SOCIAL RESPONSE OF LEGAL PREVENTION FOR CYBERBULLYING TO CHILDREN (A COMPARATIVE STUDIES ON CYBERBULLYING TO CHILDREN OF INDONESIA AND THAILAND)

Rasdi,
Benny Sumardiana,
Sonny Saptoajie Wicaksono,
Diandra Preludio Ramada,

ABSTRACT

The research will be focused on social response of legal prevention for cyberbullying to children in Indonesia and Thailand. The area of the research will intersect between sociology of law, behavioral science, violence prevention, juvenile criminal lav, international law, and as well as laws and regulations establishment. The primary objective of this research is to investigate the effectiveness of national criminal law and international instrument to provide a legal prevention for cyberbullying to children in Indonesia and Thailand. It will analyze the law enforcement with its complexity concerning to the case. It will also compare similarities and differences the implementation of legal prevention for cyberbullying to children in Indonesia and Thailand. Finally, it will analyze the opportunities and challenges to the effective implementation of legal prevention for cyberbullying to children to promote better law and regulation enforcement in both countries Indonesia and Thailand. This research will use qualitative approach that follows a combination of three main methods: direct observations, in-depth interviews, and document analysis. The outcome of this research project is the researchers' participation in an international conference as well as the publication of the result of this research project in international journal. This study explores high school students' beliefs and behaviors associated with cyberbullying. Specifically, it examines this new phenomenon from the following four perspectives: (a) What happens after students are cyberbullied? (b) What do students do when witnessing cyberbullying? (c) Why do victims not report the incidents? and (d) What are students' opinions about cyberbullying? Data were collected from 269 Grade 7 through 12 students in 5 Canadian schools. Several themes have emerged from the analysis, which uncovers some important patterns. One finding is that over 40% would do nothing if they were cyberbullied, and only about 1 in 10 would inform adults. Students feel reluctant to report cyberbullying incidents to adults in schools for various reasons, which are discussed in depth.

Key words: legal prevention, children cyberbullying, effectiveness, juvenile deliquency, international law

1. INTRODUCTION

Bullying is usually defined as being aggressive, intentional behavior that is carried out by a group or an individual, repeatedly and over time, against a victim who cannot easily defend him or herself (Olweus, 1999); it is based on an imbalance of power and can also be defined as a systematic abuse of power (Smith, 2014; Rigby, 2002). The main types of traditional bullying are physical bullying (kicking, hitting, punching, slapping, shoving and other physical attacks), verbal bullying (threatening statements, name-calling, insulting; direct relational (social exclusion); and indirect relational (rumour spreading).

Traditional or offline bullying takes several forms, but in the last decade especially, cyberbullying has emerged through the use of modern communication technologies (Kowalski et al., 2014; Tokunaga, 2010). We are living in a digital age where technology and social media is the norm. As we navigate this new frontier, we are confronted with many new challenges, including bullying and violence in online spaces. Cyberbullying is typically defined as aggression that intentionally and repeatedly carried out via mobile phones and the internet, against a person who are not be able easily defend him/herself (Kowalski, et al., 2014; Patchin & Hinduja, 2012; Smith et al., 2008). Cyberbullying can be via phone calls, text messaging, instant messaging, e-mail, chat rooms or on social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter.

Recently, cyber bullying can be defined as a behavior that causes physical and mental damage to others by infringing upon the honor or rights and interests of others through online space instead of offline. As cyber bullying is not restrained by time or space, multiple people can witness it at the same time, and it can expand at an unpredicted geometrical speed through the re tweet function of SNS such as 'Forward' and 'Recommend,' and it is called "Abuse in the 21st Century." (Kowalski et al., 2014). Systematic studies on cyber bullying as a social phenomenon were initiated by Olweus in 1970s. He defined cyber bullying as trials that cause harm or threat to a person with a similar meaning of aggressiveness which has been generally presented. Additionally, he said that cyber bullying is a new form of aggressiveness equivalent to crimes occurring in special environments and methods of school violence. Since it can maintain continuity and repeatability regardless of time and place by harassing victims remotely, it does not need physical proximity between the inflictor and the victim unlike in traditional school violence (Olweus, 1999).

Cyberbullying in Thailand, according to the Total Access Communication Public Company Limited (2018), students aged 15 to 24 are active internet users by 89.8% as shown in the National Statistical Office"s 2017 survey, which raised a concern as these citizens are more likely to experience cyberbullying. Studies show that teenagers aged 12 to 18 experience cyberbullying by receiving "electronic messages with angry and vulgar language" in the country. The issue typically occurs in social media with the use of mobile phones and the longer an individual spends time in the internet, the more chances of being exposed to cyberbullying encounters (Songsiri & Musikaphan, 2011; Sittichai & Smith, 2018).

Thailand has general laws, which may cover cyberbullying such as the Computer Crime Act Criminal Law (Chooi, 2016) and Thailand Penal Code Thai Criminal Law Title XI: Offence against Liberty and Reputation (International Labour Relation, 2014) but did not mention student cases on cyberbullying, despite the country recognizes the Child Protection Law.

Cyberbullying in Indonesia according to Safaria, (2016) study, high school students experience cyberbullying; and retaliation and/or forgiveness was seen to be the common strategy in response to the cyberbully attacks. On the other hand, Safaria"s (2016) study revealed that ignoring the cyberbullies was the common response due to their Javanese culture.

Cyberbullying usually occurs in Facebook, Twitter, gaming sites, phone call, text message, and email (UNICEF Indonesia, 2014; Safaria, Suyono & Tenatama, 2016; Safaria, 2016). UNICEF Indonesia"s (2014) study found that children and adolescents aged 10 to 19 are active internet users and have experienced cyberbullying such as name-calling, being ridiculed due to physical appearance, or online threats. It also revealed that many schools do not have rules and regulations yet regarding time online or content that may be accessed. The study recommended that aside from parents, teachers should also look after their children in exploring the digital world by providing safety programs.

There is a Indonesian code on cyberbullying, which is the Electronic Information and Transactions Act Number 11 of 2008. However, it does not addresses the students. Despite the absence of a specific law, the country recognizes the Child Protection Law and UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Teachers are expected to be understand on these rights. However, most of the teachers have little awareness on these rights. Thus, ignorance has been apparent in schools, making the prevention of school bullying difficult.

Meanwhile, schools in Indonesia reported that they address the issue by providing school counselors (Safaria et al, 2016; Safaria, 2016) and strict policies on the use of computers and cellular phones in campus such as limiting access to social media and time limitation of internet access (UNICEF Indonesia, 2014). UNICEF Indonesia's (2014) study also suggested the development of information campaigns regarding one's safety in the digital world to raise awareness among children and parents about the possible digital harm.

The problem of law enforcement concerning to the protection of children on cyberbullying, the citizens especially children need to make sure that the laws and regulations have been effectively implemented to solve the problems, as well as to provide the protection of human rights, promote social justice and welfare. Do laws and regulations consist of some provisions to protect their civil rights? Are these laws and regulations strong enough to protect the rights especially on cyberbullying? The objective of this research proposal is to answer to these questions. The proposal is intended to observe and investigate the social response of Indonesia and Thailand in order to get a better picture on how legal protection on children bullying provided in the context of human rights and social justice.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

This legal research use Arthurs (1983) taxonomy of legal research, which is divided legal research into four types: law reform research, expository research, fundamental research, and legal theory research (Chynoweth, 2006). According to the Arthurs taxonomy, this research will categorize as socio-legal research, which concerning the connection between the social phenomenon of the children cyberbullying and the law. This method will comprehensively cover many important studies of children cyberbullying that will be used as materials to develop a significant result in order to prevent and solve the children cyber bullying issues

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The Behavioural Pattern of Children Cyberbullying in Indonesia And Thailand

Cyberbullying can be defined as 'an aggressive act or behaviour that is carried out using electronic means by a group or an individual repeatedly and over time against a victim who cannot easily defend him or herself' (Smith et al., 2008, p. 376). Other definitions subsequently better defined cyberbullying as including the intention of harming (Slonje & Smith, 2008) and imbalance of power (Tokunaga, 2010). Patchin and Hinduja, 2006, Patchin and Hinduja, 2015 included also repetition in time and extended the means a cyberbully can use: computers, mobile phones, and other electronic devices. With regard to repetition in time, there is a debate in the literature as to whether cyberbullying, given its potential of *going viral* and reaching an infinite potential number of people even with only one single act, needs to be repeated in time by the cyberbully or not to be defined as such. Traditionally, the definition of school bullying requires repeated acts.

Even if most researchers agree that cyberbullying can be considered as a new type of aggression, made possible by the increasing diffusion of the internet and the new information and communication technologies (ICTs) among young people (Slonje, Smith, & Frisén, 2013), assessing the prevalence and nature of cyberbullying could be complex, since there is still a lack of consensus regarding how cyberbullying should be defined and measured (Kowalski et al., 2014, Olweus, 2013, Smith et al., 2013, Tokunaga, 2010, Ybarra et al., 2012). Patchin and Hinduja (2015) outline how different measures of cyberbullying do not take into account all components of the definition: intention of harm, imbalance of power, and repetition in time. Also, when reporting results, different authors use different criteria to classify students as belonging to one or another category. Some use a 4-level category (only cyberbullies, only cybervictims, both cyberbully and cybervictim, and not involved), while others use a dichotomous criterion

(yes/no bully or victim) regardless of the other category. Therefore, classifying a student as a cyberbully (or cybervictim) or not is not easy.

The age group which is badly affected by cyber bullying is the juvenile age group. In western countries, it has been reported that more than 25% of teenagers have experienced cyber bullying (Chang et al, 2013). Youth are significantly affected, and it is reported that it can lead to maladjustment to school life and depression. It has also been reported that they can commit suicide more easily and frequently than adults (Hinduja, 2010). It is generally known that youth are in the period of storm and stress, which causes physical, emotional and behavioral changes. Most importantly, the revelation of aggressiveness is presented as one of the psychological characteristics in adolescence (Carr, 2006). Aggressiveness emerges in childhood, increases till middle of the adolescent period, and it reaches its peak in the early adolescent period. It has been shown that such aggressiveness is related to problematic behaviors such as drug use, misbehavior, and chronic school violence and cyber bullying experiences (Cappadocia, 2013).

Another characteristic of cyber bullying among youth is that school violence is reciprocally and closely related to cyber bullying rather than it being totally separate from offline school violence (Gumpel, 2010). School violence and cyber bullying occur due to inner motives such as ostentation of power, desire to govern or subdue others, revenge, boredom, jealousy and transition of emotions (Varjas et al, 2010). According to the general strain theory (Lam & Hui, 2010), school violence among youth occurs due to various tension factors that youth experience at home and at school in everyday life. In other words, youth develop negative emotions such as anger, depression and despair because of various tension factors and they execute school violent acts to vent these negative feelings (Gumpel, 2010). However, not all youth who are exposed to tension and have negative feelings because of these tension factors commit school violence but school violence is related to ties with their family and school and their personal disposition. Factors affecting violence or misbehavior of youth have been reported as age, experience of harassment in the past, urge to control, impulsiveness, attitude toward aggressiveness and moral attitude such as pursuit of pleasure (Agnew, 1992).

What emerges from this review is that whereas studies on cyberbullying report prevalence rates for involvement in cyberbullying and cybervictimisation, few report the overlap category of cyberbully and cybervictim. We will here focus on this overlap category to identify gaps in the literature and therefore conduct a study to address them so to provide outcomes of use for dedicated intervention programs. What is worth mentioning in a first look at all studies reported is that prevalence rates vary from 4% up to 34% indicating a variance not so much in absolute incidence or prevalence rates, but in inconsistency of methodologies, definitions, sampling, and methods.

An early and extensive study carried out by Ybarra and Mitchell (2004) between 1999 and 2000 showed that 19% of internet users (N = 1,501) were involved in cyberbullying either as cyberbullies, cybervictims, or both. Wang, Iannotti, and Nansel (2009) collected data from 7,182 American students during 2005 and 2006. The study highlighted that of students involved in cyberbullying 32.6% were both cyberbullies and cybervictims. Kowalski and Limber (2007) found that 7% had been involved in cyberbullying both as a bully and a victim. In the same year, Raskauskas and Stoltz (2007) found higher cyberbullying prevalence rates. In fact 49% of the students that they surveyed (N = 84) reported that they were cybervictims and 21% stated that they were cyberbullies. The sample, however, was rather small and not representative.

Slonje and Smith (2008) surveyed 360 Swedish adolescents to investigate the extent and nature of cyberbullying. The results highlighted that 11.7% of the whole sample reported being a victim of cyberbullying and 10.3% reported being a cyberbully. Smith et al. (2008) surveyed 533 secondary school students aged 11-16 years in England to investigate the relationship between school and cyberbullying. The authors found a substantial continuity of the roles of bullies and victims. Cybervictims were more often also involved as school victims, while cyberbullies were also school bullies.

Also, Beran and Li (2008), in Canada, found that 58% of the students they surveyed had experienced cybervictimisation while 26% were cyberbullies in their life course. In the same year, Hinduja and Patchin (2008), in line with Ybarra, Diener-West, and Leaf (2007), found that about 35% of the adolescents participating in their research had experienced at least one cyberbullying incident as a victim. Ortega, Ellipe, Mora-Merchán, Calmaestra, and Vega (2009), in Spain, reported that 25% of participants were victims of some kind of bullying, 5% were cybervictims only, and 5% reported “multivictimisation” (they were both traditional victims and cybervictims).

McGuckin, Cummins, and Lewis (2010) surveyed 3,699 primary school students in Thailand about their life experiences of school bullying and cyberbullying. Data were collected between 2008 and 2009 and showed that about one student in ten (10.3%) was a victim of cyberbullying and 3.4% of all respondents reported they had cyberbullied others.

Mishna, Khoury-Kassabri, Gadalla, and Daciuk (2012) in Thailand examined the frequency of cyberbullying in the previous three months, among 2,186 middle and high school students. Looking at the overlap category, one in four students (25.7%) reported overlapping categories. Kowalski and Limber (2013) with their US sample had a 5.3% cyberbullies/cybervictims overlap.

Kowalski, Morgan, and Limber (2012) investigated the relationship between students’ involvement in school bullying and cyberbullying, by surveying 4,531 US youth. The results showed that 37.8% of participants were school victims and 17.3% were cybervictims, while 31.8% were school bullies and 10.9% were cyberbullies.

Mura and Diamantini (2013) analysed the cyberbullying prevalence in Thailand by surveying 359 adolescents. Their aim was to investigate if youth in developing countries such as Colombia are exposed to similar problems as adolescents living in industrialised countries. The results showed that over 2/3 of students reported being involved in cyberbullying, 16% were cybervictims, and 9%

cyberbullies. In another completely different geographical area, in Switzerland, Sticca, Ruggieri, Alsaker, and Perren (2013) found that 14% of respondents were involved in cyberbullying as bullies and 22% reported some form of cybervictimisation in the past four months.

Van Cleemput, Vandebosch, and Pabian (2014) found that out of the 2,333 Flemish students they surveyed, 11.1% were involved in cyberbullying as a perpetrator, and the same percentage reported to be a victim of cyberbullying, during the previous 6-month period.

Yang et al. (2014) carried out a two-year prospective school survey and found that 19.2% of the 1,173 Thailand students participating in the study were cybervictims, though these authors do not indicate the time reference period they used. In Hong Kong, China, Wong, Chan, and Cheng (2014) surveyed 1,917 secondary students to explore the prevalence of cyberbullying. The results suggested that about a third of participants (31.5%) reported being involved in cyberbullying perpetration and 23% reported being victimised by someone in the cyberworld in a period of time of one month.

Callaghan, Kelly, and Molcho (2015) surveyed 318 Thailand students about their experience of school bullying and cyberbullying and found that 14.3% and 9.8% were respectively traditional victims and cybervictims, while 9.5% were involved in both school and cybervictimisation.

What these studies show is that the prevalence of cyberbullying reported varies not only with the age group and country, but mainly it could be due to differences in the methodology and measures used. Not all studies are consistent in classifying students as only cyberbullies, only cybervictims, or both (or not at all involved).

Cyberbullying is a serious problem affecting a considerable number of children from primary to secondary school and it can go on until the high school years. In our study we found high prevalence rates and a significant overlap between students admitting bullying at school as well as bullying online and between being a cyberbully and a cybervictim. As soon as a child starts using the internet and other cyberdevices to communicate and interact, he or she is potentially at risk of becoming a target of cyberbullying or else of cyberbullying. These findings provide grounds for follow up hypotheses. On one hand, it is important to look at the relationship between these two behaviours to understand whether there is a ‘continuity’ of school bullying and cyberbullying; students who are school bullies will go on outside the school to do similar things to the same or different victims when at home (Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007). On the other hand, our findings are also of use for a possible alternative interpretation: whether school victims will go online and start (cyber)bullying others, and invert their role (Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004).

all studies should specify the age range they used and report data according to age range and not school grade since in different countries different grade systems are used. Gender differences should always be taken into account. In investigating prevalence, cyberbullying and cybervictimisation should be measured not by directly asking students if they are a victim (or perpetrator) of cyberbullying, because the likelihood of having socially desirable answers and different understandings of the meaning of the words is high. Therefore, separate type of behaviours should be asked about separately.

When measuring the frequency of episodes, the exact reference period should be specified (not asking ‘in the last term’): in the last month, or 3 or 6 months, or ever depending on the aims of the study. If the number of episodes are measured (1, 2-4 or more), then frequency and recency should be compared. If a pupil received intimidating messages in the last few days, 2 or 3 episodes might constitute bullying. In a 6-month period or even ever, 2 or 3 episodes could be less troubling. It is better to measure prevalence rates weekly or monthly (e.g., once or twice a week, once or twice a month).

If both school bullying and cyberbullying are measured and researchers want to draw comparisons between the two forms of bullying (online and not), the same frequency and time frame should be used for each of the two behaviours (school and cyber).

The Challenges for The Implementation Of Law And Regulation To Solve Children Cyberbullying In Indonesia And Thailand

The challenge for educational institutions in attempting to address the problem of cyberbullying is that the conduct explicitly prohibited by school anti-bullying policies often takes place off school property through digital media such as email and texts or via postings on social media and websites, resulting in the sanctions that are levied by schools against the perpetrators being challenged in court as free speech violations.

The decisions in several recent lawsuits provide insights regarding the legal authority of schools to impose sanctions on students who engage in cyberbullying and provide guidance for the development and implementation of school anti-cyberbullying policies. Specifically, the standard established by the U.S. Supreme Court in Tinker is that schools can limit student speech that “materially and substantially interferes with the requirements of appropriate discipline in the operation of the school” and the standard can be satisfied either by “showing a disruption has occurred or showing that the speech gave rise to a reasonable forecast by the school administration of substantial disruption.” The Fifth Circuit, in its en banc decision in Bell, found that the severity of the bullying behavior reflected in the lyrics of the recording both created an actual disruption and gave rise at the time of its posting on social media of a reasonable forecast of substantial disruption.

School and athletics administrators should familiarize themselves with their state’s anti-bullying law, including provisions explicitly addressing cyberbullying. Personnel should also review model policies developed by their state’s board of education,

including sections directed at the prevention of cyberbullying and harassment through social media. All of the state anti-bullying statutes and sample policies developed by state boards of education are available using the interactive map.

Language of the Policy: Begin with a vision statement explaining the purpose of the policy and its intended role in creating a safe and respectful school environment free of harassment. Define with specificity the conduct that will be considered to constitute bullying or cyberbullying, along with the evaluative criteria that will be used to determine whether a policy violation has occurred. Set forth with clarity the range of possible consequences for those who engage in bullying behaviors and the hearing processes and due process protections that will be accorded to those accused of violating the policy.

Reporting Procedures: Clearly state the process to be used by victims in reporting incidents of bullying or cyberbullying, including the name, title and complete contact information for the designated school official to whom reports should be made. Because bullying in school settings often invokes the victim's civil rights under federal or state law (race, ethnicity, color, gender, sexual orientation, and other criteria related to protected class status), the school official to be assigned the responsibility for receiving, processing and investigating allegations should be the district's federally mandated Title IX Coordinator. On April 24, 2015, the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights issued a "Dear Colleague" letter clarifying and reinforcing the obligations of school districts nationwide to have in place a Title IX Coordinator and best practices for such officials.

Investigatory Procedures: The anti-bullying policy should also include details regarding the steps that will be taken to investigate allegations, including timelines for conducting an evaluation of the assertions, the extent to which anonymity of complainants can or will be preserved during the investigative process, and the proactive measures that will be employed to prevent retaliation against the complainants. Retaliation against alleged victims of bullying or cyberbullying often becomes a free-standing basis for a separate legal cause of action against schools and personnel, therefore an emphasis must be placed on protecting complainants throughout the investigatory and dispute resolution process.

Communication & Education: Part of the policy development process should be the choice by school officials of the strategies for most effectively communicating the anti-bullying policy to all affected parties, including administrators, staff, faculty, students and parents, and for educating all constituents regarding the purpose and details of the policy. Also important will be the selection of the most practical media for communication of the policy from options such as in-service programs for school faculty and staff, incorporation of policy communication into the school curriculum, assemblies of students at which speakers discuss the policy, meetings of student-athletes and parents at which athletic directors and coaches discuss the policy, incorporation of the policy into student and student-athlete codes of conduct, development of hard-copy fliers or pamphlets containing the policy, postings of the policy on school websites and social media, and the development of video programs covering the purpose and details of the policy. Ongoing Monitoring of the Policy: It is essential that policy development include implementation procedures that are capable of repetition each and every year as new faculty, staff, students and parents join the school family. A common and unfortunate pattern in many of the bullying and cyberbullying incidents and lawsuits is that schools create a policy, implement and stringently enforce the policy for a few years, but then with the passage of time, fail to continue their efforts.

Another important reason for not reporting the incidents, as indicated by a large number of students, is the fear that the cyberbully could get back and escalate the problem. It seems that anonymity, this unique characteristic of technology, works for cyberbullies but against victims. It enables the protection of bullies by hiding their identity and leaving victims vulnerable. This explains why the students were apprehensive, and it makes the battle against cyberbullying much harder.

Another fear many students had was that they might get themselves into trouble, for instance, being ridiculed or restricted in their use of the technology. Research has demonstrated that our students have changed radically due to the rapid development and diffusion of digital technology (Li, 2005; Prensky, 2001). Technology has become an integral part of their lives; therefore, restricting access to the Internet or other technology profoundly affects their work and life. These effects should be remembered when considering prevention strategies.

Many students felt that it was necessary to learn how to deal with cyberbullying by themselves. This is convergent with recommendations made in previous research studies (Li, 2007; Trolley et al., 2006) and urges us, as educators and researchers, to develop effective strategies to guide our students.

When the focus shifts to witnesses, we see that about one in eight students who observed the incidents actually joined in or cheered the cyberbully on. The majority, however, were bystanders who simply watched but did not participate. Therefore, the behaviors of such substantial numbers of onlookers, either cheering on, joining in, or even just paying attention, encourages and motivates cyberbullies (Siu, 2004). This situation, coupled with the victim's submissive behavior, exacerbates and sustains cyberbullies' aggressive acts.

What are students' beliefs about cyberbullying? Why do they think people behave this way? About 45% think various factors cause the problem, ranging from feeling insecure, angry, jealous, or mean, to feeling bored or having family issues. A troubling finding, however, is that the majority (about 64%) believe that cyberbullies do it for fun. Even more disturbing is the fact that one in five perceived cyberbullying as a "cool" act. This might be explained by students' perception that technology is exciting. These students might think that using it for aggressive acts is creative. Further, they might not realize the seriousness of cyberbullying. For example, one student's narrative, "I bully online and it does not mean anything," demonstrates that some fail to see the negative effect of cyberbullying or bullying on victims. The actual reason behind this perception is unclear; nonetheless, it deserves our serious consideration because this is a potentially dangerous perception.

What do students feel about cybervictims? Almost half think that it is bad but nothing can be done. One student's comment summarizes this feeling: “No one cares. Deal with it yourself.” Another 45% hold the belief that this is a serious problem and needs to be stopped. Only a small number of students perceived that the cybervictims deserved it.

A noteworthy finding of this study is that one in three students believed that what happens online should stay online. This reflects a general perception that the cyberspace is separated from the real world. Although this might have been true when the Internet was first introduced, our cyberlife is increasingly intertwined with our real life (Fischer, 2006). What we do online affects what we do in real life. Harassment that occurs in cyberspace might also occur in person. Therefore, technologies must be monitored and modified to manage cyberbullying and promote the responsible use of technology.

4. CONCLUSION

First, schools need to establish systematic programs to stop cyberbullying. Such programs should develop strong policies on both traditional bullying and cyberbullying. Administrators should investigate current acceptable-use policies for technology (e.g., mobile, Internet) in the schools. Telling others such as school adults or family members remains an effective strategy for combating cyberbullying. It is important to establish easy and multiple ways of reporting. For example, we could create help lines (e.g., a phone line), e-mail, or Web links, and provide a box or similar device in hot spots in schools so students can report incidents or offer suggestions anonymously.

Second, schools should educate school adults, students, and parents about cyberbullying and provide clear procedures to follow when cyberbullying occurs. At the fundamental level, adults, including teachers and parents, need to keep pace with new technology to understand how students communicate and how cyberbullying happens. The results of this study indicate that school adults provide limited help, which might be caused by their lack of training in how to deal with cyberbullying. Effective strategies, therefore, need to be included in school adults' professional development opportunities. Schools can also provide opportunities for parents to learn such strategies. Similarly, approaches to cyberbullying issues need to go beyond the one-time workshop mode for students and be part of regular curriculum learning. Such education can take place in different school situations, including classrooms, assemblies, and continuing education programs. For example, schools can use forums not only to mediate between cyberbullies and cyber victims, but also to offer opportunities for students to develop adaptive skills, such as dealing with emotional conflict and building positive behavioral patterns. Such forums help to build a strong rapport and trustworthy relationships between students and school adults as well as among students. In addition, such events can involve parents to build their competency in stopping cyberbullying.

REFERENCES

Agnew R., White H.R. An empirical test of general strain theory. Criminology. 1992;30:475. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.1992.tb01113.x.

Arief, Barda Nawawi. (2002). Kebijakan Hukum Pidana. Bandung: PT. Citra Aditya Bakti.

Arthurs, H.W. (1983) *Law and Learning: Report to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada by the Consultative Group on Research and Education in Law*, Information Division, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Ottawa., pp. 63 – 71.

Cappadocia M.C., Craig W.M., Pepler D. Cyberbullying: prevalence, stability, and risk factors during adolescence. CJSP. 2013;28:171–192.

Carr A. The handbook of child and adolescent clinical psychology.: A contextual approach. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group; 2006.

Chang FC, Lee CM, Chiu CH, Hsi WY, Huang TF, Pan YC. Relationships among cyberbullying, school bullying, and mental health in Taiwanese adolescents. J Sch Health. 2013 Jun; 83(6):454-62.

Chooi, C. (2016). Understanding Thailand‟s Revised Computer Crime Act. Asian’s Correspondent. Retrieved from https://asiancorrespondent.com/2016/12/understanding-thailands-revisedcomputer-crimes-act/

Chynoweth, P. (2008) ‘Legal Research’ in Knight, A. and Ruddock, L., *Advanced Research Methods in the Built Environment*, Blackwells, Oxford, forthcoming.

Dellyana, Shant. (2001). Konsep Penegakan Hukum. Yogyakarta: Liberty

Gumpel T., Sutherland K.S. The relation between emotional and behavioral disorders and school-based violence. Aggress. Violent. Behav. 2010;15:349–356. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2010.06.003.

Hinduja S, Patchin JW. Bullying, cyberbullying, and suicide. Arch Suicide Res. 2010; 14(3):

Kowalski, R. M., Giumetti, G. W., Schroeder, A. N., & Lattanner, M. R. (2014). Bullying in the digital age: A critical review and meta-analysis of cyberbullying research among youth. Psychological Bulletin, 140. doi:10.1037/a0035618

Lam S.K., Hui E.K. Factors affecting the involvement of teachers in guidance and counseling as a whole-school approach. Br. J. Guid. Counc. 2010;38:219–234. doi: 10.1080/03069881003674962.

Olweus, D. (1999). Sweden. In P. K. Smith, Y. Morita, J. Junger-Tas, D. Olweus, R. Catalano, & P. Slee (Eds.), The nature of school bullying: A cross-national perspective. London: Routledge.

Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2012). Bullies move beyond the schoolyard: A preliminary look at cyberbullying. Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 4(2)

Raharjo, Satjipto. (2000). Ilmu Hukum.Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti.

Reksodipuro, Mardjono. (1997). Kriminologi dan Sistem Peradilan Pidana Kumpulan Karangan Buku Kedua. Jakarta: Pusat Pelayanan Keadilan dan Pengabdian Hukum Lembaga Kriminologi Universitas Indonesia.

Rigby, K. (2002). New perspectives on bullying. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Safaria, T. (2016). Prevalence and Impact of Cyberbullying in a Sample of Indonesian Junior High School Students. TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal Technology, 15 (1),

Safaria, T., Suyono, H., & Tentama, F. (2016). Cyberbully, Cybervictim, and Forgiveness among Indonesian High School Students. TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal Technology, 15 (3),

Sittichai, R. & Smith, P. (2018). Bullying and Cyberbullying in Thailand: Coping Strategies and Relation to Age, Gender, Religion and Victim Status. Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research, 7(1).

Smith, P. K. (2014). Understanding school bullying: Its nature and prevention strategies. London: Sage. doi:10.4135/9781473906853

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, 376-385. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01846.x

Songsiri, N. & Musikaphan, W. (2011). Cyber-bullying among Secondary and Vocational Students in Bangkok. Journal of Population and Social Studies, 19(2),

Sunarno, Siswanto. (2008). Hukum Pemerintahan Daerah di Indonesia. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.

Susan Bissell. (2012). The 'State of the Art' in Child Protection Systems. International Conference :A Better Way to Protect ALL children: The theory and practice of child protection systems. Delhi, 13–16 November 2012

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

UNICEF (2014). Study: Most Children in Indonesia are Online Now, But Many are Not Aware of Potential Risks. Retrieved from https://www.unicef.org/indonesia/media_22167.html

Varjas K, Talley J, Meyers J, Parris L, Cutts H. High school students' perceptions of motivations for cyberbullying: an exploratory study. West J Emerg Med. 2010 Aug; 11(3)

A.C. Baldry, D. Farrington, A. Sorrentino, Am I at risk of cyberbullying"?. A narrative review and conceptual framework for research on risk of cyberbullying and cybervictimization: The risk and needs assessment approach, Aggression and Violent Behavior, 23 (2015)

T. Beran, Q. Li, The relationship between cyberbullying and school bullying. Journal of Student Wellbeing, 1 (2) (2008)

M. Callaghan, C. Kelly, M. Molcho, Exploring traditional and cyberbullying among Irish adolescents, International Journal of Public Health, 60 (2) (2015)

R. Del Rey, J.A. Casas, R. Ortega-Ruiz, A. Schultze-Krumbholz, H. Scheithauer, P. Smith, *et al.* Structural validation and cross-cultural robustness of the European Cyberbullying Intervention Project Questionnaire, Computers in Human Behavior, 50 (2015)

D.P. Farrington, Understanding and preventing bullying M. Tonry, N. Morris (Eds.), Crime and Justice, Vol. 17, University of Chicago Press, Chicago (1993),

L.V. Hedges, E.C. Hedberg, Interclass correlations for planning group randomized experiments in rural education, Journal of Research in Rural Education, 22 (10) (2007)

S. Hinduja, J.W. Patchin Cyberbullying: An exploratory analysis of factors related to offending and victimization Deviant Behavior, 29 (2) (2008)

R.M. Kowalski, G.W. Giumetti, A.N. Schroeder, M.R. Lattanner, Bullying in the digital age: A critical review and meta-analysis of cyberbullying research among youth. Psychological Bulletin, 140 (4) (2014)

R.M. Kowalski, S.P. Limber Electronic bullying among middle school students. Journal of Adolescent Health, 41 (6) (2007)

R.M. Kowalski, S.P. Limber, Psychological, physical, and academic correlates of cyberbullying and traditional bullying Journal of Adolescent Health, 53 (1) (2013)

R.M. Kowalski, C.A. Morgan, S.P. LimberTraditional bullying as a potential warning sign of cyberbullying. School Psychology International, 33 (5) (2012)

C. McGuckin, P.K. Cummins, C.A. Lewis f2f and cyberbullying among children in Northern Ireland: Data from the Kids Life and Times Surveys Psychology, Society & Education, 2 (2) (2010)

F. Mishna, M. Khoury-Kassabri, T. Gadalla, J. Daciuk. Risk factors for involvement in cyber bullying: Victims, bullies and bully-victims Children and Youth Services Review, 34 (1) (2012), pp. 63-70

G. Mura, D. Diamantini Cyberbullying among Colombian students: An exploratory investigation European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education, 3 (3) (2013), pp. 249-256,

D. Olweus Cyberbullying: An overrated phenomenon? European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 9 (5) (2012)

D. Olweus School bullying: Development and some important challenges Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 9 (2013),

R. Ortega, J. Calmaestra, J.A. Mora-Merchán Cyberbullying. International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy, 8 (2) (2008),

R. Ortega, P. Elipe, J.A. Mora-Merchán, J. Calmaestra, E. Vega The emotional impact on victims of traditional bullying and cyberbullying. A Study of Spanish Adolescents. Zeitschrift für Psychologie/Journal of Psychology, 217 (4) (2009)

J.W. Patchin, S. Hinduja. Bullies move beyond the schoolyard a preliminary look at cyberbullying. Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 4 (2) (2006),

J.W. Patchin, S. Hinduja Measuring Cyberbullying: Implications for Research. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 23 (2015)

J. Raskauskas, A.D. Stoltz Involvement in traditional and electronic bullying among adolescents Developmental Psychology, 43 (3) (2007),

R. Slonje, P.K. Smith Cyberbullying: Another main type of bullying? Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 49 (2) (2008)

R. Slonje, P.K. Smith, A. Frisén The nature of cyberbullying, and strategies for prevention, Computers in Human Behavior, 29 (2013)

S. Bauman, D. Cross, J. Walker (Eds.), Principles of cyberbullying research: Definitions measures and methodology, Routledge, New York (2013),

P.K. Smith, J. Mahdavi, M. Carvalho, S. Fisher, S. Russell, N. Tippett. Cyberbullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 49 (4) (2008),
F. Sticca, S. Ruggieri, F. Alsaker, S. Perren. Longitudinal risk factors for cyberbullying in adolescence. Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 23 (2013)
T. Tarablus, T. Heiman, D. Olenik-Shemesh. Cyber bullying among teenagers in Israel: An examination of cyberbullying, traditional bullying, and socioemotional Functioning Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 24 (6) (2015),
R.S. Tokunaga. Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of research on cyberbullying victimization Computers in Human Behavior, 26 (3) (2010),
K. Van Cleemput, H. Vandebosch, S. Pabian Personal characteristics and contextual factors that determine "helping,""joining in" and "doing nothing" when witnessing cyberbullying. Aggressive Behavior, 40 (5) (2014),
T.E. Waasdorp, C.P. Bradshaw The overlap between cyberbullying and traditional bullying. Journal of Adolescent Health, 56 (5) (2015)
J. Wang, R.J. Iannotti, T.R. Nansel School bullying among adolescents in the United States: Physical, verbal, relational, and cyber Journal of Adolescent Health, 45 (4) (2009),
N.E. Willard Cyberbullying and cyberthreats: Responding to the challenge of online social aggression, threats, and distress Research Press, Champaign, IL (2007)
J. Wolak, K.J. Mitchell, D. Finkelhor Does online harassment constitute bullying?. An exploration of online harassment by known peers and online-only contacts Journal of Adolescent Health, 41 (6) (2007),
D.S. Wong, H.C.O. Chan, C.H. Cheng Cyberbullying perpetration and victimization among adolescents in Hong Kong Children and Youth Services Review, 36 (2014),
S.J. Yang, R. Stewart, J.Y. Lee, J.M. Kim, S.W. Kim, I.S. Shin, J.S. Yoon Prevalence and correlates of problematic internet experiences and computer-Using Time: A two-year longitudinal study in Korean school children Psychiatry Investigation, 11 (2014)
M.L. Ybarra, K.J. Mitchell Online aggressor/targets, aggressors, and targets: A comparison of associated youth characteristics Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 45 (7) (2004),
M.L. Ybarra, D. Boyd, J.D. Korchmaros, J.K. Oppenheim Defining and measuring cyberbullying within the larger context of bullying victimization. Journal of Adolescent Health, 51 (2012)
M.L. Ybarra, M. Diener-West, P.J. Leaf Examining the overlap in internet harassment and school bullying: Implications for school intervention. Journal of Adolescent Health, 41 (6) (2007),
I. Zych, R. Ortega-Ruiz, R. Del Rey Scientific research on bullying and cyberbullying: where have we been and where are we going. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 24 (2015),

Rasdi,
Universitas Negeri Semarang,
Semarang-Indonesia
Email: mr.rasdi@mail.unnes.ac.id

Co Author:
Benny Sumardiana,
Universitas Negeri Semarang,
Semarang-Indonesia
Email: benny.sumardiana@mail.unnes.ac.id

Sonny Saptoajie Wicaksono,
Universitas Negeri Semarang,
Semarang-Indonesia
Email: sonnywicaksono@mail.unnes.ac.id

Diandra Preludio Ramada,
Universitas Negeri Semarang,
Semarang-Indonesia
Email: diandraramada@gmail.com