# *A Study of Cyberbullying Patterns Among Thai Youths*

Pawarin Choti, Burapha University, Thailand
Juthamas Haenjohn, Burapha University, Thailand
Warakorn Subwirapakorn, Burapha University, Thailand

The Asian Conference on Psychology & the Behavioral Sciences 2024
Official Conference Proceedings

**Abstract**
This research is a survey research with the objectives to 1) obtain the pattern of cyber bullying among Thai teenagers 2) know the personal factors (gender, family, hours of internet use, and number of internet access devices) affecting the pattern of cyber bullying in Thai youths and 3) use the obtained model to analyze impacts related to the brain, mind, and learning and create a program to reduce such impacts. The sample group consisted of 405 teenagers aged 18-22 years in Chonburi province who completed electronic questionnaires consisting of 1) general information questionnaire 2) Adolescent Cyber-Aggressor Scale (CYB-AGS) 3) Cyber-Victimization Scale (CYBVICS) and 4) Cyberbullying Bystander Scale (CBS). The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and the survey data was analyzed using Repeated One-way: ANOVA. The research found that 1) overall, youth have Patterns of being a passive witness to cyber bullying. 2) Male and female teenagers have a pattern of being passive witnesses to cyberbullying than do alternative genders, at a statistical significance of .05.3) Youth living with their father or mother had significantly higher cyberbullying patterns than youth living with both parents and youth living alone at the level .05. For the variables Internet usage hours and number of Internet access devices, there were various and unrelated patterns related to cyberbullying.

Keywords: Cyberbullying Patterns, Gender, Family, Internet Hours and Number of Internet Access Tools

## Introduction

In the digital world, where the internet and social media play an important role in human life. Most of the activities that once took place in the real world now take place in cyberspace. One thing that is emerging and is a big problem today is cyber bullying, which is the act of harassing another person using digital technologies such as social media, texting, gaming, and mobile phones, etc. Cyberbullying is repetitive behavior and is intended to shock, upset, anger or embarrass the victim. Through various methods such as lying or posting embarrassing pictures of others on social media, sending threatening messages, vulgar messages to harass the target (Olenik-Shemesh, Heiman and Zur,2019) by various media such as emails, chat rooms, social networks such as Facebook, Twitter that can Interact and share, replicate instantly to a wide audience at any time of the day or night without revealing your identity.

Those who do these things may not be aware of the consequences and the information posted remains in the cyber media indefinitely (Ruiz, 2019). Cyberbullying is spread all over the world and affects the brain, mind, and learning of the harasser, the victim, and the victim. For example, Faryadi's research (Faryadi, 2011) found that 13% of 365 college students experienced emotional problems due to cyberbullying, which 85% stated that cyberbullying causes emotional and mental stress, 70.8% has a negative effect on academic performance, 16.6% said they had bullied others on campus at least 2 or 3 times a month, 1.1% had bullied people outside of the university at least 2 or 3 times a month. 20.8% had heard cyberbullying stories or being knowledgeable of bullying that occurs within the university. From research with respondents of various ages, it was found that 14.9% had been victims of cyber bullying, with 2.2% having experienced bullying in during the past month. Meanwhile, young people aged 18-25 years experienced the highest levels of cyberbullying over the past month. The elder had the lowest experience of cyberbullying among those aged 66 and over (Wang, Yogeeswaran, Andrews, Hawi, & Sibley, 2019). 80% of teens have experienced cyberbullying at least once (Lianos and McGrath, 2018). A study in Indonesia of secondary school students found that 80% experienced occasional to almost daily cyberbullying. A relationship has been found between being the victim of cyber bullying and students' level of psychological distress (Safaria, 2016). A total of 63 studies from 2015 - 2019 on cyber bullying among teenagers found that the prevalence rate of cyber bullies ranged from 6 - 46.3%, and the prevalence rate of cyber bullies ranged from 13.99 -. 57.5% and found that verbal violence is the most common form of cyberbullying (Zhu, Huang, Evans, & Zhang, 2021). In a Korean study, 34% of student respondents participated in cyberbullying, with 6.3% being a perpetrator, 14.6 % being a victim, and 13.1% being both a perpetrator and a victim. Boys have a higher percentage of cyberbullying than girls (Lee and Shin, 2017). In Thailand, cyber bullying tends to be more serious. From preliminary survey data in 2017, a study of cyber bullying from 14 countries around the world, it was found that 80% had been harassed in real life, 66% had been harassed once a week, 12% had been harassed every day, 45 % have been cyber-harassed at least once, a statistic 4 times higher than in the United States, Europe, and Japan (Pornnoppadol, 2017). Students who were cyber-harassed accounted for 54.57%, with female students having a higher chance of being harassed than male students. The most common form of bullying is 60.73% is gossip through online media, 42.86% of the reasons for bullying come from having had a dispute before in the real area (Lertratthamrongkul, 2021). Experiences of cyber bullying among 354 middle school students from 6 schools in Bangkok. It was found that 44.60% had experience of being victims of cyber bullying, with 33.1% being the perpetrators and 67.8% being victims of bullying (Auemaneekul, Powwattana, Kiatsiri, & Thananowan, 2020).

Cyberbullying has many direct and indirect effects, such as mental health effects including anxiety, stress, depression, self-harm and suicide (Kimalee, 2020). Decreased mental well-being (Sittichai & Smith, 2020). Low levels of self-control and higher levels of stress, with anger is a mediator between stress and cyberbullying (Lianos & McGrath, 2018). It was found that 13% of the survey participants experienced emotional problems, 85% experienced emotional and mental stress, 70% affected their studies (Faryadi, 2011). It was found that men with higher levels of social media use had more depression and anxiety, which predicted more cyberbullying and cyberbullying. In contrast, in women, depression and anxiety were not associated with cyberbullying (Schodt, Quiroz, Wheeler, Hall, & Silva, 2021). Researchers have found that cyberbullying is characterized by high levels of aggression, low empathy, depression, alcohol use, increased hostility problems, and psychopathology (Savage & Tokunaga, 2017). Victims often have low self-esteem, depression, anxiety, and suicidal thoughts and attempts (Mitchell, et al., 2016). While Cyberbullying Bystanders tend to show low levels of empathy (Van Cleemput, Vandebosch, & Pabian, 2014). Cyber-victim has higher cortisol secretion and greater perceived stress compared to Cyber-perpetrator and Cyberbullying bystander. Being Cyber-victim may stimulate the activity of brain areas. Hypothalamicpituitary -adrenocortical axis (González-Cabrera, Calvete, León-Mejía, Pérez-Sancho, and Peinado, 2017). Boys with high cyberbullying experience had higher levels of distress and smaller vlPFC structures compared to boys with low distress and low cyberbullying experience. Researchers suggest that stress affects brain development (du Plessis M. R., Smeekens, Cillessen, Whittle, & Güroğlu, 2019). McLoughlin and colleagues (McLoughlin, Lagopoulos, & Hermens, 2020) are the first researchers to assess cyberbullying situations by using functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI) to measure how cyberbullying bystanders respond to stimuli. and found that such stimuli stimulate responses in many areas of the brain, including those linked to social and emotional processing. And they found that people who had not experienced cyberbullying had a greater response in brain regions responsible for feeling self-conscious. And they found that women had a stronger response to stimuli in the right ACC, a brain region that plays a key role in processing empathy when witnessing cyberbullying. Quinlan and colleagues (Quinlan, et al., 2020) studied the connection between adolescent brain development. Cyberbullying and schizophrenia have been investigated with changes in the volume of the left putamen, with a smaller size being associated with anxiety.

Boys are more likely to be cyberbullied while girls are more likely to be victims (Chang, 2021). 54.57% of students who were cyber-harassed, female students were more likely to be harassed than male students (Lertratthamrongkul, 2021). On the other hand, a survey of 1,817 teenagers between 13 and 17 years old (56% female) found that girls participate in cyberbullying. This has been traced back to an increased amount of online social activity and online contact. while boys had higher exposure to antisocial media content and predicted higher levels of victimization over time (Festl & Quandt, 2016). Across 27 empirical studies of LGBTQ people, between 10.5% and 71.3% of cyberbullying among young people has negative psychological and psychological consequences and emotion (suicidal thoughts and attempts, depression, lower self-esteem), behavior (physical aggression and loneliness), and lower academic performance (Abreu & Kenny, 2018).

The relationship between average daily internet use among high school students and having experienced cyberbullying was 54% among those who used the internet >3 hours/day, 39% compared to those who used the internet 1-3 hours/day, and 30% among users less than 1 hour/day (Chi, Lan, Ngan, & Linh, 2020). Information about children ages 11-15 (180,919 in 42 countries) who participated in the 2017-2018 School-Age Behavior Study. It was found

that being a cyber-perpetrator and being a cyber-victim were related to social media use (Craig, et al., 2020).

Adults who reported childhood experiences of higher levels of sibling rivalry and hostility were more likely to that will become a vice between siblings. Conversely, sibling bullying is associated with lower self-esteem and life satisfaction (Plamondon, Bouchard, &Lachance-Grzela, 2021). A review of the role of family variables in abuse and cyber-victims across 34 studies found that the most consistent dynamic variables were family communication and quality of family relationships. (López-Castro & Diana, 2019).

Therefore, the researcher is interested in studying the patterns of cyber bullying among Thai teenagers in order to know the characteristics of being a Cyber-perpetrator or Cyber-victim or Cyberbullying perpetrator-victim or Cyberbullying bystander, how are similar or different? And differences between the genders, which according to many studies are different and to obtain patterns of cyber bullying among the youth and gender population in Thailand that truly need help. With that help, strategies can be used to create assistance programs that are appropriate for this population group.

## Methodology

### Participants

The sample consisted of 400 people involved in cyberbullying among teenagers aged 17-22 years. The sample size was determined according to the views of R.V. Krejcie and D.W. Morgan (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). Random sampling in higher education institutions in Chonburi Province, 400 people from a total of 49,528 people (Office of the Eastern Special Development Zone Policy Committee, 2018), gender not limited. Not specifying whether left- or right-handedness is voluntary through self-administered questionnaires related to executive functions and/or through an intermediary is anger that results in cyberbullying among teenagers. Criteria for selecting the sample included age 17 - 22 years, no serious illness that would be an obstacle to participating in the program, and consent to participate in research. The criteria for excluding the sample were those who did not complete the questionnaire.

### Measures

Research tools are the Cyber-Aggressor Scale (CYB-AGS) (Buelga & Pons, 2020) consists of 18 items that directly and indirectly measure cyberbullying. Ranked on a Likert scale of 1 (never) to 5 (always), these items measure youth' experiences as Cyber-perpetrator in the past 12 months with Cronbach's alpha = 0.94, the revised Cybervictimization Scale (CYBVIC) (Buelga, Cava, & Musitu, 2019) is an updated version of the 12 months cyber-perpetrator scale. Eighteen self-reported past experiences were rated on a scale from 1 (never) to 5 (always) by lemurs. Cronbach's alpha = 0.88. And the Cyberbullying Bystander Scale (CBS) (Sarmiento, Herrera-López, & Zych, 2019) has 40 items distributed among 6 factors. alpha=0.90 Defender of the cyber victim online has Cronbach's alpha = 0.91 and Reinforcer of the cyber bully online has Cronbach's alpha=0.94.

**Procedure**

This research study is survey research to find patterns of cyberbullying among Thai teenagers. It consists of the following steps: 1) Collect and create tools used to survey personal information, including gender, age, education level, number of hours of internet use, type and number of tools for accessing the internet, and living with family. 2 ) Contact the creator of the scale and create a Thai version of the scale following the back translation process, including the Cyber-Aggressor Scale (CYB-AGS), Cybervictimization Scale (CYBVIC), and Cyberbullying Bystander Scale (CBS). 3) Verify the accuracy of personal measures and measures related to cyber bullying in the Thai version by experts. 4) Test all measures by doing a try out with a population of people who have the specified qualifications and test Reliability of all measurements with Cronbach's Alpha. 5) All measures were tested with 400 questionnaire participants in Chonburi Province. 6) Analyzed the data obtained from item 5 and processed with a computer statistical program. Both descriptive statistics and inferential statistics include t-test values and F-test values to explain and compare differences between hypothesized variables.

**Result**

From Table 1 is information on youth involved in cyber bullying aged 18-22 years in Chonburi Province, 62.2% are 33.1% were female, 4.7% were male, and were transgender, respectively.

Table 1: Information on youth involved in cyber bullying aged 18-22 years in Chonburi Province

| Gender | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | 134 | 33.1 | 33.1 | 33.1 |
| Male | 252 | 62.2 | 62.2 | 95.3 |
| LGBTQ | 19 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 405 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Comparative analysis of cyber bullying patterns among teenagers aged 18-22 years in Chonburi Province.

Table 2: ANOVA summary table for Comparative analysis of cyber bullying patterns classified by gender variable

| Variable | | SS | df | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mean_CA | Between Groups | .440 | 2 | .220 | 1.954 | .143 |
| | Within Groups | 45.281 | 402 | .113 | | |
| | Total | 45.721 | 404 | | | |
| Mean_CV | Between Groups | .046 | 2 | .023 | .193 | .824 |
| | Within Groups | 48.225 | 402 | .120 | | |
| | Total | 48.272 | 404 | | | |
| Mean_CBSP | Between Groups | .483 | 2 | .241 | 1.710 | .182 |
| | Within Groups | 56.754 | 402 | .141 | | |
| | Total | 57.237 | 404 | | | |
| Mean_CBSV | Between Groups | .302 | 2 | .151 | .431 | .650 |
| | Within Groups | 140.782 | 402 | .350 | | |
| | Total | 141.084 | 404 | | | |
| Mean_CBI | Between Groups | 29.392 | 2 | 14.696 | 8.231 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 717.778 | 402 | 1.786 | | |
| | Total | 747.170 | 404 | | | |

Note: SS sums of square, MS mean squares

From Table 2, it is found that the Cyberbullying bystander Ignorant model (CBI) or Passive outside online were significantly different at the .05 level, while the Cyberbullying bystander support perpetrator (CBSP), Cyberbullying bystander support victim (CBSV), Cyber-perpetrator, and Cyber-victim models were not significantly different.

Comparative analysis of cyber bullying patterns classified by living with family variables.

Table 3: ANOVA summary table for Comparative analysis of cyberbullying patterns classified by living with family variables (n = 405)

| Variable | | SS | df | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mean_CA | Between Groups | 1.713 | 3 | .571 | 5.204 | .002 |
| | Within Groups | 44.008 | 401 | .110 | | |
| | Total | 45.721 | 404 | | | |
| Mean_CV | Between Groups | 1.250 | 3 | .417 | 3.554 | .015 |
| | Within Groups | 47.021 | 401 | .117 | | |
| | Total | 48.272 | 404 | | | |
| Mean_CBSP | Between Groups | .417 | 3 | .139 | .981 | .401 |
| | Within Groups | 56.820 | 401 | .142 | | |
| | Total | 57.237 | 404 | | | |
| Mean_CBSV | Between Groups | .144 | 3 | .048 | .136 | .938 |
| | Within Groups | 140.940 | 401 | .351 | | |
| | Total | 141.084 | 404 | | | |
| Mean_CBI | Between Groups | 12.871 | 3 | 4.290 | 2.343 | .073 |
| | Within Groups | 734.299 | 401 | 1.831 | | |
| | Total | 747.170 | 404 | | | |

From Table 3, it was found that the comparative analysis of cyber bullying patterns classified according to the variables of living with family when considered on a side by side basis found that the patterns Cyber-perpetrator and Cyber-victim are significantly different at the .05 level. While the Cyberbullying bystander Ignorant model (CBI), Cyberbullying bystander

support perpetrator (CBSP) and Cyberbullying bystander support victim (CBSV), there is no difference.

Comparative analysis of cyber bullying patterns classified according to the variable of hours of internet use.

Table 4: ANOVA summary table for Comparative analysis of cyber bullying patterns classified by internet hours variable (n = 405)

| Variable | | SS | df | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mean_CA | Between Groups | 1.601 | 4 | .400 | 3.628 | .006 |
| | Within Groups | 44.120 | 400 | .110 | | |
| | Total | 45.721 | 404 | | | |
| Mean_CV | Between Groups | .576 | 4 | .144 | 1.208 | .307 |
| | Within Groups | 47.695 | 400 | .119 | | |
| | Total | 48.272 | 404 | | | |
| Mean_CBSP | Between Groups | .944 | 4 | .236 | 1.677 | .154 |
| | Within Groups | 56.293 | 400 | .141 | | |
| | Total | 57.237 | 404 | | | |
| Mean_CBSV | Between Groups | 2.501 | 4 | .625 | 1.805 | .127 |
| | Within Groups | 138.583 | 400 | .346 | | |
| | Total | 141.084 | 404 | | | |
| Mean_CBI | Between Groups | 86.554 | 4 | 21.638 | 13.102 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 660.616 | 400 | 1.652 | | |
| | Total | 747.170 | 404 | | | |

From Table 4, It was found that the comparative analysis of cyber bullying patterns classified according to the variables of living with family when considered on a side by side basis found that the patterns Cyber-perpetrator and Cyberbullying bystander Ignorant (CBI), are significantly different at the .05 level. While the Cyber-victim, Cyberbullying bystander support perpetrator (CBSP) and Cyberbullying bystander support victim (CBSV), there is no difference.

Comparative analysis of cyber bullying patterns classified by number of internet access devices.

Table 5: ANOVA summary table for Comparative analysis of cyber bullying patterns classified by number of internet access devices (n = 405)

| Variable | | SS | df | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mean_CA | Between Groups | .653 | 3 | .218 | 1.938 | .123 |
| | Within Groups | 45.068 | 401 | .112 | | |
| | Total | 45.721 | 404 | | | |
| Mean_CV | Between Groups | 1.983 | 3 | .661 | 5.728 | .001 |
| | Within Groups | 46.288 | 401 | .115 | | |
| | Total | 48.272 | 404 | | | |
| Mean_CBSP | Between Groups | 2.460 | 3 | .820 | 6.003 | .001 |
| | Within Groups | 54.777 | 401 | .137 | | |
| | Total | 57.237 | 404 | | | |
| Mean_CBSV | Between Groups | .961 | 3 | .320 | .917 | .433 |
| | Within Groups | 140.123 | 401 | .349 | | |
| | Total | 141.084 | 404 | | | |
| Mean_CBI | Between Groups | 79.727 | 3 | 26.576 | 15.967 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 667.443 | 401 | 1.664 | | |
| | Total | 747.170 | 404 | | | |

From Table 5, It was found that the comparative analysis of cyber bullying patterns classified by the variable number of internet access devices when considered on a side by side basis found that the patterns Cyberbullying bystander Ignorant (CBI), Cyber-victim, and Cyberbullying bystander support perpetrator (CBSP) were significantly different at the .05 level. While the format There is no difference between Cyber-perpetrator and Cyberbullying bystander support victim (CBSV).

**Conclusion**

Overall, it was found that teenagers had the Cyberbullying bystander Ignorant pattern more than the Cyber-perpetrator, Cyber-victim, Cyberbullying bystander support perpetrator (CBSP) and Cyberbullying bystander support victim (CBSV) patterns.

Male youth have a significantly higher pattern of Cyberbullying bystander Ignorant (CBI) than those of alternative genders at the .05 level, and female youth have a higher pattern of Cyberbullying bystander Ignorant (CBI) than those of sexual genders. Selected for statistical significance at the .05 level. The patterns of Cyberbullying bystander Ignorant (CBI) of male and female teenagers were not different. The patterns of being Cyber-perpetrator, Cyber-victim, Cyberbullying bystander support perpetrator (CBSP) and Cyberbullying bystander support victim (CBSV) among male, female and transgender youths were not different.

The pattern of being a Cyber-perpetrator of youth living with father or mother is higher than that of youth living with both father and mother, with statistical significance at the .05 level. And the pattern of being a Cyber-perpetrator of youth living with father or mother is higher than that of youth living alone, with statistical significance at the .05 level. As for the pattern of being a Cyber-perpetrator, youth living with father or mother and youth living with relatives are not different. Patterns of being Cyber-victim, Cyberbullying bystander support perpetrator (CBSP), Cyberbullying bystander support victim (CBSV) and Cyberbullying bystander Ignorant in youth living with father and mother, youth living with relatives and youth housing alone is no different.

The pattern of being Cyberbullying bystander Ignorant (CBI) of youth with internet usage hours of more than 9 hours per day is significantly higher than youths with internet usage hours of 5-6 hours per day and 3-4 hours per day. Statistically significant at the .05 level. There is no difference in the pattern of Cyberbullying bystander Ignorant (CBI) among youth with more than 9 hours of internet use per day and youth with 7-8 and 1-2 hours of internet use per day. The cyber-perpetrator pattern of youth who use the internet 7-8 hours per day is significantly higher than that of youth who use the internet more than 9 hours per day at the .05 level. Pattern of being a Cyber-perpetrator of youth with internet usage hours of 7-8 hours per day with youth having 1-2 hours of internet use hours per day, 3-4 hours per day and 5-6 hours per day There is no difference. and the pattern of being Cyber-victim, Cyberbullying bystander support perpetrator (CBSP), Cyberbullying bystander support victim (CBSV) in youth with internet usage hours of 1-2 hours per day, 3-4 hours per day, 5-6 hours per day, 7-8 hours per day, and more than 9 hours per day were not different.

The pattern of being a cyber-perpetrator in youth with 3 internet access devices is higher than in youth with 2, with statistical significance at the .05 level. There is no difference in the pattern of being a cyber-victim in youth with the number of internet access devices 3 versus 1 and more than 4. The Cyberbullying bystander support perpetrator (CBSP) pattern in youth with a higher number of internet access devices 1 than youth with 3, and in youth with 2 internet access devices, it is higher than youth with 3, with statistical significance at the .05 level. As for the Cyberbullying bystander support perpetrator (CBSP) pattern, there is no difference between youth with 1 piece and youth with 2 pieces and more than 4 pieces. And there is no difference between cyberbullying bystander support victim (CBSV) in youth with more than 4 and youth with 2 and 3. The pattern is Cyberbullying bystander Ignorant (CBI) in youth that is 2 pieces higher than youth that has 1 piece, in youth that is 3 pieces higher than youth that is 1 and 2 pieces, and in youth that is more than 4 pieces higher than youth that is 4 pieces higher. youth that has 1 piece with statistical significance at the .05 level. There was no difference in youth with 2, 3, and 4 pieces.

**Discussion**

Overall, it was found that youth aged 18-22 in Chonburi province have more Cyberbullying bystander Ignorant (CBI) patterns than other patterns. This is consistent with a study of experiential, psychological, and situational factors influencing the behavioral reactions of 331 bystanders of cyberbullying in Seoul, South Korea. The majority were indifferent (n = 201, 60.7%), followed by defensive bystanders. (n = 101, 30.5%), supportive bystanders (n = 18, 5.4%) and bullying bystanders (n = 11, 3.3%) (Song & Oh, 2018) Study among young people in Malaysia. A total of 399 respondents were surveyed, including witnesses to cyberbullying (N = 194), victims (N = 117), and bullies (N = 26) (Balakrishnan & Norman , 2020). Research examining emotional reactions and actions related to cyberbullying, focusing on Cyber-perpetrator, Cyber-victim and Cyberbullying bystander among 1,158 Malaysian university students, indicates that 8% (N=93) were bullied. ,18.6% (N=216) were a victim, 15.2% (N=174) were bullied and victimized, and 53.4% (N=675) Cyberbullied bystander in the past year. (Balakrishnan, 2018). According to these studies, the percentage of Cyberbullying bystanders is higher than any other role. Significantly, it is necessary to deeply understand the nature and behavior of Cyberbullying bystanders as the impact their actions can have on the development, situation and experience of Cyber-victim and Cyber-perpetrator. While this is counter to other research that has found prevalence rates among groups involved in cyberbullying vary, for example, the most comprehensive classification study groups bystanders of cyberbullying into five sub-roles. There was a difference between

victim defenders (54.6%), victim advocates (18.3%), passive victims of bullying (22.7%), cyberbullying promoters (1.6%) and aggressors' assistants (2.2%). Positive behavior in the case of those who protect the victim, those who disrupt the situation and those who provide assistance. This is in contrast to teenagers who only support the victim but do not stop attacking the aggressor (González-Cabrera, León-Mejí a, Machimbarrena, Balea, & Calvete, 2019).

Male adolescents had a significantly higher pattern of being passive bystanders of cyberbullying than did homosexuals, and female adolescents had a significantly higher pattern of being passive bystanders of cyberbullying. Statistically at the .05 level, males and females were not different. This is consistent with research that supports the results of male bystanders of cyberbullying. For example, a study examining the gender and age of cyberbullying witnesses of 2,109 students in Australia analyzed the actions of cyberbullying witnesses when One friend found that victims of cyberbullying found that bystanders of cyberbullying were less likely to do anything or help the victim, while girls were more likely to help students who were cyberbullied than boys (Campbell, et al. , 2017) Research into the role of gender and brain activity when witnessing cyberbullying indicates that there is a significant relationship between BOLD signal and bullying witness scores in males but not females. This is in contrast to research studies of experimental situations that examine the influence of contextual factors. (Severity of the event) and the behavior of other bystanders) on the behavior of bystanders of cyberbullying, intent to help the bully or reinforce the bully in the case of harassment on Facebook, indicating that female bystanders of bullying Males are more likely to support cyber victims (Bastiaensens, et al., 2014). This is the form of being a witness to cyber bullying and supporting the victim. Patterns of being a victim of cyberbullying. Patterns of being a witness to cyberbullying. Supporting the bully. And there are no differences in patterns of cyberbullying among male, female, and genderqueer youth. For example, research on intervention by bystanders of cyberbullying indicates that there are no differences between males and females. In terms of being a bystander to cyberbullying who supports the victim (Lyndsay, Jenkins, Fredrick, & Nickerson, 2018), this is counter to research that finds that bystanders of cyberbullying are the most common, such as studies of the prevalence of Cyberbullying and moral consequences in the relationship between Big Five personality traits and cyberbullying in undergraduate students655 Significant gender differences were found in cyberbullying, with males reporting more cyberbullying than females in all three dimensions: perpetration; Victimization and bystander behavior (Patterson, Allan, & Cross, 2017) Review of empirical studies 27 Pieces that examined the impact of cyberbullying on LGBTQ youth found it to be between 10.5% and 71.3% (Abreu & Kenny, 2018).

Living with family and being a Cyber-perpetrator and being a Cyber-victim are significantly different at the .05 level, while being a Cyberbullying bystander support victim (CBSV), Cyberbullying bystander support There is no difference between perpetrator (CBSP) and Cyberbullying bystander Ignorant (CBI). The pattern of cyberbullying in youth living with father or mother was significantly higher than youth living with father and mother at the .05 level and higher than youth living with father or mother. Living alone has statistical significance at the .05 level. This is consistent with the results of research showing that the level of cyberbullying is higher among individuals with divorced parents than among individuals with intact families. (Ozden-Yildirim, 2019). Students from single-parent families have been found to be more likely to be cyber-harassed (Bevilacqua, et al., 2017). Individuals with divorced/widowed parents are more likely to be cyber-victims (Abdulsalam, Al Daihani, & Francis, 2017).

Hours of internet use and the pattern of being a Cyber-perpetrator and the pattern of being a Cyberbullying bystander Ignorant (CBI) are significantly different at the .05 level, while the patterns of being a Cyber-victim, Cyberbullying bystander support victim ( CBSV) and Cyberbullying bystander support perpetrator (CBSP) are no different.

The pattern of being a witness to cyber bullying among teenagers is that they use the internet for more than 9 hours per day. Higher than teenagers who have internet usage hours of 5-6 and 3-4 hours per day with statistical significance at the .05 level, consistent with a survey of the relationship between the average time of using the internet per day in Vietnam, 215 people did. An online survey found that the prevalence of having experienced cyberbullying was 54% among those who used the Internet >3 hours per day, compared to 39% among those who used the internet >3 hours per day, compared to 39% among those who used the internet 1–3. hours and 30% among users <1 hour (Chi P. L., Lan, Ngan, & Linh, 2020), which is counter to the increased prevalence of being a bully and being the victim of cyberbullying when More hours of internet use Students who use the website High social network and high experience of cyber victimization Tend to engage in a variety of bystander behaviors (Jia, Wu, Jin, & Zhang, 2022).

The number of Internet access tools and the modes of being Cyber-victim, Cyberbullying bystander support perpetrator (CBSP), and Cyberbullying bystander Ignorant (CBI) were significantly different at the .05 level, while Cyber-perpetrator was significantly different. and the form of Cyberbullying bystander support victim (CBSV) are not different. However, various research studies do not focus on the number of Internet access devices.

**References**


Abdulsalam A.J., Al Daihani A.E., & Francis K. (2017). Prevalence and Associated Factors of Peer Victimization (Bullying) among Grades 7 and 8 Middle School Students in Kuwait. *Int J Pediatr.*

Abreu R.L., Kenny M.C. (2017). Cyberbullying and LGBTQ Youth: A Systematic Literature Review and Recommendations for Prevention and Intervention. *J Child Adolesc Trauma*.11(1):81-97.

Auemaneekul, N., Powwattana, A., Kiatsiri, E., & Thananowan, N. (2020). Investigating the mechanisms of theory of planned behavior on Cyberbullying among Thai adolescents. *Journal of Health Research*, 34(1), 42-55.

Balakrishnan, V. (2018). Actions, emotional reactions and cyberbullying – From the lens of bullies, victims, bully-victims and bystanders among Malaysian young adults. *Telematics and Informatics*, 35, 1190-1200.

Balakrishnan V., & Norman A.A. (2020). Psychological motives of cyberbullying among Malaysian young adults. *Asia Pacific Journal of Social Work and Development*. 30.

Bastiaensens S., Vandebosch H., Poels K., Van Cleemput K., DeSmet A., & De Bourdeaudhuij D. (2014). Cyberbullying on social network sites. An experimental study into bystanders' behavioural intentions to help the victim or reinforce the bully. *Comput. Hum. Behav*, 31, 259– 271.

Bevilacqua L., Shackleton N., Hale D., Allen E., Bond L., Christie D., Elbourne D., Fitzgerald-Yau N., Fletcher A., Jones R., Miners A., Scott S., Wiggins M., Bonell C., Viner RM. (2017). The role of family and school-level factors in bullying and cyberbullying: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Pediatr*. 11;17(1):160.

Buelga S., Martínez-Ferrer B., María-Jesús C., & Ortega-Barón J. (2019). Psychometric Properties of the CYBVICS Cyber-Victimization Scale and Its Relationship with Psychosocial Variables. *Soc. Sci*., 8(13).

Buelga S., Postigo J., Martínez-Ferrer B., María-Jesús C., & Ortega-Barón J. (2020). Cyberbullying among Adolescents: Psychometric Properties of the CYB-AGS Cyber-Aggressor Scale. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 3090, 1-15.

Campbell M.A., Whiteford C., Duncanson K., Spears B., Butler D., & Slee P.T. (2017). Cyberbullying Bystanders: Gender, Grade, and Actions among Primary and Secondary School Students in Australia. *International Journal of Technoethics*. 8.

Chang, Y. (2021). Do Boys and Girls Behave Differently Online? A Review of Gender Differences in Cyberbullying. *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Humanities and Social Science Research*, 819-824.

Chi P., Lan V., Ngan N.H., & Linh N.T. (2020). Online time, experience of cyber bullying and practices to cope with it among high school students in Hanoi. *Health psychology open*, 7(1).

Craig W., Boniel-Nissim M., King N., Walsh S.D., Boer M., Donnelly P.D., Harel-Fisch Y., Malinowska-Cieślik M., Gaspar de Matos M., Cosma A., Van den Eijnden R., Vieno A., Elgar F.J., Molcho M., Bjereld Y., Pickett W. (2020). Social Media Use and Cyber-Bullying: A Cross-National Analysis of Young People in 42 Countries. *J Adolesc Health*, 66(6S):S100-S108.

du Plessis M.R., Smeekens S., Cillessen A.H., Whittle S., & Güroglu B. (2019). Bullying the brain? Longitudinal links between childhood peer victimization, cortisol, and adolescent brain structure. *Front. Psychol*, 9, 2706.

Faryadi, Q. (2011). Cyberbullying and academic performance. *International Journal of Computational Engineering Research*, 23-30.

Festl R., & Quandt T. (2016). The Role of Online Communication in Long-Term Cyberbullying Involvement Among Girls and Boys. *J Youth Adolescence*, 45, 1931–1945.

González-Cabrera J., Calvete E., León-Mejía A., Pérez-Sancho C., & Peinado J.M. (2017). Relationship between cyberbullying roles, cortisol secretion and psychological stress. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 70, 153-160.

González-Cabrera J., León-Mejía A., Machimbarrena J.M., Balea A., & Calvete E. (2019). Psychometric properties of the cyberbullying triangulation questionnaire: a prevalence analysis through seven roles. *Scand. J. Psychol*. 60.

Jia Y., Wu Y., Jin T., & Zhang L. (2022). How Are Bystanders Involved in Cyberbullying? A Latent Class Analysis of the Cyberbystander and Their Characteristics in Different Intervention Stages. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 19.

Kimalee, P. (2020). Study of the causes and in-depth effects of being a victim of cyber bullying in the workplace. *Journal of Business Information Systems (JISB)*, 2, 6-20.

Krejcie R.V., & Morgan D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 30, 607-610.

Lee C., & Shin N. (2017). Prevalence of cyberbullying and predictors of cyberbullying perpetration among Korean adolescents. *Comput. Hum. Behav*, 68, 352-358.

Lertthamrongkul, W. (2021). Cyberbullying among middle school students: Prevalence, methods for dealing with the problem and risky behavior. *Academic and research journals Regional university Northeast*, 11(1), 275-289.

Lianos H., & McGrath A. (2018). Can the General Theory of Crime and General Strain Theory Explain Cyberbullying Perpetration? *Crime & Delinquency*, 64(5), 674-700.

López-Castro L., & Diana P. (2019). Influence of Family Variables on Cyberbullying Perpetration and Victimization: A Systematic Literature Review. *Social Sciences*, 8(3).

Lyndsay N., Jenkins N.L., Fredrick S.S., & Nickerson A. (2018). The assessment of bystander intervention in bullying: Examining measurement invariance across gender. *Journal of School Psychology*, 69, 73-83.

McLoughlin L.T., Shan S., Broadhouse K.M., Winks N., Lagopoulos J., & Hermens D.F. (2020). Neurobiological underpinnings of cyberbullying: a pilot functional magnetic resonance imaging study. *Hum. Brain Mapp*, 41, 1495–1504.

Mitchell S.M., Seegan P.L., Roush J.F., Brown S.L., Sustaíta M.A., & Cukrowicz K.C. (2016). Retrospective cyberbullying and suicide ideation: The mediating roles of depressive symptoms, perceived burdensomeness, and thwarted belongingness. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1- 19.

Olenik-Shemesh D., Heiman T., & Zur Y. (2019). Educational Intervention Program for Coping with Youth Cyberbullying, Based on Bystanders' Involvement. *International Journal of Education*, 11(2), 126-148.

Ozden-Yildirim, M.S. (2019). The Relationship Between Loneliness, Malicious Envy, and Cyberbullying in Emerging Adults. *Education in the Knowledge Society*. 20.

Patterson L.J., Allan a., & Cross D. (2017). Adolescent Bystander Behavior in the School and Online Environments and the Implications for Interventions Targeting Cyberbullying. *Journal of School Violence*. 16.

Plamondon A., Bouchard G., & Lachance-Grzela M. (2021). Family Dynamics and Young Adults' Well-Being: The Mediating Role of Sibling Bullying. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(9- 10), NP5362–NP5384.

Pornnoppadol, C. (2017). Prevalence and factors related to cyberbullying in grades 7-9. http://www.manager.co.th/Cyberbiz/ViewNews.aspx?NewsID=9600000061934.

Quinlan E.B., Barker E.D., Luo Q., Banaschewski T., Bokde A.L., Bromberg U., & Imagen C. (2020). Peer victimization and its impact on adolescent brain development and psychopathology. *Mol Psychiatry*, 25(11), 3066-3076. doi:10.1038/s41380-018-0297-9

Ruiz, R. (2019). Curbing Cyberbullying among Students: A Comparative Analysis of Existing Laws among Selected Asian Countries. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(3), 1285-1305.

Safaria, T. (Jan 2016). Prevalence and Impact of Cyberbullying in a Sample of Indonesian Junior High School Students. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology - TOJET*, 15(1), 82-91.

Sarmiento A., Herrera-López M., & Zych I. (2019). Is cyberbullying a group process? Online and offline bystanders of cyberbullying act as defenders, reinforcers and outsiders. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 9, 328–334.

Savage M.W., & Tokunaga R.S. (2017). Moving toward a theory: Testing an integrated model of cyberbullying perpetration, aggression, social skills, and internet self-efficacy. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 353–361.

Schodt K.B., Quiroz S.I., Wheeler B., Hall D.L., & Silva Y.N. (2021). Cyberbullying and Mental Health in Adults: The Moderating Role of Social Media Use and Gender. *Front Psychiatry*, 12(674298).

Sittichai T., & Smith P.K. (2020). Information Technology Use and Cyberbullying Behavior in South Thailand: A Test of the Goldilocks Hypothesis. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 17(19), 7122.

Song J., & Oh I. (2018). Factors influencing bystanders' behavioral reactions in cyberbullying situations. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 78.

Van Cleemput K., Vandebosch H., & Pabian S. (2014). Personal characteristics and contextual factors that determine "helping," "joining in," and "doing nothing" when witnessing cyberbullying. *Aggressive Behavior*, 40(5), 383–396.

Wang M.J., Yogeeswaran K., Andrews N.P., Hawi D.R., & Sibley C.G., (2019). How Common Is Cyberbullying Among Adults? Exploring Gender, Ethnic, and Age Differences in the Prevalence of Cyberbullying. *Cyberpsychol Behav Soc Netw*, 11, 736-741.

Zhu C., Huang S., Evans R., & Zhang W. (2021). Cyberbullying Among Adolescents and Children: A Comprehensive Review of the Global Situation, Risk Factors, and Preventive Measures. *Front Public Health*, 9(634909).

**Contact email:** 63810119@go.buu.ac.th