

Title: Association between School-Bullying, Cyber-Bullying and Moral Foundations.

Practitioner: Calli Tzani-Pepelasi, Ntaniella- Roumpini Pylarinou & Anita Fumagalli.

Measure: Bully survey, Cyber-bullying and Online Aggression Survey & MFQ30.

Participants: EU.

Introduction

Research on school-bullying (SB) and cyber-bullying (CB) is broad (Puhl & King, 2013; Lapidot-Lefler & Barak 2012); although, more understanding is needed (Gerler, 2008), particularly regarding the consequences that affect both victims and perpetrators and the means for SB/CB intervention and prevention (Bennett, Holloway & Farrington, 2008).

The prevalence rates differ in each study (Cankaya & Tan, 2011); varying from 12.1% up to 43% for bullying behaviour (Scheithauer, Hayer & Petermann, 2006; Raskauskas, 2009; 2010), up to 46.6% for victimisation (Fleming & Jacobsen, 2009), and 31.5% up to 56.2% for CB (Messias, Kindrick & Castro, 2014; Modecki, Minchin, Harbaugh, Guerra & Runions, 2014).

There is support that in some aspects SB differs from CB (Huang & Chou, 2010) and in others the two forms are similar (Juvonen & Gross, 2008). Such aspects are risk factors related victimisation and perpetration (Khamis, 2014; 2015), which signify the importance to understand the differences/similarities for the development of successful anti-bullying programs (Tzani-Pepelasi, Ioannou, Synnott & Ashton, 2018).

An example is morality that, broadly is about right doing to ensure fair treatment for all, protecting the social institution of the family, community and one's country, duty, obedience, respect, and preserving tradition, God or religious norms (Graham, Nosek, Haidt, Iver, Koleva & Ditto, 2011). The Moral Foundation Theory (Graham, et al., 2011) distinguishes morality into five moral foundations (Haidt, 2013). Those being: fairness/cheating (Fairness) and care/harm (Care), which focus on the individual; loyalty/

betrayal (Loyalty) or In-group; authority/subversion (Authority), which comprise the binding moral foundations; and purity/degradation (Purity), which has been linked with religious attendance (Bulbulia, Osborne & Sibley, 2013).

Examining the association between morality and bullying, research has shown that moral disengagement is associated with SB perpetration (Sims-Schouten, 2015). It was advised (Harrison, 2015) that research on SB/CB and moral values must be further explored, especially the aspect of how morals affect children's perception of bullying, as the key to understanding bullying may exist there. Therefore, the current project aimed to examine any possible associations between SB, CB and the five moral foundations moral foundations have not been used previously in research regarding SB and CB.

Methodology

Participants ($N = 207$) were recruited through the social media and completed the questionnaire electronically. The project and questionnaire completion complied with the APA and BPS ethical guidelines.

For SB and CB participants were asked if they had been bullied in school/ cyber-bullied, if they had bullied someone else in school/ cyber-bullied anyone else, with responding options YES, SORT OF (teased/not severe or/repetitive), and NO.

SB was defined according to the Bully survey "Bullying happens when someone hurts or scares another person on purpose and the person being bullied has a hard time defending himself/herself. Usually, bullying happens over and over" (Swearer, Turner, Givens & Pollack, 2008).

CB was defined according to the Cyber-bullying and Online Aggression Survey "Cyber-bullying is when someone repeatedly makes fun of another person online or repeatedly picks on another person through email or text message or when someone posts something online about another person that they don't like" (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009).

The Moral Foundations Questionnaire consists of 32 questions, including two catch questions.

Results

Out of the 207 participants, 40 are males and 167 females. Participants' age ranged from 16 years old to 63 years old ($M = 23.6$, $SD = 9.5$). SB victims reached 63% of the sample, SB bullies reached 22%, 33% were CB victimised and 8% CB perpetrated.

Participants' onset of social media use ranged from one-year old (parents created and controlled the account) to 55 years of age ($M = 13.3$, $SD = 7.28$). SB/CB victimisation and perpetration were examined against all moral foundations with multinomial logistic regression.

The results of the multinomial logistic regression model were significant ($\chi^2(10) = 20.93$, $p = .022$) only for SB perpetration, suggesting that Harm, Fairness, In-group, Authority and Purity had a significant effect on the odds of observing at least one response category of SB perpetration relative to NO. Since the overall model was significant, each predictor was examined further (see Table 1).

Table 1. *Multinomial Logistic Regression.*

Variable	Response	B	SE	χ^2	p	OR
(Intercept)	SORT-OF	3.16	1.77	3.19	.074	
HARM	SORT-OF	-1.20	0.38	10.05	.002	0.30
FAIRNESS	SORT-OF	0.41	0.43	0.91	.341	1.50
IN-GROUP	SORT-OF	-0.37	0.40	0.85	.356	0.69
AUTHORITY	SORT-OF	-1.13	0.41	7.65	.006	0.32
PURITY	SORT-OF	0.51	0.34	2.15	.142	1.66
(Intercept)	YES	-1.63	1.62	1.01	.315	
HARM	YES	-0.02	0.37	0.00	.955	0.98
FAIRNESS	YES	-0.13	0.42	0.10	.746	0.87
IN-GROUP	YES	-0.01	0.35	0.00	.980	0.99
AUTHORITY	YES	0.12	0.36	0.10	.747	1.12
PURITY	YES	0.02	0.32	0.01	.942	1.02

Note. $\chi^2(10) = 20.93$, $p = .022$, McFadden $R^2 = 0.07$.

Discussion

Using multinomial logistic regression, this study assessed whether the five moral foundations, namely Harm, Fairness, Ingroup, Authority, and Purity predicted SB/CB victimisation and perpetration categories. Results were significant only for SB perpetration, indicating that Harm, Fairness, Ingroup, Authority, and Purity had a significant effect on the odds of observing cyber-perpetration. For Harm in response to category Sort of (sort of bullied someone else at school) results were significant, indicating that an increase in Harm scores would decrease the odds of observing the Sort of category in relation to No category (I have not school bullied anyone) by 70%. Likewise, the results for Authority in response to the category Sort of SB perpetration were significant, indicating that an increase in Authority scores would decrease the odds of observing the Sort of category in relation to the No category, by 68%. Results from this study support previous research (Sims-Schouten, 2015).

Concluding this project used the MFQ30 to explore possible associations and the predictive effect of the moral foundations in relation to SB and CB; the moral foundations of Harm and Authority have a predictive effect of SB perpetration and should be considered in prevention and intervention school policies, bullying awareness and anti-bullying education campaigns.

References

- Bennett, T., Holloway, K., & Farrington, D. (2008). The statistical association between drug misuse and crime: A meta-analysis. *Aggression and violent behavior, 13*(2), 107-118.
- Bulbulia, J., Osborne, D., & Sibley, C. G. (2013). Moral foundations predict religious orientations in new zealand: E80224. *PLoS One, 8*(12)
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0080224.
- Cankaya, I. H., & Tan, C. (2011). Effect of cyber bullying on the distrust levels of preservice teachers: Considering Internet addiction as a mediating variable. *Procedia Computer Science, 3*, 1353-1360. doi:10.1016/j.procs.2011.01.015.
- Gerler, E. (2008). bullying. *Journal of School Violence, 7*(2), 1-2.
doi:10.1300/J202v07n02_01.
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iver, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. (2011). Mapping the Moral Domain. *Personality and Social Psychology, 101*, (2)366-385.
Doi:10.1037/a0021847.
- Haidt, J. (2013). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion.* New York: Vintage Books.
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2009). *Bullying beyond the schoolyard: Preventing and responding to cyberbullying.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Huang, Y. Y., & Chou, C. (2010). An analysis of multiple factors of cyberbullying among junior high school students in Taiwan. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26*(6), 1581-1590.
- Juvonen, J., & Gross, E. F. (2008). Extending the school grounds?—Bullying experiences in cyberspace. *Journal of School Health, 78*(9), 496-505. doi:10.1111/j.1746-1561.2008.00335.x.

- Khamis, V. (2014;2015;). Bullying among school-age children in the greater beirut area: Risk and protective factors. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 39, 137-146.
doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2014.08.005.
- Lapidot-Lefler, N., & Barak, A. (2012). Effects of anonymity, invisibility, and lack of eye-contact on toxic online disinhibition. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(2), 434-443.
doi:10.1016/j.chb.2011.10.014.
- Messias, E., Kindrick, K., & Castro, J. (2014). School bullying, cyberbullying, or both: Correlates of teen suicidality in the 2011 CDC youth risk behavior survey. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 55(5), 1063-1068. doi:10.1016/j.comppsy.2014.02.005.
- Modecki, K. L., Minchin, J., Harbaugh, A. G., Guerra, N. G., & Runions, K. C. (2014). Bullying prevalence across contexts: A meta-analysis measuring cyber and traditional bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 55(5), 602-611.
doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.06.007.
- Perren, S., & Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, E. (2012). Cyberbullying and traditional bullying in adolescence: Differential roles of moral disengagement, moral emotions, and moral values. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 9(2), 195.
doi:10.1080/17405629.2011.643168.
- Puhl, R. M., & King, K. M. (2013). Weight discrimination and bullying. Best Practice and Research: *Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism*, 27(2), 117-127.
doi:10.1016/j.beem.2012.12.002.
- Raskauskas, J. (2009; 2010;). Text-bullying: Associations with traditional bullying and depression among new Zealand adolescents. *Journal of School Violence*, 9(1), 74-97.
doi:10.1080/15388220903185605.

Scheithauer, H., Hayer, T., & Petermann, F. (2006). Physical, verbal, and relational forms of bullying among German students: Age trends, gender differences, and correlates.

Aggressive Behavior, 32(3), 261-275. doi:10.1002/ab.20128.

Sims-Schouten, W. (2015). Bullying in early childhood and the construction of young children as premoral agents: Implications for practice. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 33(4), 234-245. doi:10.1080/02643944.2015.1094121.

Tzani-Pepelasi C., Ioannou M., Synnott J. and Ashton, S. A. (2018). Comparing Factors Related to School-bullying and Cyber-bullying. *Journal of Crime Psychology Review*. DOI: 10.1080/23744006.2018.1474029.