completion of the recruitment of interview participants.

In total across countries, 335 students showed interest in participating in the study by clicking on the survey link and starting the online survey. However not all students provided consent or completed the whole study and therefore the data of these students were deleted for further analyses. This resulted in an analytical dataset of in total, across countries, 258 participants: $N_{\text{Netherlands}} = 51$, $N_{\text{Bulgaria}} = 39$, $N_{\text{Romania}} = 38$, $N_{\text{Italy}} = 26$, $N_{\text{Poland}} = 55$, $N_{\text{Portugal}} = 49$. On average, students were 15.07 years old (Standard Deviation = 1.816; range 10 to 19). Somewhat less than half of the sample identified themselves as female (48.4%), 45.7% as male, 1.6% as non-binary, 0.8% as transgender, 0.8% as questioning, 1.2% as 'other', and 1.6% preferred not to say. Almost all students described their ancestry as 'European' (99.4%).

In-depth interviews

Finally, in-depth semi-structured face-to-face interviews were administered to further understand adolescents' experiences with social media and with cyberbullying. The interviews were conducted by each partner in their own country. The interview scheme (set of questions) was translated by each partner country. The interview started with an introduction in which TABASCO was presented, as well as the goal of the study. Active informed consent was asked of all students that participated in the interviews. During the introduction, ethical considerations were also explained, such as the right to stop the interview any time and more information about how the data will be stored and reported (confidential, anonymized, secured storage). After the introduction, general questions about social media use were asked, such as their motivations for using social media, their activities online, their positive experiences with social media and their negative experiences. In a next part, questions about

privacy were asked, such as how concerned are they about their privacy and whether they share personal information online. In the last part of the interview, questions were asked about cyberbullying. Cyberbullying was described as: “Sometimes someone uses the internet or mobile phones to send someone mean or hurtful messages using words, pictures, or videos. When this happens again and again, and it is difficult for the person to defend themselves or make it stop happening, it is called cyberbullying. Some examples are spreading mean messages to someone, spreading lies or rumours, or deliberately leaving someone out of an online group.” Interview participants described their involvement in cyberbullying as a witness (bystander), victim, and perpetrator. Furthermore, interview participants were asked to describe the cyberbullying education they received on school. They were also asked what they would do if they would like to learn more about cyberbullying and/or if they needed help or support on cyberbullying.

In total, valid information was collected from 29 adolescents. Participants were recruited via the online survey and/or via schools in which partners are active. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcriptions were made. Based on the transcripts, summaries of each interview and comparisons between each interview could be made.

Summary methods

By using a mixed-methods approach consisting of desk research, online survey, and face-to-face in-depth interviews, a wealth of data was collected to have an overview of the current situation percountry, the seriousness of the problem, remedies applied, involvement of general and local stakeholders in the awareness and prevention of bullying and missing approaches. In the next part of the current synthesis report, we will make meaningful comparisons between countries.

DESKTOP RESEARCH OF CURRENT SITUATION IN THE SIX TABASCO COUNTRIES: LEGISLATION, OFFICIAL MEASURES, PRIVATE INITIATIVES, PRESS COVERAGE

Introduction legislation, official measures, private initiatives

Legislation is a tool for governments to change undesirable behavior, due to its deterrence (i.e., evoking fear of punishment) but also due to the implicit moral values that laws represent (e.g., people should not harm others; Finamore, 2019). Therefore, an important question we want to answer is: Does the prevention of cyberbullying currently have a legal basis and does it differ per country? To answer this question, all project partners of TABASCO conducted desk research to map available information on legislation regarding cyberbullying in their country in 2021. All partners adopted a similar search strategy based on a predefined template. Information was retrieved from Google Search. This article summarizes how the legislation in the participating European countries matches and differs from each other, and highlights observed particularities. It should be noted that the field of prevention and intervention is constantly changing, so it is possible that this overview is not 100% complete at the time of publication.

What legislation is currently targeting (cyber)bullying?

By legislation, we mean specific (cyber)bullying prevention laws or policies imposed by the government or other authorities (e.g., the police). Of the six countries that were investigated (Bulgaria, Romania, Poland, Portugal, Italy, and the Netherlands), only two countries (Italy and Romania) have laws in place that specifically address traditional bullying or cyberbullying. In Italy, there is Law No. 71/2017, called "Provisions for the protection of minors to prevent and combat the phenomenon of cyberbullying - anti-cyberbullying law"

(Gazzetta Ufficiale, 2017). This law aims to combat cyberbullying using preventive actions aimed at protecting victims on the one hand while re-educating perpetrators on the other hand. The law ensures that service providers who manage social networks and online messaging platforms are held responsible. In addition, victims can file a lawsuit against perpetrators, who can then be prosecuted. The Italian Law No. 71/2017 states that, as a form of prevention, the Ministry of Education and Schools should organize workshops or conferences about (cyber)bullying prevention and should support schools to do the same. Similarly, in Romania, following the National Education Law (No. 1/2011), teachers are trained through information sessions and campaigns to identify (cyber)bullying and adequately counter incidents (Parliament of Romania, 2011). Thus, the installed laws in Italy and Romania mainly focus on organizing preventive initiatives, although they raise the question of what an educational program regulated by law looks like.

In Bulgaria, the Netherlands, Poland, and Portugal there is only *indirect* legislation that could apply to (cyber)bullying incidents. A general legislation that applies in all six countries is the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which was established by the United Nations in 1990 and has become “one of the most widely ratified human rights treaties in history” (UNICEF, n.d.). This convention describes all rights of children in the civil, political, economic, social, health, and cultural fields. States that have ratified this convention are required to comply with every article described by international law (e.g., protection from maltreatment [Article 19 and freedom from discrimination [Article 2; UNICEF, n.d.]). Discrimination was found to be a driving factor in a majority of bullying incidents (65%, The Dutch Ombudsman for children, 2021). Other, more general, legislation focuses on the responsibility of schools to provide a safe environment and obligations to act on misconduct (e.g., in Portugal and the Netherlands). Additionally, there are laws regarding bullying-related

behaviors such as defamation, threats, sexual harassment, and dissemination of harmful content.

What does anti-(cyber)bullying legislation look like in practice?

In all countries, the police mainly have a direct intervening role: when a (cyber)bullying incident has taken place and it is considered a criminal offense (e.g., defamation or threats), victims can report it and perpetrators can be prosecuted. In Portugal, the role of the police is both preventive and curative. The public security police (*Polícia de Segurança Pública*), the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the Ministry of Education jointly launched the "Safe School" program (*Programa Escola Segura*), which helps schools (1) to prevent (cyber)bullying incidents, and (2) to intervene when (cyber)bullying incidents have occurred (*Polícia de Segurança Pública*, n.d.). In Poland, the police merely play a preventive role: the Polish police regularly organize information sessions on preventing cyberbullying in schools.

Conclusion legislation, official measures, and private initiatives

In sum, specific laws against (cyber)bullying are rather uncommon in European countries. This does, however, not mean that (cyber)bullying issues fall completely outside of legislation, as extant laws can indirectly apply to a (cyber)bullying incident. Accordingly, in all the investigated European countries, the incident can officially be reported with the police if the (cyber)bullying behavior in question violates the law. Moreover, several countries devote extra attention to bullying prevention in certain education or safety legislation. The long-term effects of such legislation on reducing bullying behavior have not yet been extensively studied and therefore should be put on the future research agenda. Only then can we effectively evaluate the (un)necessity of developing and maintaining specific anti-(cyber)bullying legislation.

Press coverage

In the last section of the overview of current legislation, official measures, private initiatives and press coverage, we want to compare press coverage on cyberbullying across the six countries. Cyberbullying is a topic that appears in the press, although in none of the countries there is weekly press coverage. In most of the countries, the topic appears one or a few times per month and/or year in the press. In all countries new coverage include statistics (numbers) that represent prevalence rates of cyberbullying, for instance after publication of a national research. Other content of press coverage on cyberbullying contains information on legislation, (cyber)bullying initiatives and campaigns. In some countries personal stories are shared in the press, although these seem scarce. It can be concluded that there is some press coverage, although it is limited (few times per month/year) and only limited diverse in terms of content/provided information.

SERIOUSNESS OF THE PROBLEM: SOCIAL MEDIA USE AND PREVALENCE RATES CYBERBULLYING

Social media use in all countries

Adolescents spend a considerable amount of time per day online. In the online survey, we asked students how much time per day they spend on social media. On average, across countries, students indicated to spend between three and four hours a day on social media. In Bulgaria, adolescents seem to spend a bit more time on social media. On average, Bulgarian students indicated to spend between five and six hours a day on social media. A statistical test (ANOVA-analysis) was performed to see whether these differences between countries are statistically significant. The results of the analysis confirmed significant differences between the countries for time spend on social media per day ($F(5,249)=6.227, p < .001$). Across countries, students used a variety of social media platforms, including

WhatsApp, Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, Snapchat, TikTok, YouTube, Discord, Snapchat, Twitch, Telegram and Google+. The most popular platforms, across countries were Instagram (used by 71.3% of the students more than three times per day), WhatsApp (used by 59.7% of the students more than three times per day), and TikTok (used by 54.7.3% of the students more than three times per day). WhatsApp was the most popular platform in the Netherlands and Italy. TikTok was the most popular platform in Bulgaria. Instagram was the most popular platform in Romania and Portugal. Finally, Facebook was the most popular platform in Poland.

Prevalence rates of cyberbullying in all countries

Based on the answers of the students, for each country and for all countries together prevalence rates of general cyberbullying victimization, prejudice-based cyberbullying victimization, general cyberbullying perpetration, prejudice-based cyberbullying perpetration, general cyberbullying bystandership, and prejudice-based cyberbullying bystandership were calculated. The numbers are presented in Table 1. The percentages represent the portion of students that were involved at least once in the past three months in this specific role. For all countries together, the prevalence rates indicate that more than half of the sample (58.4 %) was a victim of general cyberbullying at least once in the past three months. About four out of ten students indicated to have been the victim of prejudice-based cyberbullying at least once in the past three months (39.3%). With regard to perpetration, four out of ten (39.7%) admitted having (general) cyberbullied someone at least once in the past three months and one in five (24.1%) admitted to have perpetrated prejudice-based cyberbullying at least once in the past three months. Finally, about half of the sample indicated to have been a witness of cyberbullying (general: 53.6%; prejudice-based: 46.6%) at least once in the past three months.

Numbers for each country are discussed separately in the national reports, but a comparison shows that there are some differences between countries. With regard to general cyberbullying victimization, the largest portion of victims was found in Italy and the smallest portion in Portugal. Similar results were found with regard to prejudice-based cyberbullying victimization: the largest portion of victims was found in Italy and the smallest portion in Portugal. For general cyberbullying perpetration, the largest portion of perpetrators was found in Italy, whereas the smallest in Poland. For prejudice-based cyberbullying perpetration, the largest portion of perpetrators was found in Italy, whereas the smallest in the Netherlands. Finally, for general cyberbullying bystandership, the largest portion was found in Romania, whereas the smallest in Bulgaria. Similar results were found for prejudice-based cyberbullying bystandership, the largest portion was found in Romania, whereas the smallest in Bulgaria. Statistical tests (ANOVA-analyses) were performed to see whether these differences between countries are statistically significant. The results of these analyses confirmed significant differences between the countries for all roles/behaviors (general cyberbullying victimization: $F(5,251)=5.345, p < .001$; prejudice-based cyberbullying: $F(5,251)=3.957, p < .01$; general cyberbullying perpetration: $F(5,251)=8.156, p < .001$; prejudice-based cyberbullying perpetration: $F(5,251)=3.274, p < .01$; general cyberbullying bystandership: $F(4,204)=4.797, p < .01$; prejudice-based cyberbullying bystandership: $F(4,203)=2.977, p < .05$).

Table 1. Percentage of students that were involved in the different roles and cyberbullying types (general versus prejudice-based) at least once in the past three months.

| Country | % CB | | % CB | | % CB | |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| | % CB | victimization | % CB | perpetrator | % CB | bystander |
| | victimization | prejudice- | perpetrator | prejudice- | bystander | prejudice- |
| | general | based | general | based | general | based |
| Netherlands | 43,1 | 25,5 | 39,2 | 9,8 | 64,7 | 43,1 |
| Bulgaria | 69,2 | 37,8 | 35,9 | 20,5 | 25,6 | 26,3 |
| Romania | 68,2 | 55,3 | 36,8 | 28,9 | 84,2 | 84,2 |
| Italy | 88,5 | 73,1 | 76,9 | 57,7 | 65,4 | 50,0 |
| Poland | 58,2 | 50,9 | 32,7 | 32,7 | 36,4 | 36,4 |
| Portugal | 41,7 | 10,4 | 33,3 | 10,4 | * | * |
| All countries* | 58,4 | 39,3 | 39,7 | 24,1 | 53,6 | 46,6 |

Note: CB stands for cyberbullying. *Because of practical constraints, bystander behavior was not measured in Portugal.

Personal experiences (based on the interviews)

During the interviews, interview participants talked about their experiences with social media and with cyberbullying. In all countries, participants talked about positive and negative experiences. Almost all participants in all countries described that they have more positive experiences online than negative. Examples of positive experiences are for instance, learning new skills, having a great time with friends and gaining self-confidence. Some of the interview participants witnessed cyberbullying and/or were victimized themselves. **It is clear**

from the interviews that youngsters believe that cyberbullying is a serious problem. A problem that is growing.

REMEDIES APPLIED BY SCHOOLS, RECOMMENDATIONS FROM SCIENCE, APPROACHES SUPPORTED BY AUTHORITIES, RECOGNIZED BEST PRACTICES

Our desk research allowed us to give, for each country, an overview of instances that provide remedies/support. More precisely, we focused on official contact points (hotlines), helplines and online communities.

Official contact points or hotlines are places where individuals can report (cyber)bullying incidents (online or offline), and these places are authorized or have means to do something about that reported incident. In all the countries, there is one or more official contact point to report (cyber)bullying incidents. However, in none of the countries, this is an official contact point to report (cyber)bullying only. Most of the official contact points have a broader focus, ranging from violence in school to mental health and well-being problems.

A child helpline is a telecommunication and outreach service, including the web, on behalf of children. A child helpline provides direct services, including, but not limited to: counselling, referral and active listening. In all countries, there is one or more child helpline available to talk about (cyber)bullying. Again, most of the helplines have a broader focus: children can talk with these helplines about all kind of difficulties they are facing.

An online community is a place where peers can help and support each other in times of stress or difficulties. So these communities differ from helplines, where professionals (or educated volunteers) interact with youngsters. Online communities can exist on for example social media or an online forum. In contrast to the official contact points and child helplines, online communities are very topic-specific and in each country online communities on

(cyber)bullying exist. Some of these communities have a large reach with more than 100,000 members while other communities are smaller (less than 50 members).

INVOLVEMENT OF LOCAL STAKEHOLDERS IN AWARENESS AND PREVENTION OF BULLYING

Interview participants in all countries provided us more insight on the involvement of local stakeholders in awareness and prevention of bullying. **First, the participants talked about receiving education on (cyber)bullying at school.** All interview participants in all countries have received some form of education on (cyber)bullying in school, but the frequency, length, and content of these trainings varied a lot. Some interview participants in some countries shared the feeling that the school does not do enough to prevent, diminish, and/or stop (cyber)bullying, however, again, there was a wide variation in actions performed by the schools between and within countries.

Second, interview participants talked about involvement of their personal environment, including friends, parents, and family. In general, participants in all countries felt that they could go to someone in their close environment to help them if they would be the victim of (cyber)bullying.

Finally, interview participants talked about the role of the police. **In all countries, the police play, according to the interview participants, a role in awareness raising, preventing and in intervening (cyber)bullying.**

INVOLVEMENT OF GENERAL STAKEHOLDERS IN AWARENESS AND PREVENTION OF BULLYING

In this part we will compare general stakeholders that are involved in awareness raising and prevention of bullying in the six countries. More precisely, we will focus on information centers and national campaigns.

Information centers are places where individuals can find information about (cyber)bullying definitions, types, and coping strategies. These centers also commonly refer users to helplines or official contact points. In all countries, there is at least one information center available that is focused on internet safety and/or on (cyber)bullying specifically.

National campaigns are (a series of) coordinated activities such as posters, public speaking, events, or other relevant communications that are designed to achieve a social goal. National campaigns specifically designed with regards to (cyber)bullying may aim to: (1) inform individuals about its prevalence, (2) promote certain helplines or contact points, (3) raise awareness of the topic, or (4) start a conversation about the topic. Earlier in this report, we described the presence of local activities (e.g., in the school). Comparing the results of the different countries regarding national campaigns, it is clear that large, national campaigns have run or are still running in all countries. Again, these campaigns are very diverse within/between countries in terms of goals, methods of communication (channels), and duration. Most of the campaigns aim to raise (cyber)bullying awareness. Social media is the most used method of communication. Campaigns have a broad range in terms of duration, ranging from one day until ongoing (non-stop).

COMPARISON OF APPROACHES

In all countries, (cyber)bullying is considered a serious issue by youngsters. Also other stakeholders, including local stakeholders, such as schools, and national stakeholders, such as

governments, consider (cyber)bullying as a serious issue, given their efforts to develop legislation, prevent, and/or intervene in (cyber)bullying. In all countries there is already a wide variety of official contact points, helplines, information centers, national campaigns, and online communities. (Cyber)bullying is also sporadically mentioned in the press. Despite the wealth of initiatives, campaigns, supports, ... and so on, (cyber)bullying remains a significant problem in Bulgaria, Romania, Italy, Portugal, Poland, and the Netherlands. Evidence for the effectiveness of the available tools is missing, which makes it impossible to rank its effectiveness.

MISSING APPROACHES: URGENT NEEDS

In this final part of the current synthesis report, we formulate developmental needs, based on the collected data in all countries. Future initiatives might want to consider involving as many potential stakeholders as possible: children, adolescents, teachers, parents, social media providers, public services (police), political parties, press, ... when developing and launching a campaign. **It seems that these stakeholders develop and launch their own initiatives, but there is little collaboration. We believe that collaboration between different stakeholders could benefit (cyber)bullying campaigns.** An important party that seems not directly involved in the development of anti-(cyber)bullying initiatives are **youngsters themselves**. Therefore, we believe that a collaboration between different stakeholders (e.g., a whole school approach), including children could lead to successful initiatives on (cyber)bullying. These initiatives can be aimed to increase awareness of how hurtful (cyber)bullying is or could try to prevent and/or intervene in (cyber)bullying. It is important that methods and instruments that are developed are **easy to reach and understand for youngsters, that these are perceived as attractive by young people, and, finally, that these are perceived as 'effective' by youngsters.**

REFERENCES

- Ang, R. P., (2016) Cyberbullying: Its Prevention and Intervention Strategies In Deb, S. (Ed)., *Child Safety, Welfare and Well-being: Issues and Challenges*.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-81-322-2425-9>
- Ciucci, E., Baroncelli, A., & Nowicki, S. (2014). Emotion Perception Accuracy and Bias in Face-to-Face Versus Cyberbullying. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 175(5), 382–400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221325.2014.934653>
- Del Rey, R., et al. (2015). Structural validation and cross-cultural robustness of the European Cyberbullying Intervention Project Questionnaire. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 50, 141–147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.03.065>
- Dooley, J. J., Pyzalski, J., & Cross, D. (2009). Cyberbullying Versus Face-to-Face Bullying. *Zeitschrift Für Psychologie / Journal of Psychology*, 217(4), 182–188.
<https://doi.org/10.1027/0044-3409.217.4.182>
- Finamore, E. (2019, March 21). Can the law change how we behave? All About Law.
Retrieved from <https://www.allaboutlaw.co.uk/commercial-awareness/legal-spotlight/can-the-law-change-how-we-behave->
- Gazzetta Ufficiale. (2017). Disposizioni a tutela dei minori per la prevenzione ed il contrasto del fenomeno del cyberbullismo [Provisions for the protection of minors for the prevention and contrast of the phenomenon of cyberbullying] (Nr. 127). *Gazzetta Ufficiale - Serie Generale*. Retrieved from
<https://www.gazzettaufficiale.it/eli/gu/2017/06/03/127/sg/pdf>
- Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. (n.d.). Veiligheid op school [Safety at school].
Veilig leren en werken in het onderwijs | Rijksoverheid.nl. Retrieved from
<https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/veilig-leren-en-werken-in-het-onderwijs/veiligheid-op-school>

- Ministry of Justice and Security. (n.d.). Wat doet de Nationaal Rapporteur? [What does the National Reporter do?] Over ons | Nationaal Rapporteur. Retrieved from <https://www.nationaalrapporteur.nl/over-ons/aanpak-mensenhandel-en-seksueel-geweld-tegen-kinderen>
- NOS. (2020, February 14). Kamer wil Nationaal rapporteur internetcriminaliteit [House of Representatives wants National reporter cybercrime]. Retrieved from <https://nos.nl/artikel/2322946-kamer-wil-nationaal-rapporteur-internetcriminaliteit>
- Parliament of Romania (2011, January 5). Law no. 1/2011 on Education. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/library-document/law-no-12011-education_en
- RTL Boulevard. (2016, April 26). Petite Peter R. de Vries succes: 80.000 handtekeningen [Petition Peter R. De Vries success: 80,000 signatures]. Retrieved from <https://www.rtlboulevard.nl/entertainment/artikel/608766/petitie-peter-r-de-vries-succes-80000-handtekeningen>
- Smith, P. K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., & Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying: its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 49(4), 376–385. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01846.x>
- Sticca, F., Ruggieri, S., Alsaker, F., & Perren, S. (2013). Longitudinal Risk Factors for Cyberbullying in Adolescence. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 23(1), 52–67. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2136>
- Toepoel, V. (2015). *Doing surveys online*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tomé-Fernandez, M., Ortiz-Marcos, J.M., & Olmedo-Moreno, E.M. (2019). Educational environments with cultural and religious diversity: Psychometric analysis of the cyberbullying scale. *Religions*, 10(443). <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel10070443>

UNICEF. (n.d.). Convention on the Rights of the Child. Retrieved from

<https://www.unicef.org/child-rights-convention>

Veiligheid.nl. (n.d.a). Fysieke veiligheid op scholen [Physical safety at schools].

Kinderveiligheid | VeiligheidNL. Retrieved from

<https://www.veiligheid.nl/kinderveiligheid/professionals/scholen/fysieke-veiligheid>

Veiligheid.nl. (n.d.b). Sociale veiligheid op scholen [Social safety at schools].

Kinderveiligheid | VeiligheidNL. Retrieved from

<https://www.veiligheid.nl/kinderveiligheid/professionals/scholen/sociale-veiligheid>