

# Analysis of Experts' and Trainers' Views on Cyberbullying

Thomas Jäger,<sup>1</sup> João Amado,<sup>2</sup> Armanda Matos<sup>2</sup> and Teresa Pessoa<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Zentrum für empirische pädagogische Forschung, University of Koblenz-Landau, Germany*

<sup>2</sup> *Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação, University of Coimbra, Portugal*

Partners from nine European countries developed a cyberbullying training manual for the benefit of trainers working with parents, school staff and young people.<sup>1</sup> The development of the training manual built on a two-level qualitative research process that combined elements of the Delphi method and online focus groups. The two studies outlined in this article aimed to assess trainers' and experts' views on the problem of cyberbullying while also gathering insight in relation to their preferences in terms of a training manual. This article outlines the main outcomes of a content analysis of experts' and trainers' views. According to experts and trainers, the sources of cyberbullying were specifically related to new technical developments and new patterns of usage, a lack of media literacy and media education, and the lack of appropriate laws, control and reporting mechanisms. Approaches for tackling cyberbullying suggested by experts and trainers included the provision of enhanced information on ICT and e-safety, adequate rules, monitoring mechanisms and sanctions. Furthermore a range of approaches targeting children and young people, parents and other adults, schools as well as approaches run by authorities and IT providers were suggested. In terms of the elements and style of a training manual, experts and trainers emphasised that it should be practically oriented, and that elements like narratives, case examples or video clips would be vital for the implementation of training.

■ **KEYWORDS:** cyberbullying, training manual, qualitative, online focus group

169 ◀

In recent years the internet and communication technologies (ICT) have had an increasingly important impact on our everyday life. Today, approximately 52% of the European population is online. For young people in Europe aged 6 to 17 years, internet use is even higher, with an average rate of 75% (Livingstone & Haddon, 2009). Also, cell phone use has increased. In 1996, just seven mobile phone lines were available per 100 inhabitants, 10 years later this figure had risen to 106 lines per 100 inhabitants (EuroStat, 2010).

*Address for Correspondence:* Thomas Jäger, Zentrum für empirische pädagogische Forschung, University of Koblenz-Landau; Bürgerstrasse 23, 76259 Landau, Germany. E-mail: jaegerth@zefp.uni-landau.de

Despite the numerous benefits of ICT, rapid and constant development has created a number of rather negative side effects. One of these is the problem of cyberbullying. According to one widely used definition, cyberbullying is an ‘aggressive, intentional act carried out by a group or individual, using electronic forms of contact, repeatedly and over time against a victim who cannot easily defend him or herself’ (Smith et al., 2008, p. 376).

While some researchers suggest that cyberbullying is simply an electronic form of traditional bullying (Kowalski, Limber, & Agaston, 2008), there are indications that it is a rather new, distinct phenomenon. However, one factor that makes cyberbullying ‘hard to grasp’ is its complexity. For instance, following Willard’s widely used taxonomy (2005, 2006) cyberbullying can take different forms, including flaming, harassment, denigration, impersonation, outing and trickery, exclusion, and cyberstalking. Another popular classification relates to the media channels used by perpetrators — for example, with phone-call bullying, text-message bullying, picture/videoclip-bullying when using mobile phones, email bullying, bullying through instant messaging, bullying via websites, chatroom bullying, and bullying via social networking sites and virtual worlds (Smith, *in press*; Smith, Mahdavi, Carvalho, & Tippett, 2006).

In spite of a number of overlaps with traditional bullying, there are aspects that are unique to cyberbullying. For instance, perpetrators often can conceal their identity and stay anonymous. Also, cyberbullying transcends the boundaries of time and space; it can occur 24 hours a day at any time of the day or night, and it is not restricted to places such as a school, but can occur anywhere (Hinduja & Patchin, 2008; Smith et al., 2008; Willard, 2005).

In recent years, a number of studies have examined the prevalence of cyberbullying in different countries around the globe. Interestingly, the studies suggest that the frequency of cyberbullying varies considerably, both from country to country and from study to study within the same country. This does not necessarily mean that the prevalence of cyberbullying indeed varies considerably from country to country but could also be an effect of differing cyberbullying definitions, measurement methods and analytical strategies, samples and other factors (Gradinger, Strohmeier, & Spiel, 2010). One of the few studies that provides a transnational overview of cyberbullying in Europe showed that 29% of the young people considered themselves victims of cyberbullying (Microsoft, 2009).

Although the number of studies and research programs on cyberbullying has increased significantly in recent years, cyberbullying is still a relatively young field of research. To a wide extent, cyberbullying developed from previous research programs on traditional bullying, especially on bullying in schools (Smith, *in press*). In Europe, due to the efforts of the Safer Internet Programme co-funded by the European Union, a big proportion of the rather practical-oriented work such as the creation of resources and training modules has been done by experts on ICT and internet safety. For this reason, most of the resources available provide well-founded information on ICT; however, they often do not consider the vast knowledge from academic research on traditional school bullying.

The CyberTraining project aims to bridge this gap by providing a training manual that builds on well-grounded research outcomes on cyberbullying as well on the expertise of project partners that have been key actors in several European

research programmes on traditional school bullying. The two studies we present in this article were part of the CyberTraining project's first research-based phase that aimed to explore and analyse experts' and trainers' views and experiences in relation to cyberbullying.

## ■ The CyberTraining Project

The two qualitative studies presented in this article were part of the CyberTraining project.<sup>2</sup> The project was co-funded by the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Commission and is a cooperative project of school bullying researchers from Germany, Ireland, Spain, Portugal and the United Kingdom and experts on ICT and internet culture from Switzerland, Norway and Bulgaria. It aims to develop a training manual on cyberbullying that provides trainers with clear guidance, support and resources. The training manual primarily addresses trainers working with schools, parents and young people affected by/or dealing with cyberbullying on various levels and aims to be both practical-oriented and well-grounded in the latest research findings on cyberbullying. The research-based information, the activities and resources provided in the training manual's modules aim to convey background information and skills that help parents, school staff and young people in understanding the nature of cyberbullying, recognising cyberbullying, coping with incidents and supporting young people who report having been victimised, as well as learning more about preventive measures.

The training manual addresses a rather broad scope of trainers. As mentioned above, cyberbullying blurs the boundaries between the formerly separated fields, 'traditional school bullying' and 'ICT and internet safety'. Moreover, in different European countries there are differing understandings, concepts and traditions in terms of the professional profile of trainers. In order to do justice to the broad scope of trainers dealing with cyberbullying in different European countries, the CyberTraining project chose a rather pragmatic approach saying that the training manual addresses professionals providing training for parents, school staff and young people in the field of cyberbullying. In order to do justice to the needs to rather inexperienced trainers, the manual also introduces basic training principles and strategies.

By autumn 2010 the training manual will be made available in form of an eBook in English, Spanish, Portuguese, German and Bulgarian. The creation of the training manual builds on an initial research-oriented phase. In order to ensure that the training manual meets the needs of trainers, the project emphasises the value of involving its target group — trainers working with parents, school staff and young people as well as experts — in the process of developing the manual, by means of assessing their training needs, interests, suggestions and preferences.

## ■ Method

The method applied for the initial research-oriented phase of the CyberTraining project combines elements of the Delphi technique (Hsu & Sandford, 2007;

Linston & Turroff, 1975) alphabetic by first author always and online focus groups (Kitzinger, 1994; Rezabek, 2000) in a two-level qualitative questioning process. After an initial Delphi-style online questioning of trainers and experts, selected outcomes of a content analysis of trainers' and experts' answers were deepened in two online focus groups.

## Participants

### Experts' Questioning and Online Focus Group

A selection of experts were invited for the initial online questioning based on an internal classification system that aimed to reflect different professional backgrounds and thus also different perspectives on the cyberbullying problem. Apart from researchers, the classification system included representatives of web sites on school bullying and cyberbullying, teachers, representatives of companies dealing with new technologies, representatives of projects, initiatives dealing with internet safety, youth protection coordinators, lawyers and legal experts, counsellors, mediators and therapists, policy-makers, ICT experts and online educators and representatives of regional or national anti-bullying networks, organisations, initiatives, campaigns.

One hundred and twenty-two experts were selected from all categories outlined above were invited for the experts' questioning. The experts' questionnaire was completed by 41 experts. The majority of experts were from Europe with experts coming from the UK ( $n = 10$ ), Germany ( $n = 5$ ), Greece ( $n = 3$ ), Belgium, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Portugal ( $n = 2$ ), Austria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Spain, Finland, Ireland, Latvia and the Netherlands ( $n = 1$ ). Moreover, the questionnaire was completed by experts from Australia ( $n = 2$ ), the United States ( $n = 2$ ) and Japan ( $n = 1$ ). In terms of their professional background, the predominant group of experts were researchers ( $n = 17$ ), representatives from regional or national anti-bullying networks, organisations, initiatives, campaigns, and so on ( $n = 8$ ) and representatives of a project or initiative dealing with Internet safety ( $n = 4$ ).

### Trainers' Questioning and Online Focus Group

The trainers were selected on basis of an internal classification system based on queries in each of the partner countries. The three main categories included ICT trainers (e.g., trainers working for IT companies, trainers working for the national Internet safety initiatives), research and training centres (e.g., trainers with a background in traditional school bullying, trainers working in teacher training centres) and police and legal experts. From each of these main groups trainers were invited to complete the online questionnaire.

From the 121 trainers invited to participate, 55 completed the trainers' questionnaire. Again, the majority of trainers were from Europe, with experts coming from Portugal ( $n = 21$ ), Switzerland ( $n = 12$ ), Ireland ( $n = 7$ ) and Spain ( $n = 5$ ), Bulgaria ( $n = 4$ ) and Brazil ( $n = 2$ ), Germany ( $n = 1$ ), Italy ( $n = 1$ ), France ( $n = 1$ ) and the United States ( $n = 1$ ). In terms of their professional profile, the predominant groups were trainers from research and training centres (21), school staff such as teachers or counsellors (17) and trainers dealing with information and communication technologies (ICT) and Internet safety (7).

All in all, 25 experts of the 41 who previously completed the experts' questionnaire participated actively at the discussions of the online focus group, with 149 postings. Another 10 experts logged in and followed the discussions without actively contributing to the discussions. From the group of 55 trainers who completed the trainers' questionnaire, 13 contributed actively to the online discussions.

## Measures and Procedure

### Questionings of Experts and Trainers

In Phase 1 of the information-gathering process selected experts and trainers were asked to fill in a short questionnaire. The questionnaire for experts consisted of five open questions, the questionnaire for trainers of seven questions. The questions in both questionnaires resulted from an internal discussion process between the partners from the CyberTraining project and varied slightly in terms of their thematic focus. While the focus of the experts' questioning was on the sources of cyberbullying, approaches tackling cyberbullying, and future perspectives, the trainers' questionnaire focused on information and skills needed by trainers to deal with cyberbullying, the kind of resources needed for a training manual on cyberbullying, and the challenges trainers face when dealing with cyberbullying. The questionnaires asked for the issues and elements a training manual on cyberbullying should cover. Both questionnaires were made available online.

Both the experts' and trainers' answers were categorised and analysed by means of a content analysis. The first step of the content analysis aimed to develop a system of overall categories. As most answers consisted of several 'sub-answers', each answer was spilt up into single content units. These content units were coded and allocated to the overall categories that were refined during the analytical process. While the content analysis of the experts' questioning was supported by the MAXQDA text analysis software, the content analysis of the trainers' questioning was carried out manually, without the support of content analysis software.

### Online Focus Groups

The outcomes of the content analysis were summarized in short reports that formed the starting point for deepening selected topics in Phase 2 of the information-gathering process, the subsequent moderated online focus group for experts and the parallel online focus group for trainers.

The online discussions were held in asynchronous online discussion forums within a Moodle learning environment. The moderated discussion forums were open for a period of four weeks. All discussions were moderated; interim outcomes as well the final outcomes and conclusions of the discussions were summarised and reported back to the participants within each discussion thread. Again, the postings that were made in the course of the online discussions from the online focus group of experts were analysed by means of a content analysis.

## Results

In this section we present selected categories that resulted from the content analysis of answers from the experts' questionnaires and online focus groups.



As mentioned previously, the thematic focus of both questionnaires and online focus groups differed. This was partly due to the research interests of the CyberTraining partners. However, the weight of certain topics also resulted from the outcomes of the initial online questionings as well as from the course of the discussions and participants' interests in the two online focus groups.

### Outcomes of the Experts' Questionnaire and Online Focus Group

For each of the overall categories that resulted from the content analysis of experts' answers to the questionnaire and the subsequent online discussion, we will provide an overview in form of tables. The figures in brackets indicate the frequency of content units within each category and subcategory. Due to space restrictions we cannot present all outcomes in detail.<sup>3</sup>

#### The Sources of Cyberbullying

The outcomes outlined below relate to the question 'What factors promote the emergence/development of cyberbullying?' of the experts' questionnaire and the discussion of selected outcomes within the experts' online focus group. Table 1 gives an overview of all categories and subcategories that resulted from the content analysis.

As cyberbullying has been influenced by the rapid development of ICT in the past decade, it is not surprising that experts account for one source of cyberbully-

**TABLE 1**

**The Sources Of Cyberbullying: Experts' Questionnaire and Online Focus Group**

Overall categories	Subcategories
New technical developments and new patterns of usage (37)	Technological advances (14) Easy and wide access (13) New patterns of ICT usage (10)
Characteristics of ICT that promote cyberbullying (23)	Sense of anonymity (12) Wider audience (5) Lack of direct feedback by pupils (4) Unreal character of ICT (2)
▶ 174 Motivating factors for bullies (34)	Sense of anonymity and safety (9) New possibilities due to enhanced technology (6) Lack of rules, control and consequences (4) Lack of direct feedback by pupils (4) Lower threshold (3) Others factors within bullies (8)
Lack of knowledge and education (35)	Lack of knowledge and strategies (27) Lack of awareness (8) Lack of discussion (2) Lack of tools and programmes (3)
Lack of laws, control and reporting (33)	Inadequate/insufficient laws and policies (10) Lack of control and monitoring (20) Lack of reporting (3) Other factors within young people, parents, schools, media and society (33)
Other factors within young people, parents, schools, media and society (33)	New patterns of young people's lives (7) Poor quality of child-parent relationships (3) Factors within school (8) Role of media (8) Factors within society (7)

ing in new technical developments and also new patterns of usage in terms of the internet and mobile phones, which have a considerable impact on people's lives.

Characteristics of ICT that promote cyberbullying, some of which can also be considered as motivating factors for bullies, are, for instance, the sense of anonymity perpetrators have and the fact that perpetrators are not confronted with immediate reactions from their victims. As one experts stated, 'Cyberbullying is becoming increasingly popular due to the level of anonymity, ease and the likelihood to reach as many bystanders as possible'. In most cases they do not have to be afraid of the punishment and consequences, which may also reduce their inhibition considerably. As several experts stated, this may also attract new groups of perpetrators who would be more sensitive to face-to-face interactions.

There was a broad agreement among experts that both young people and adults lack knowledge and education in ICT. In relation to young people, the lack of media literacy often leads to an inappropriate usage of new technologies. For many experts the lack of knowledge in ICT in relation to parents as well as professionals working with young people is even more obvious. Some even speak of a digital divide between generations.

Experts also agreed that there is a lack of legislation, control and reporting related to cyberbullying. In most countries there are few mechanisms that allow monitoring and controlling of online activities in chat rooms, online communities or content/video sharing communities. In terms of monitoring their children's use of internet, mobiles and other new technologies, many parents neither have the capacity to monitor continuously, nor have they an adequate knowledge and competences to judge their children's activities. One expert from Norway stressed the sheer impossibility of monitoring children's use of the internet: 'Youngsters can tell parents they do homework, bring the laptop (that they get from their schools) to their room, chat all night, and parents lose control'.

In terms of the category 'Other factors within young people, parents, schools, media and society', the subcategory factors within schools is remarkable. As several experts stated, schools should play a crucial role in tackling cyberbullying. Nevertheless, most schools are not addressing cyberbullying in their curricula or school policies yet, they do not prepare their staff, and also do not provide students with the necessary knowledge on ICT and cyberbullying.

175 ◀

### **Approaches Tackling Cyberbullying**

The outcomes outlined below relate to the question 'What kind of approaches do you consider to be helpful when tackling the problem of cyberbullying?', and the discussion of selected outcomes within the experts' online focus group. Table 2 gives an overview about all categories and subcategories that resulted from the content analysis.

A considerable number of answers were related to rules, monitoring and sanctions. Experts saw a clear need for rules, legislation and restrictions, as well as the need for monitoring and control (e.g., reporting and filter mechanisms). Experts also pointed out that there is the clear need for knowledge in ICT and Internet Safety, not only in terms of the dangers and annoyances of ICT but also in terms of its positive and appropriate use. As one expert put it, 'The solution is not to ban social networking sites, ban the use of mobile phones or limit internet access. It is

**TABLE 2**

**Approaches Tackling Cyberbullying: Experts' Questionnaire and Online Focus Group**

Overall categories	Subcategories
Knowledge on ICT and Internet Safety (21)	Better understanding of ICT, its potentials and dangers (7) Appropriate, responsible, safe and positive usage of ICT (14)
Rules, monitoring and sanctions (72)	Rules, legislation and restrictions on cyberbullying (21) Monitoring and control (13) Technical solutions: reporting and filter mechanisms (13) Consequences, sanctions and punishment (12) Arguments against restrictions, banning and punishment (13)
Awareness raising and motivational strategies (33)	Awareness-raising and campaigns (27) Creative ideas for reaching target audience (3) Not merely focusing on technology issues (3)
Approaches targeting children and young people (52)	Empowering young people (17) Increasing knowledge and awareness (9) Peer based approaches (21) Conveying respect and traditional values (2) Involving young people in development of resources (5)
Approaches targeting parents and other adults (22)	Information and knowledge for parents: training, courses, manuals and tools (11) Encouraging and motivating parents (2) Help and assistance for parents (4) Training of professionals (5)
Approaches targeting Schools (57)	Policies / whole school approach (13) Teacher training (22) Restrict or monitor access to ICT (9) Education: information on ICT and Internet safety (8) Approaches on class level (5)
Challenges (26)	Rapid change of technology (3) Costs and funding (5) Resistance to training and lack of support by schools and government (7) Danger of mixing up cyber safety with cyberbullying (6) Need of enhanced cooperation between Internet safety experts and experts on school bullying (5)

not the technology that is the problem; it is the misuse of it.' While a number of experts expressed their concerns about restrictive and punitive approaches, there was a broad agreement with regards to the need and effectiveness in educating users in terms of adequate online behaviour and risk management.

The experts also widely agreed on the importance of awareness raising and motivational strategies in order to attract parents', teachers', professionals' and young people's attention on the relevance of the cyberbullying problem. In this context one expert from the United Kingdom pointed out 'that educators (need to) understand that cyberbullying isn't just "about" technology, particularly as many educators may lack confidence in this area'.

In terms of approaches targeting children and young people, empowerment and peer-based approaches were regarded as very effective methods to tackle cyberbullying. As one expert stated, 'Young people who are being bullied often don't want to talk to an adult figure, be it a parent or teacher. They are more comfortable talking to another young person.'

One of the focuses of approaches targeting parents, teachers, youth workers and other professionals should be on conveying information and knowledge on ICT and cyberbullying in form of training, manuals, courses and other resources. Also, providing help and assistance — for example, by means of help lines as well as training of professionals — were regarded as being important.

In terms of approaches targeting schools, whole-school approaches and teacher training were considered to be effective methods. Again, approaches focusing on restricting and monitoring access to Internet and mobile phones in schools were not considered as effective by a number of experts.

One major challenge when developing resources on cyberbullying is the rapid change in technologies. Introductions to the latest state of development of ICT may be out of date soon. Experiences reported by the experts also suggest that governments, authorities and schools are hesitant when it comes to financing projects and programs, though in the long run funding these projects may be less expensive than having to cope with the negative effects of cyberbullying. The discussions also revealed the need for enhanced cooperation between anti-bullying and cyber safety experts.

### Outcomes of the Trainers' Questionnaire

The outcomes we present in the following section are the result of a content analysis of trainers' answers from the questioning and the discussion of selected outcomes within the experts' and trainers focus group. Unlike the content analysis of experts' answers, the trainers' contributions to the online discussions have not been considered in the following presentation of the main outcomes. Again, due to space restrictions we cannot present all outcomes in detail.<sup>4</sup>

#### Difficulties Trainers Face When Dealing With Cyberbullying

The outcomes outlined below relate to the question 'What are the main difficulties you face as a trainer when dealing with cyberbullying?' of the trainers' questionnaire. Overall, the content analysis revealed three categories: difficulties related to the topic of cyberbullying itself, difficulties of the training's target group, and difficulties trainers may have. Table 3 provides an overview about the categories and subcategories that resulted from the content analysis.

**TABLE 3**

**Trainers' Difficulties: Trainers' Questionnaire and Online Focus Group**

Overall categories	Subcategories
Difficulties related to the topic of cyberbullying (18)	Complexity of the topic Available of information on cyberbullying Difficulty/complexity of training needed
Difficulties of the training's target group (22)	Differences in 'language' of target audience Silence of victims and aggressors Parents and teachers' lack of awareness Difficulties in defining responsibilities False beliefs
Difficulties of trainers (6)	Information available for trainers still low Keeping up-to-date in terms of ICT

The first category focused on difficulties related to the topic of cyberbullying. According to trainers in many countries there is still relatively little information available. However, as queries in each of the partner countries in the CyberTraining project indicated, the number of web sites, brochures, manuals and other resources is surprisingly large. The trainers' answers thus may be taken as a hint that they are not aware of the resources available in their countries.

As trainers stated, one of the difficulties when working with the training manual's target group is the differing 'language' of these groups and the fact that many adults are not familiar with a basic ICT terminology. Very often parents and teachers are not aware of cyberbullying. Trainers also expressed their concerns about 'false beliefs' related to cyberbullying and school bullying in general; for instance, the fact that many parents or teachers overestimate the effectiveness of punishment and restrictions.

Information and communication technologies are changing rapidly, so that one of the main difficulties of trainers themselves is to keep up-to-date in terms of the latest developments and problems that result from new technologies.

### Elements and Resources Needed for a Training Manual

The outcomes presented in this section relate to two questions in the trainers' questionnaire: 'What elements/components should a training manual on cyberbullying include?' and 'What kind of resources would you find useful in your training activities?' The categories that resulted from the content analysis of answers stress the need for well-grounded theoretical information (see Table 4).

For the resources that trainers suggested should be included in the training manual, they stressed the need for a practical orientation with regards to the format of the manual. For example, the manual should include narratives (e.g.,

**TABLE 4**

**Elements Of A Training Manual: Trainers' Questionnaire And Online Focus Group**

Overall categories	Subcategories
Introduction to the basics of cyberbullying (47)	Definitions of cyberbullying Differences to and similarities with traditional bullying Consequences of cyberbullying Examples
Information about training skills (36)	Personal and Interpersonal skills Communication skills Cognitive skills Technological pedagogic skills
Information about strategies for diagnosis and intervention (71)	Diagnostic skills Prevention/intervention strategies Technological strategies Strategies for victim support Strategies for intervention in schools Strategies for intervention with parents Police role
Resources needed (75)	Narratives Audiovisual material: images, films, and so on Digital multimedia resources: CDs, forums, chats, and so on Written documentation: manuals or other literature Newspaper article

case examples or fictional narratives), audiovisual material (e.g., images, films), digital multimedia resources (e.g., CDs), or articles from newspapers, or online journals.

The content analysis also revealed a broad interest in information on different training skills as well as information about strategies for diagnosis and intervention. However, as the trainers' suggestions were not specific to the cyberbullying problem we will not present them in detail here.

## ■ Conclusions

The main aim of the experts' and trainers' questionnaires and the discussions in both online focus groups was to gather information that contributes to the development of a training manual that meets trainers' needs and reflects the current state of cyberbullying research. The two studies presented in this article, among others, revealed the trainers' need for well-grounded information on ICT, basic information on cyberbullying, and approaches for tackling cyberbullying, as well as training skills that are needed for dealing with the cyberbullying problem. Although the outcomes of the studies were not surprising, they gave valuable hints in terms of the style of a training manual preferred by trainers, as well as the resources needed. Moreover, the outcomes of the experts' questionnaires and online discussion were helpful in clarifying the framework and scope of approaches for tackling cyberbullying. In the project's second phase, the main outcomes were considered when developing the training manual.

Apart from these findings that were of practical use for the CyberTraining project, the two studies also brought up some results that are of interest both for cyberbullying research and the rather practical-oriented work — for example, when providing training. Both studies revealed that cyberbullying is a phenomenon that blurs the boundaries of formerly separated fields: traditional school bullying on the one side and ICT and internet safety on the other side. The development of resources, training, projects and campaigns that tackle cyberbullying makes multi-disciplinary cooperation an imperative. Neither approaches that focus on the bullying related aspects, nor approaches focusing merely on the ICT-related aspects will do. When dealing with cyberbullying or ICT in general, one also has to be aware of the digital gap between generations. Adults very often lack awareness and understanding of the world that young people are living in and they have clearly different concepts of reality and social life. As for many adults, this lack of understanding often goes along with a lack of confidence when dealing with ICT. This may need to be considered when designing resources or campaigns. As one participant of the experts' online focus group suggested, it can be helpful to point out that 'cyberbullying isn't just about technology ... but fundamentally about behavioural and pastoral issues — areas where most schools and educators have comprehensive frameworks already in place'. Finally, the controversy between experts on restrictive and punitive approaches made clear that this issue needs a clarification in the light of research findings on cyberbullying.

## Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank the ‘Leonardo da Vinci’/Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Commission for co-funding the CyberTraining project. We also wish to thank the partners of the CyberTraining project as well as the experts and trainers who participated at the online questionings and the online focus groups.

## Endnotes

- 1 The development of the training manual was part of the EU-funded project CyberTraining (<http://www.cybertraining-project.org/>)
- 2 <http://www.cybertraining-project.org>
- 3 The detailed figures are available online in the report ‘Experts’ Questioning and Online Focus Group — Outcomes and Implications’ (Jäger, 2009).
- 4 The detailed findings are available online in the report ‘Trainers’ Needs Analysis — Outcomes and Conclusions’ (Amado, Matos, & Pessoa, 2009) that is available online.

## References

- Amado, J., Matos, A., & Pessoa, T. (2009). *Trainers’ needs analysis — Outcomes and conclusions*. Retrieved from <http://www.cybertraining-project.org/reports/CyberTraining%20%20Trainers%20Needs%20Analysis%20-%20Outcomes%20and%20Conclusions.doc>
- Eurostat. (2010). *Information society statistics*. Retrieved from: [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/information\\_society/data/main\\_tables](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/information_society/data/main_tables)
- Gradinger, P., Strohmeier, D., & Spiel, C. (2009). Traditional bullying and cyberbullying: Identification of risk groups for adjustment problems. *Journal of Psychology*, 217(4), 205–213.
- Hsu, C.-C., & Sandford, B.A. (2007). The Delphi technique: Making sense of consensus. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, 12(10), 1–8. Retrieved from <http://pare-online.net/getvn.asp?v=12&n=10>
- Jäger, T. (2009). *Experts’ questioning and online focus group — Outcomes and implications*. Retrieved from <http://www.cybertraining-project.org/reports/CyberTraining%20Online%20Focus%20Group%20-%20Outcomes%20and%20Implications.doc>
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. (2008). Cyberbullying: An exploratory analysis of factors related to offending and victimization. *Deviant Behavior*, 29(2), 1–29.
- Kitzinger, J. (1994). The methodology of focus groups: the importance of interactions between research participants. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 16, 103–121.
- Kowalski, R., Limber, S., & Agaston, P. (2008). *Cyber Bullying*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Linstone, H.A., & Turoff, M. (1975). *The Delphi Method: Techniques and applications*. London: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Livingstone, S., & Haddon, L. (2009). EU Kids Online: Final Report. Retrieved from <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EUKidsOnline/Reports/EUKidsOnlineFinalReport.pdf>
- Microsoft. (2009). *Microsoft’s European Online Safety Survey*. Retrieved from [http://www.microsoft.com/emea/presscentre/pressreleases/OnlinebullyingPR\\_100209.mspx](http://www.microsoft.com/emea/presscentre/pressreleases/OnlinebullyingPR_100209.mspx)
- Rezabek, R. (2000). Online focus groups: Electronic discussions for research. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 1(1). Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/1-00/1-00rezabek-e.htm>

- 
- Smith, P. (in press). Cyberbullying: the European perspective. In J. Mora-Merchan & T. Jäger (Eds.), *Cyberbullying: A cross-national comparison*. Landau, Germany: Verlag Emprische Padagogik.
- Smith, P.K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, C., & Tippett, N. (2006). *An investigation into cyberbullying, its forms, awareness and impact, and the relationship between age and gender in cyberbullying. A Report to the Anti-Bullying Alliance*. Retrieved from <http://www.education.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RBX03-06.pdf>
- Smith, P.K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., & Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying, its forms and impact on secondary school pupils. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *49*, 376–385.
- Slonje, R., & Smith, P.K. (2008). Cyberbullying: Another main type of bullying? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *49*, 147–154.
- Willard, N. (2005). *Educator's guide to cyberbullying and cyberthreats*. Retrieved from <http://new.csriu.org/cyberbully/docs/cbcteducator.pdf>
- Willard, N. (2006). *Cyberbullying and cyberthreats. Effectively managing internet use risks in schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.cyberbully.org/onlinedocs/cbct.pdf>

