

التنمر الإلكتروني وأثره على طفل الروضة في السعودية

سبحة حاكم اللحياني
استاذ مساعد في تدريس الطفولة المبكرة
قسم رياض الاطفال
جامعة أم القرى
المملكة العربية السعودية

الخلاصة

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى الكشف عن ظاهرة التنمر عبر الإنترنت بين أطفال رياض الأطفال والأطفال في الصفوف الأولى في مرحلة التعليم الابتدائي في المملكة العربية السعودية من أجل تحديد العوامل المحتملة التي قد تؤثر على التنمر الإلكتروني، وقياس معدل انتشار التنمر الإلكتروني وأثره على طفل الروضة. وقد تألفت عينة الدراسة من (125) طفلاً من رياض الأطفال والأطفال في الصف الأول الابتدائي الذين تتراوح أعمارهم بين 5 إلى 8 سنوات. وقد أظهرت نتائج الدراسة أن بعض أطفال الروضة لديهم نقص في الوعي حول مخاطر التنمر عبر الإنترنت حيث أن ذلك يعد سلوكاً غير قانوني. كما أكدت الدراسة على وجود حاجة لعقد مؤتمرات في المدارس ورياض الأطفال من أجل تثقيف الآباء ومقدمي الرعاية حول كيفية مساعدة أطفالهم الذين كانوا ضحايا على الإنترنت، واتخاذ إجراءات جادة لحماية الأطفال الآخرين من أن يكون ضحايا في المستقبل. وأشارت النتائج على أهمية دور المدارس ورياض الأطفال لرفع وعي الطلاب حول التنمر عبر الإنترنت وكيفية استخدام الأجهزة التكنولوجية بفعالية في حياتهم اليومية دون الشعور بالتهديد من الآخرين. الاستنتاجات : تم الحصول على فهم أفضل لخبرات الأطفال في التسلسل عبر الإنترنت بين أطفال الروضة ، ووجدت نتائج هذه الدراسة أن تعليم الأطفال من قبل الأقران في رياض الأطفال والمدرسة كان الأسلوب الأكثر استخداماً الذي ذكره المشاركون في الدراسة، ويوصى به ، ولكن من الأفضل أن تطلب من الآباء المساعدة فيما يتعلق بالتنمر عبر الإنترنت ، لأن الأقران لن يكون لديهم أي حلول بخلاف الآباء الذين لديهم حلول مقبولة ، حيث تهدف هذه الحلول إلى تقليل التنمر الإلكتروني قدر الإمكان بين الأطفال في الروضة وحمايتهم من التعرض للتنمر الإلكتروني. كما أكدت الدراسة على أهمية دور الآباء ومقدمي الرعاية في مراقبة ما يفعله أطفالهم على الإنترنت في المنزل، بما في ذلك المواقع التي يزورها أطفالهم والرسائل التي يتلقونها وما ينشرونه.

Cyberbullying and It`S Impact on The Saudi Kindergarten Children

Sabha Hakim Allehyani

Department of Kindergarten

Umm Al-Qura University

Saudi Arabia

ABSTRACT

Background: The current study intended to investigate cyberbullying among kindergarten children in Saudi Arabia to identify possible factors that may impact cyberbullying; measure the prevalence rate of cyberbullying and its impact on the kindergarten child. **Method:** participants were 125 children from kindergarten and school children their ages between 5 to 8 years. **Results:** The results from this study revealed that some kindergarten children had lack of awareness about cyberbullying would be illegal behavior. It was also revealed that there is a need for holding conferences in school and kindergarten settings in order to educate parents and caregivers how to help their children who were being cyber-victims and to take serious action to protect other children from being victims in the further. Participants agreed that Schools/kindergarten settings would have to raise student's awareness about cyberbullying and how to use technological devices effectively in their daily lives without feeling being threatening from others. **Conclusions/significance:** A better understanding of children experiences of cyberbullying among kindergarten children has been obtained. The findings from this study found that peer education by children in kindergarten and school was the most commonly used approach mentioned by participants and is recommended, but it's better to ask parents for help in relation to a cyberbullying incident, because peers will have no solutions unlike parents who have sensible solutions. These solutions intentioned to minimize cyberbullying as much as possible among children in preschools and to protect them from being cyberbullied. **Implementation:** Parents and caregivers should closely monitor what their children do on the Internet at home, including what sites their children visit, what messages they receive, and what they post.

Introduction

Cyberbullying is an aggressive behavior performed by an individual or group with the intention to harm others. Modern information and communication technologies are used to repeatedly and intentionally embarrass, humiliate, threaten or harass persons who cannot easily defend themselves (Smith, Mahdavi, Carvalho, Fisher, Russell & Tippett, 2008). Cyberbullying is a combination of the word *cyber* and *bullying* where cyber basically means the Internet or on-line. In this case, cyber bullying will focus on getting in action with bullying by using the Internet or contemporary technologies such as on-line chats, online media and short messaging texts through social media. This includes repetitively performing the act of harming and hurting an individual through the Internet or modern devices without physically confronting the victim (Zalaquett & Chatters, 2014). With the rapid rise in the availability of mobile phones and Internet access amongst the young, texting and social media sites such as Facebook have been embraced with extraordinary speed and passion. Not surprisingly perhaps, given that the reason for its invention in the first place 'was the sweet revenge of a lover spurned', at the same time as the dramatic increase in the participation rate, an ugly side of the texting/social media phenomena has revealed itself: online bullying, or so-called 'cyberbullying'. Although bullying has long been acknowledged as a serious issue in schoolyards and corridors, it is this new kind of bully (Srivastava, Gamble, & Boey, 2013).

Generally, cyber bullying is defined as bullying through the use of a variety of electronic media, including text messages, phone calls, email, social media and other communications technology. And among the many forms of cyber bullying, the most common ones are sending offensive messages via phone and the Internet, spreading rumor to harm the victim, and name-calling (Dehue, 2008). This newer form of bullying has become truly a global phenomenon transcending country boundaries and researched in all countries where adolescents have access to technology (Monks, Robinson & Worlidge, 2012). Cyberbullying is a relatively recent phenomenon that takes one of two forms: direct bullying and indirect bullying by proxy (Wong-Lo, Bullock, & Gable, 2009). With direct cyberbullying, messages are transmitted from the bully to the victim; whereas with indirect cyberbullying, the instigator enlists others to bully the victim, some authorities feel that cyberbullying is another form of traditional bullying using 21st-century technologies (Li, 2007).

Cyberbullying has been linked to media-specific risk factors and correlates such as risky self-disclosure, sharing of passwords, and deviant online behavior such as visiting chat rooms with violent, pornographic, or extremist content (Weber, Ziegele, & Schnauber, 2013).

Nowadays most children grow up with a plethora of information and communication technologies, although these afford new opportunities for social interaction and information retrieval, they also present new platforms for interpersonal aggression and victimization (Pieschl, Kuhlmann, & Porsch, 2015). This absorption in online communication, followed by use of smart phones and social networking, has been seen as typical of adolescents, but it is becoming characteristic of ever younger children (p.635) (Livingstone & Smith; 2014).

Children may be bullied for various reasons, including their appearance, speech, or lack of coping mechanisms (Hoover J, Oliver R. 1996). Recent studies have documented that relational aggression is a relatively frequent hostile event in many preschool classrooms, although the manifestation of relational aggression during the preschool years is similar in many ways to that of school age children, it also includes unique features. For example, when preschoolers engage in relationally aggressive acts, they tend to do so in relatively simple, direct ways that typically involve a current situation or provocation, i.e., telling a peer that she/he will not be a peer's friend unless the peer gives her/him a crayon. In contrast, older children are more adept at using more complex and subtle forms of relational aggression that may reflect a response to a situation or transgression that occurred in the past, i.e., purposely excluding a peer from a party because the peer did not invite him or her to the peer's party last month (Crick et al., 1999).

Several studies have dealt with cyberbullying, Approximately 7% of students in Years 4 to 9 reported being cyberbullied every few weeks or more often in their last term at school (Cross et al., 2009). Although the estimates vary, depending on the measure used and the age range of the sample, the results suggest that about 50% of the variance of physical aggression is determined by genes (approximate range between 40% and 80%). The remainder of the variance of physical aggression seems to be influenced mainly by unique or non-shared environmental factors. Existing evidence also suggests that males and females do not seem to differ in terms of the relative magnitude of genetic and environmental effects on aggressive and antisocial behavior (Rhee & Waldman, 2002).

According to the Bureau of Justice, California has the highest level of cyberbullying, also same survey reported that 85% of the cyberbullying occurred on school grounds, the school bus, or on the way to school (Cyberbullying Statistics, 2013). Children are using the Internet regularly; In Netherlands, 84% of seven-year olds had access to the Internet at home, with more than a quarter using the Internet daily or almost every day (27%) (Pääjärvi, 2012).

Recent reviews of the epidemiological studies report rates between 10 and 33% of victims and between 5 and 13% of aggressors in the case of face-to-face bullying (Hymel & Swearer, 2015); and rates between 3.2 and 33% of cyber-victims and between 1 and 29.7% of cyber-aggressors in the case of cyberbullying (Garaigordobil, 2015).

In a study of Monks et al. (2005), it was found that the distribution of roles in preschool children were as follows: Aggressor 25.0%, victim 22.1%, defender 16.3%, defender/victim 4.8%, aggressor/victim 1.9%, and 29.8% were not assigned a role. Correspondingly, in a study conducted with preschool children in Switzerland, data have shown that 6% of children were classified as victims, 10% as bully-victims, 11% as bullies, and 47% were not involved in bullying, but the remaining 17% of children could not be categorized according to the researchers' restrictive criteria (Perren & Alsaker, 2006).

In the study of Tokunaga (2010), more than 97% of youths in the United States are connected to the internet, implying that children have a myriad of opportunities readily on hand to bully one another on social media and can do this even with a false identity or under the expectancy of privacy in terms of identity. Clearly, the rapid increase in the popularity of social media implies that opportunities for this type of bullying have the potential to multiply overnight. To investigate cyberbullying among kindergarten children and to identify possible factors that may impact cyberbullying.

Theoretical framework

Preschool institutions come in various forms and under different labels (i.e., kindergartens, day-care centers) across different educational systems in the Western world. While some educate young children of a wide age range including those aged under and over 3 years, others enroll narrower age groups and may target, for example, only children under 3 years of age or from 3 to 6 years (Dahlberg et al. 1995). Entering formal preschool education is a crucial developmental step in many children's lives mainly because it is within this context where they participate, for the first time, as members in a stable peer group and well-organized team activities. Consequently, preschool may be the first context beyond the home environment where children's difficulties in social interactions with peers can be primarily detected and assessed by adults and professionals. The early identification and elimination, therefore, of these problems at this young age prevent their escalation in later years and minimize their negative impact on children's social and emotional development while foster their successful adaptation in school (Vlachou, Andreou, Botsoglou, & Didaskalou, 2011).

Across the world's wealthy countries, the trend is for media and communication devices to become internet-enabled and portable. While household saturation in internet and telephony was reached some years ago, personal ownership of multiple devices continues to rise. Insofar as this includes the provisioning of children, internet and mobile use is becoming more private and inaccessible to parental oversight (Livingstone, 2009). Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has introduced new atmospheres for communication and learning, however, this seems optimistic and only shows part of the equation. Evidence shows that ICT can be harmful (Cowie & Colliety, 2010). The technological advances in recent decades have changed social interactions from face-to-face to virtual exchanges. While this increased connectivity provides some social benefits for the virtual relationships of adolescents, such relationships are not without risks, including cyberbullying (Fernández-Montalvo, Peñalva, & Irazabal, 2015).

During preschool period, children learn how to build and maintain friendships, establish groups of consistent play partners, acquire reputations, and develop social skills. By the time children reach the age of 5 or 6 years, they are more likely to have reciprocal friends and to be members of small networks of peers, to engage in less solitary and more social play, and to spend more time with members of social and friendship networks (Rubin & Coplan, 1998). The findings emanating from the limited number of studies available indicate that preschoolers can be the perpetrators and victims of both direct and indirect peer aggression and those children of this age are capable of displaying different forms of bullying such as verbal, physical, social exclusion, and rumor spreading (Alsaker & Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger 2010).

Bullying through fists and face-to-face exchanges and electronic bullying may seem equally harmful, but there are considerable differences between cyber and standard bullying and the apparent effect upon the victim. Unlike standard bullying, which typically happens on school grounds and can be witnessed and contained, cyberbullying takes place twenty-four hours a day and reaches the victims even when they are alone, another distinctive characteristic of cyberbullying is that malicious messages and images can be posted anonymously and distributed quickly to a massive audience, and it may be difficult if not impossible to trace the source. This inability to escape the cruel attack may leave victims feeling hopeless, anxious, depressed, and stressed. The hurt caused by cyberbullying can marinate over time and impact the view that the person has of him or herself. It is rare, but in some very highly publicized cases, some students have turned to suicide. The term *cyberbullicide* has found its way into the literature to describe suicide that is directly or indirectly influenced by experiences with electronic aggression (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010).

When bullying happens on the playground there are people looking out for that, when it's on these (electronic) devices, it's more sinister in a way. It's so invasive, and we can't stop it" (Truitt, 2013). The differences between cyber bullying and traditional bullying are not very obvious due to the similarities in techniques. Although both cyber bullying and traditional bullying brings harm and treats towards the victims, cyber bullying allows the bully to hide behind a screen and conduct the bullying without being easily identified, which allows anonymity. Next, cyber bullying also allows information to be spread rapidly and allows the perpetrator to access the bullying anywhere, anytime. Hence, availability and accessibility to bullying are more convenient and generally assisting the act (Cowie, 2008). The similarities and differences between offline bullying and cyberbullying are complicated and contentious, however, in the existing literature there is general agreement that the two types of bullying share several key features, including intentionality, repetition, and a power imbalance between victims and perpetrators. Key differences between the two types of bullying include the potential for reduced empathy by cyberbullying perpetrators due to their inability to witness their victims' reactions, the relative and perceived anonymity the cyber context offers cyberbullying perpetrators (which may also skew the victims' judgement of threat), and the potential in cyberbullying for a much larger audience (Kowalski, Giumetti, Schroeder, & Lattanner, 2014). All forms of bullying have negative impacts on those involved. Cyber bullying has a few factors, which may intensify its negative impacts, including the difficulty in escaping from the bullying, the magnitude of the potential audience, the anonymity of the bully, and the ability to attack at any time and any place. On the other hand, cyber bullying does not cause physical harm, making its consequences fewer visible and nasty text messages or e-mails can be easily and quickly deleted (Lindfors, Kaltiala-Heino, & Rimpelä, 2012). It was also found that cyber victims tend to lose trust in others and feel angry (Dehue et al., 2008). Low self-esteem, depression, suicidal ideation, and poorer academic performance are also related to the experience of being cyberbullied (Patchin & Hinduja, 2010).

Children raised with authoritarian styles were more likely to be victims, and aggressors' parents had permissive and negligent styles (Dehue et al., 2012). The studies suggest that both authoritarian and very permissive parenting styles are risk factors, whereas a democratic style based on affection is a protective factor against bullying/cyberbullying. However, in contrast to the investigations that emphasizes the relevance of the family (Lee and Song, 2012). There is a survey of parents in the United States on cyberbullying, "77 % of parents of internet users have checked which websites their child visited, up from 65 % of parents who did this in 2006" (Lenhart et al., 2011). The numbers in Great Britain are a bit lower, with 50 % of parents reporting that they monitor their children's Internet history or otherwise monitor their use (e.g., monitor on line profiles or text messages) (Livingstone et al. 2011).

Also it was noted that parents are often unaware of new technology, so they may neglect the issue of online bullying (Dehue, Bolman, and Vollink; 2008). For instance, it was found that only 30% of teenagers reported such bullying to adults (Li, 2007).

It was also important for parents to check their child's on-line profile, which their child adds as a friend to social networking sites, or the content of email or text messages (Livingstone et al. 2011). Children also report that they are afraid of overreaction and subsequent loss of Internet privileges if they report cyber bullying incidents to their parents (Baas, 2013). In spite of these facts, previous research revealed that victims of cyberbullying are less likely to talk to someone about the experience than victims of traditional bullying or they choose to talk only to their friends (Slonje, Smith, & Frisén, 2013). Telling anyone about being cyber-victimized is seen as a desirable way of coping with cyberbullying because it supposedly helps the victim both emotionally and to solve the problematic situation and recent research confirms this (Machackova, Cerna, Sevcikova, Dedkova, Daneback, 2013). Talking to friends rather than to parents about cyberbullying can be motivated by the increasing importance of peers in adolescence, and even more facilitated by the fact that friends usually better understand the specifics of the online context (Sasson & Mesch, 2014).

Researchers have also evaluated a gender-balanced model of peer victimization among preschoolers according to which girls deliver more relational aggression than boys, who are more likely to display physical aggression than girls (Crick et al., 1999). Cyber bullying is more common among students, whether they are children or adults. Social skills and coping skills should be taught and spread among students in educational settings. Awareness on the impact of such problems should be effectively conveyed to all potential victims or bullies. Coping strategies played a vital role in helping potential or involved students to be able to cope better with their problems (Von Marées & Petermann, 2012).

The students' lack of support in a bullying situation in school was referred to the lack of professionals' awareness of bullying and its consequences on students, therefore educational institutes' and families' efforts are required to face this problem and to protect children from being bullied (Al- Buhairan et al., 2015).

Most authorities agree that it is important for schools to develop policies on bullying and cyberbullying that address the seriousness of the problem and the consequences for engaging in such behavior (e.g., Beale & Hall, 2007). There has been considerable controversy, however, as to what authority schools have in the regulation of student behavior that occurs outside of the school. As such, the school has limited jurisdiction, although this has not prevented some schools from

developing policies that hold students accountable for their online behavior, even while off campus (Walsh-Sarnecki, 2009).

The Anti-Defamation League (2009) developed a model statute to help states and municipalities develop cyberbullying prevention legislation. Depending on the situation, students who perpetrate cyberbullying may be in violation of one or more of the following offenses often covered in civil legislation:

- Invasion of privacy/public disclosure of a private fact: publicly disclosing a private fact about an individual under conditions that would be highly offensive to a reasonable person.
- Defamation: publishing a false statement about another that damages his or her reputation.
- Invasion of personal privacy/false light: publicly disclosing information that places an individual in a false light.
- Intentional infliction of emotional stress: engaging in intentional behavior that are outrageous and intolerable and result in extreme distress to another.

Based on the review of the existing literature, it can be argued that although there appears to be sufficient awareness of the issue of cyberbullying around the world from the last years, cyberbullying in Saudi Arabia is apparently prevalent phenomena in recent years among children. The current study will measure the prevalence rate of cyberbullying and its impact on the kindergarten children; examine preventative solutions for cyberbullying to protect children from being cyberbullied and to minimize cyberbullying as much as possible.

Cyberbullying definitions

Cyberbullying has been defined as any online bullying referenced over an electronic media. It also defined as a willful and involves recurring or repeated harm inflicted through electronic text or pictures. It may encompass cell phones, computers and other electronic communication devices including instant messaging, chat rooms, e-mails and messages posted on websites (California Department of Education, 2012).

Procedural definition

Cyberbullying is a relatively new, but emerging phenomenon among youngsters. It often includes behaviors not covered by traditional definitions of bullying; cyberbullying is the use of electronic forms of communication by an individual or group to engage repeatedly in sending or posting content about an individual or group that a reasonable person would deem cruel, vulgar, threatening, embarrassing, harassing, frightening, or harmful.

Methods

Research problem

Given to the above argument that cyberbullying via social media will be related to variables associated with a) Internet use, b) the use of different communication tools via social networks, and lastly c) the bullying experiences. The investigation of this study intended to answer the following questions.

- How do kindergarten children feel about cyberbullying, and what we all can do to prevent Cyberbullying?
- Examine all forms of bullying to develop a complete understanding of how and why children harass their peers?
- What are the factors that affect cyberbullying between children, and what are the best ways to stop children from bullying others?

The Significance of this research

To our knowledge, this study is the first quantitative investigation of addressing children's experiences with cyberbullying in Saudi Arabia which explored this phenomenon in order to

a) reducing cyberbullying will affect the child's behaviors positively, leading to raising a child without any mental problems; b) defining cyberbullying in an attempt to limit it, which gives society psychologically moderate children, leading to the development and success of society as a whole and c) helping parents safeguard young people from online harms and offers opportunities for healthy online participation.

Participants

Research sample formed from 125 children from kindergarten and school children their ages between 5 to 8 years, and the children were selected randomly from public and private schools in Eastern region in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Instrument

In this study, the self-compiled questionnaire for children was conducted. The questionnaire based on 6 points Likert Scale. The questionnaire has 12 main items (themes) which investigated participants' gender, school types (public/ private), geographic location, age, experiences of being cyber-victims, reporting cyber incidents to adults, their perspectives toward cyberbullying, frequencies of being cyberbullying and their suggestions of what would be done to minimize being cyber-victims. To The data were analyzed alongside the ongoing data collection. The following is a comprehensive presentation of the data analysis of these themes as shown Tables 1 to 12.

Results

Age and Gender differences

Table 1.

The distribution of the participants' age variable

Percentage	Number	How old are you
24%	30	5-6years
40.8%	51	6-7years
35.2%	44	7-8years
100%	125	Sum

As shown in Table (1), the distribution of the research sample according to the age variable showed that a total of 51 of the research sample their ages were 6-7 years with a percentage 40.8%, followed by 44 of the research sample their ages were 7-8 years with a percentage 35.2%, Then 30 of the research sample their ages were 5-6 years with a percentage 24%.

Table 2.

The distribution of the research sample according to the gender variable

Percentage	Number	What's your gender
56.8%	71	Girl
43.2%	54	Boy
100%	125	Sum

As shown in Table (2), the 71 of the participants were girls with a percentage 56.8%, While 54 of participants were boys with a percentage 43.2%.

As mentioned previously in this study, sampling was selected randomly. This led to have more girls being participated in this study more than boys; therefore, the differences in experiencing cyberbullying between gender (girls and boys) has not been addressed in this study, which could be the subject of future investigation.

School types

Table 3.

The distribution of the research sample according to the school variable

Percentage	Number	What kind of school/kindergarten do you attend
52.8%	66	Public
47.2%	59	Private
100%	125	Sum

As shown in Table (3), the distribution of the research sample according to the school variable demonstrates that 66 of the research sample were enrolled in public schools with a percentage 52.8%, While 59 of the research sample were enrolled in private schools with a percentage 47.2%. No differences were found in school types whether public nor private in regard to children's experiences cyberbullying. However, the results confirmed that cyberbullying exists in kindergarten and school settings.

Geographic location

Table (4) shown the distribution of the research sample according to the cities of residence variable in the Eastern region in Saudi Arabia which include (Mecca, Jeddah, Taif, and Madenah).

Table 4.

The distribution of the research sample according to the city of residence variable

Percentage	Number	Where do you live
37.6%	47	Mecca
26.4%	33	Jeddah
20.8%	26	Taif
15.2%	19	Madenah
100%	125	Sum

There were 47 of the research sample living in the city of *Mecca* with a percentage 37.6%, followed by 33 of the research sample living in the city of *Jeddah* with a percentage 26.4%, then in the third place 26 of the research sample living in *Taif* with a percentage 20.8%, Finally 19 of the research sample living in *Madenah* with a percentage 15.2%. No differences were found in children's experiences of being cyberbullying.

Children's Perspectives toward Cyberbullying

As shown in Table (5), the distribution of the participants according to children`s perspectives toward cyberbullying were varied.

Table 5.

The distribution of the participants' different perspectives toward cyberbullying

Percentage	Number	Cyberbullying is (select all the apply)
9.6%	12	When some children bullies another child on the Internet
21.6%	27	When you send mean text message or pics to another child
14.4%	18	When you call another child names online
24.8%	31	When you use children's cell phone to get them

		into trouble
29.6%	37	When you pretend to be another student online
100%	125	Sum

There were 37 of the research sample defined cyberbullying as 'when you pretend to be another student online' with a percentage 29.6%, followed by 31 of the research sample defined cyberbullying as 'when you use children's cell phone to get them into trouble' with a percentage 24.8%. In the third place 27 of the research sample defined cyberbullying as when you send mean text message or pics to another child with a percentage 21.6%. Then in the fourth place 18 of the research sample defined cyberbullying as 'when you call another child names' online with a percentage 14.40%. Only 12 of the research sample defined cyberbullying as 'when some children bullies another child on the Internet' with a percentage 9.6%. It can be noted that there were obvious differences between children in regard to their perspectives toward the actual definition of 'Cyberbullying' may influenced by their life experiences and their age.

Children were asked the following question if '*they were ever being cyberbullied?*' As shown

Table 6.

The distribution of the participants experiences of 'being cyberbullied or not'

Percentage	Number	Have you ever been cyberbullied
78.4%	98	Yes
9.6%	12	No
12%	15	Not sure
100%	125	Sum

In Table (6), the distribution of the research sample according to being cyberbullied or not. Table (6) indicated children's' responses (yes, no, not sure) to experiencing cyberbullying. A total of 98 of the participants have been cyberbullied with a percentage 78.4%, followed by 12 of the research sample haven't been cyberbullied with a percentage 9.6%. Around 15 of the research sample indicated they were 'not sure' if they have been cyberbullied or not with a percentage 12%.

Forms of Online Bullying

As presented in Table (7), the distribution of the research sample according to the forms of cyberbullying on the internet differ from using SMS, hacking, email, name-calling, gossiping and blaming.

Table 7.

The Distribution of the most Mentioned Action Labeled as Forms of Online Bullying

Percentage	Number	How have you been bullied on the Internet by...
22.4%	22	SMS
14.3%	14	Hacking
25.5%	25	Email
19.4%	19	name-calling
11.2%	11	Gossiping
7.1%	7	Blaming
100%	98	Sum

Most of the incidents that were reported involving email with a percentage 25.5%, followed by 22 of children who have being cyberbullied by SMS with a percentage 22.4% (see Table 7). Only 19 of the participants have been cyberbullied by name-calling with a percentage 19.4%, while 14 of the research sample have been cyberbullied by hacking with a percentage 14.3%. Then in the fifth place 11 of the research sample have been cyberbullied by gossiping with a percentage 11.2%, and finally 7 of the research sample have been cyberbullied by blaming with a percentage 7.1%. Although these results based on small sample, our findings shown that cyberbullying may considered a real problem in this young age group.

Reporting Cyberbullying to Adults

Table (8) illustrated the distribution of the participants according to reporting cyberbullying to anyone or not including parents, relatives, caregivers, teachers, peers and others.

Table 8.

The distribution of the participants reporting incidents of 'being cyberbullied to anyone or not'

Percentage	Number	If you have been cyberbullied, did you report it to anyone else (parents, teachers, relatives....)
57.1%	56	Yes
42.9%	42	No
100%	98	Sum

As shown in Table (8), a total of 56 of the children reporting cyberbullying to others ((parents, caregivers, teachers, relatives....)) with a percentage 57.1%, while 42 of the research sample not telling anyone about being cyberbullied with a percentage 42.9%.

Participants' Justification of Not Reporting Cyberbullying incidents

Participants were asked the flowing question: 'If you didn't report it and were cyberbullied, why didn't you report it?' As shown in Table (9), the reasons of didn't reporting cyberbullying to others.

Table 9.

Participants' negative emotional reactions justified their actions of didn't reporting cyberbullying incidents to others

Percentage	Number	If you didn't report it and were cyberbullied, why didn't you report it
35.7%	15	Feel shame
19%	8	Fear of retaliation
16.7%	7	Don't recognize cyberbullying
28.6%	12	Think no one will help
100%	42	Sum

Table (9) displays the negative emotional reactions by children toward cyberbullying, which clearly influenced their actions of refusing to report cyberbullying incident to others. A total of 15 of the research sample didn't tell anyone because they feel shame with a percentage 35.7%, followed by 12 of the research sample didn't tell anyone because they think no one will help with a percentage 28.6%. In the third place 8 of the research sample didn't tell anyone because they fear of retaliation with a percentage 19%, and finally 7 of the research sample didn't tell anyone because they don't recognize cyberbullying with a percentage 16.7%.

Frequencies of Cyberbullying Incident

Table (10) shown the distribution of the research sample according to how often cyberbullying occurs in their community.

Table 10.

The distribution of participants according to how often cyberbullying occurs in their community

Percentage	Number	How often do you think cyberbullying happens
20.8%	26	It happens all the time
12.8%	16	It happens too often, but not all the time
31.2%	39	It happens sometimes
16.8%	21	It hardly ever happens
18.4%	23	It never happens
100%	125	Sum

As shown in Table (10), a total of 39 of the research sample indicated that “it happens sometimes” with a percentage 31.2%, followed by 26 of the research sample said that “it happens all the time” with a percentage 20.8%. Then in the third place 23 of the research sample reported that “it never happens” with a percentage 18.4%. Around 16.8 per cent of the children (n=21) reported that it “hardly ever happens”, followed by 16 of the research sample said that “It happens too often, but not all the time” with a percentage 12.8%. These findings clearly showed that most of the children 64.8% being bullied on the Internet consistently.

Participants' perspectives and experiences of Cyberbullying

Table 11.

Participants' perspectives and experiences of cyberbullying

Percentage	Number	Please select all the answer that apply to you
7.1%	11	I don't know what cyberbullying is
15.4%	24	Cyberbullying is no big deal
10.3%	16	Friends of mine have been cyberbullied
8.3%	13	We've had cyberbullying incident in my school/kindergarten
5.8%	9	I have cyberbullied others
7.7%	12	I have said nasty things to others online, but don't consider it cyberbullying
9.6%	15	I have been cyberbullying by a close friend
5.1%	8	I have had someone steal my password/cell phone and pretend to be me on public social network
3.8%	6	I sent a joke to someone, but they thought it was cyberbullying
11.5%	18	I've cyberbullying someone with my friends just for fun
6.4%	10	Others have said mean things to or about me online, but I don't consider it cyberbullying
8.9%	14	Share your thoughts about cyberbullying
100%	156	Sum

Table (11) shows that 24 of the research sample indicated that “cyberbullying is no big deal” with a percentage 15.4%, followed by 18 of the research sample reported that “I've cyberbullying someone with my friends just for fun” with a percentage

11.5%. Around 10.3 per cent of the children (n=16) reported that “friends of mine have been cyberbullied” with a percentage followed by 15 of the research sample said that “I have been cyberbullied by a close friend” with a percentage 9.6%. A total of 14 of the research sample said that “share your thoughts about cyberbullying” with a percentage 8.9%, followed by 13 of the research sample said that “we've had cyberbullying incident in my school/kindergarten” with a percentage 8.3%. A total of 12 of the research sample reported that “they have said 'nasty things to others online', but don't consider it cyberbullying” with a percentage 7.7%, followed by 11 of the research sample said that “I don't know what cyberbullying is” with a percentage 7.1%. Only 10 of the research sample reported that “others have said mean things to or about me online', but I don't consider it cyberbullying” with a percentage 6.4%, followed by 9 of the research sample said that “I have cyberbullied others” with a percentage 5.8%. A few number of participants (n=8) mentioned that “I have had someone steal my password/ cell phone and pretend to be me on public social network” with a percentage 5.1%, followed by 6 of the research sample reported that “I sent a joke to someone, but they thought it was cyberbullying” with a percentage 3.8%.

Participants' opinions in providing law against cyberbullying

Participants were asked question' If you could write a law about cyberbullying, what would it provide? (Select all that apply) in order to incorporated children in design-making regarding minimizing cyberbullying. Table (12) shows the distribution of the research sample according to their opinions in providing a law against cyberbullying

Table (12)

The distribution of the research sample according to their opinions in providing a law against cyberbullying

Percentage	Number	If you could write a law about cyberbullying, what would it provide? (select all that apply)
26.8%	44	Cyberbullying would be illegal
12.2%	20	Educational institutions (school/kindergarten/school aftercare etc.) would have to help children who were cyberbullied
9.1%	15	There would be a cyberbullying police squad to investigate cyberbullying
7.9%	13	Schools/kindergarten settings would have to teach children about cyberbullying
15.9%	26	Schools/kindergarten settings would teach parents and caregivers how to help their children who are cyberbullied
9.1%	15	There would be youth helpline where children

		could go to get help anytime they need to
18.9%	31	They would have to hold conferences of young people to help solve the problem
100%	164	Sum

Table (12) shows that 44 of the research sample reported that 'cyberbullying would be illegal' with a percentage 26.8%, followed by 31 of the research sample indicated that 'they would have to hold conferences of young people to help solve the problem' with a percentage 18.9%. A number of 26 of the research sample said Schools/kindergarten settings would teach parents and caregivers how to help their children who are cyberbullied with a percentage 15.9%, followed by 20 of the research sample reported that Educational institutions (school/kindergarten/school aftercare etc.) would have to help children who were cyberbullied with a percentage 12.2%. Only 15 of the research sample stated that 'both there would be a cyberbullying police squad to investigate cyberbullying' and ' there would be youth helpline where children could go to get help anytime they need to' with a percentage 9.1%, followed by 13 of the research sample said Schools/kindergarten settings would have to teach children about cyberbullying with a percentage 7.9%.

Discussion

As this is the first quantitative study intended to get deep understanding of kindergarten/ school children's experiences, perspectives, and opinions in regard to cyberbullying in Saudi Arabia, which extend our knowledge and added the previous existing literature by investigating cyberbullying among young children. Firstly, the results highlight the fact that girls were more cyber-victim than boys in kindergarten and school settings in Saudi Arabia. These findings were similar to previous findings, which demonstrated that preschoolers' girls deliver more relational aggression than boys, who are more likely to involve in physical aggression than girls (Crick et al., 1999). This finding suggested that girls seem to use forms of cyberbullying than boys do, and they may be at risk of cyberbullying (as an aggressor) than boys in Saudi context.

Secondly, the analysis of this study revealed that kindergarten children have deferent definitions and perspectives toward 'what is cyberbullying?' Most of children were defined cyberbullying as 'when you pretend to be another student online' with a percentage 29.6%, others defined cyberbullying as 'when you use children's cell phone to get them into trouble' and sending mean text message or pics to another child. This result confirmed the previous argument that preschoolers can be the perpetrators and victims of both direct and indirect peer aggression as children of this age are capable of demonstrating diverse forms of bullying such as verbal, physical, social exclusion, and rumor spreading (Alsaker & Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger 2010). Hence, these findings showed that there were no significant age differences in regard to contribution in cyberbullying either as a perpetrator or as victims.

Thirdly, children in this study appeared to have negative emotional reactions to cyberbullying and influenced their action of being unable to report it to others. Most children expressed unpleasant emotional reactions of not being able to report cyberbullying to others such as feeling shame, thinking no one will help and feeling fear of retaliation (around 83.3%). Very few (under 19%) of the children in this study indicated they couldn't report being cyber victims as they were fear of retaliation. This result supports previous arguments that children who were cyberbullied were found to be less likely to talk to someone about the experience than victims of traditional bullying or they choose to talk only to their friends (Slonje, Smith, & Frisé, 2013). Most of those children were cyberbullied by some close friends through the social media. When asked how they cyberbullied others in their community, few children were most likely steal other password/ cell phone and pretend to be them on public social network' t or sent a joke to someone. Very few children (around 6.4%) they admitted they have said mean and nasty things to or about them online', however they don't consider it as a cyberbullying.

Lastly, when children were asked how would they contribute in decision-making to establish anti-cyberbullying policy, they suggested it would be useful to hold conferences of young people to help solve the problem and to rise their parents' and caregivers' awareness of how to help their children who are cyberbullied. This would benefit adults who are unaware about the harm and unsafe online activities that their children might face or experiences through contacting with strangers. Few children in this study also suggested that it's would be more beneficial to have anti-cyberbullying policy for children be a cyberbullying police squad to investigate cyberbullying and there would be youth helpline where children could go to report online incidents and get help anytime they need. These results agreed with previous argument that most authorities come to an agreement that it is important for educational settings (kindergarten/ schools) to develop policies on bullying and cyberbullying that address the seriousness of the problem and the consequences for engaging in such behavior (Beale & Hall, 2007). Based on these findings, it can be recommended that parents should closely monitor what their children do on the Internet, including what sites their children visit, what messages they receive, and what they post. Another recommendation, asking for help from peers is a commonly used approach and is recommended, but it's better to ask parents for help in relation to a cyberbullying incident, because peers will have no solutions unlike parents who have solutions.

There are a number of limitations to this study. Though the nature of this study does not allow the identification of causality, the analysis guide us to arguments that are significant to consider in future studies on cyberbullying prevention. These findings were emerged from Eastern region of the country; thus, it cannot be generalizable. Another limitation, the questionnaire didn't obtain the mother's, fathers' and teachers' cyberbullying experiences with their children and their thoughts of how to manage their children's emotional stress of being cyber-victims. Finally, it may be useful to explore children's cyberbullying experiences in their kindergarten and primary school settings.

References

1. Al-Buhairan F.S, Al Eissa,M., Alkufeidy,N.,& Almuneef.M.(2015). Bullying in early adolescence: An exploratory study in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpam.2016.01.002>
2. Alsaker, F. D., & Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, E. (2010). Social behavior and peer relationships of victims, bully–victims, and bullies in kindergarten. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *the handbook of school bullying. An international perspective* (pp. 87–99). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
3. Anti-Defamation League. (2009). *Bullying, cyberbullying prevention law: Model statute and advocacy toolkit*. Chicago, IL:Author.
4. Beale, A. V., & Hall, K. R. (2007). Cyberbullying: What schools administrators (and parents) can do. *The Clearing House*, 81(1), 8–12.
5. California Department of Education. (n.d.). What is cyberbullying? Retrieved May 29, 2013, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ss/se/bullyfaq.asp>.
6. Cowie, H., & Colliety, P. (2010). Cyberbullying: sanctions or sensitivity? *Pastoral Care in Education*, 28(4), 261-268. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02643944.2010.528017>
7. Cowie, H., & Jennifer, D. (2008). *New perspectives on bullying*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
8. Crick, N. R., Casas, J. F., & Ku, H-Ch. (1999). Relational and physical forms of peer victimization in preschool. *Developmental Psychology*, 35(2), 376–385.
9. Cross, D., Shaw, T., Hearn, L., Epstein, M., Monks, H., Lester, L., et al. (2009). *Australian Covert Bullying Prevalence Study (ACBPS)*. Retrieved from <http://www.deewr.gov.au/SchoolUng/NationalSafeSchools/Pages/research.aspx>
10. Cyberbullying Statistics. (2013). Source: bureau of Justice Statistics, US Department of Health and Human Services, Cyberbullying Research Center. Retrieved December 10, 2013, from <http://www.statisticbrain.com/cyber-bullying-statistics/>
11. Dahlberg, G., Moss, P., & Pence, A. (1995). *Beyond quality in early childhood education and care: Postmodern perspectives*. London: Routledge.
12. Dehue, F., Bolman, C., & Vollink, T. (2008). Cyberbullying: Youngsters; experiences and parental perception. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 11, 217–223.
13. Dehue, F., Bolman, C., Vollink, T., & Pouwelse, M. (2012). Cyberbullying and traditional bullying in relation to adolescents' perception of parenting. *Journal of CyberTherapy and Rehabilitation*, 5, 25-34.
14. Fernández-Montalvo, J., Peñalva, A., & Irazabal, I. (2015). Hábitos de uso y conductas de riesgo en Internet en la preadolescencia. [Internet Use Habits and Risk Behaviours in Preadolescence]. *Comunicar*, 44, 113-120. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3916/C44-201512>

15. Garaigordobil, M., Martínez-Valderrey, V., Páez, D. & Cardozo, G. (2015). Bullying y cyberbullying: diferencias entre colegios públicos-privados y religiosos-laicos [Bullying and Cyberbullying: Differences between public-private and religious-secular schools]. *Pensamiento Psicológico*, 13 (1),39-52. doi:10.11144/Javerianacali.PPSI13-1.bcdc
16. Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J.W. (2010). Cyberbullying Identification, Prevention and Response. Retrieved from, http://www.cyberbullying.us/cyberbullying_Identification_Prevention_Response_Fact_Sheet.pdf
17. Hoover, J., & Oliver, R. (1996). *The bullying prevention handbook: a guide for principals, teachers, and counselors*. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.
18. Hymel, S., & Swearer, S. M. (2015). Four Decades of research on school bullying. *American Psychologist*, 70(4), 293-299. doi:10.1037/a0038928
19. 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, 1073–1137.
20. Lee, C. H., & Song, J. (2012). Functions of parental involvement and effects of school climate on bullying behaviors among South Korean middle school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27, 2437- 2464. doi:10.1177/0886260511433508
21. Lenhart, A., Madden, M., Smith, A., Purcell, K., Zickuhr, K., & Rainie, L. (2011). *Teens, kindness and cruelty on social network sites*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved from: <http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2011/Teens-and-social-media.aspx>. Accessed 13 January 2013.
22. Li, Q. (2007). New Bottle but old wine: A research of cyberbullying in schools. *Computers- in Human Behavior*, 23(4), 1777–1791.
23. Lindfors, P.L., Kaltiala-Heino, R., & Rimpelä, A.H. (2012). Cyberbullying among Finnish adolescents--a population-based study. *BMC Public Health*, 12(1), 1027.
24. Livingstone, S. (2009). *Children and the Internet: Great Expectations, Challenging Realities*. Cambridge: Polity.
25. Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Goëtzig, A., & Ólafsson, K. (2011). *Risks and safety on the internet: the perspective of European children: full findings and policy implications from the EU Kids Online survey of 9-16 year olds and their parents in 25 countries*. EU Kids Online, Deliverable D4. EU Kids Online Network, London, UK.
26. Livingstone, S., & Smith, K. P. (2014). Annual Research Review: Harms experienced by child users of online and mobile technologies: the nature, prevalence and management of sexual and aggressive risks in the digital age. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 55(6), 635–654.
27. Machackova, H., Cerna, A., Sevcikova, A., Dedkova, L., & Daneback, K. (2013). Effectiveness of coping strategies for victims of cyberbullying. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace* 7(3).

28. Monks, C. P., Smith, P. K., & Swettenham, J. (2005). Psychological Correlates of peer victimization in preschool children: Social cognitive skills, executive functions and attachment profiles. *Aggressive Behavior*, 31, 571–588.
29. Monks, C.P., Robinson, S., & Worlidge, P. (2012). The emergence of cyberbullying: A survey of primary school pupils' perceptions and experiences. *School Psychology International*, 33, 477-491. doi: 10.1177/0143034312445242
30. Pääjärvi, S. (2012). Media use among 7-11-year-old children and their experiences of media education. *Children's Media Barometer 2011*. Retrieved from Finnish Society on Media Education website: <http://www.mediaeducation.fi/publications>
31. Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2010). Cyberbullying and self-esteem. *Journal of School Health*, 80, 614–621.
32. Perren, S., & Alsaker, F. D. (2006). Social behavior and peer relationships of victims, bully–victims and bullies in kindergarten. *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 47, 165–176.
33. Pieschl, S., Kuhlmann, C., & Porsch, T. (2015) Beware of Publicity! Perceived Distress of Negative Cyber Incidents and Implications for Defining Cyberbullying. *Journal of School Violence*, 14(1), 111-132.
34. Rhee, S., & Waldman, I. D. (2002). Genetic and environmental influences on antisocial behavior: A metaanalysis of twin and adoption studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 29, 490–529.
35. Rubin, K. H., & Coplan, R. J. (1998). Social and non-social play in childhood: An individual differences perspective. In O. N. Saracho & B. Spodek (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on play in early childhood education* (pp. 144–170). Albany: State University of New York Press.
36. Sasson, H., & Mesch, G. (2014). Parental mediation, peer norms and risky online behavior among adolescents. *Computers in Human Behavior* 33, 32–38.
37. Slonje, R., Smith, P. K., & Frisé, A. (2013). The nature of cyberbullying, and strategies for prevention. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(1), 26-32.
38. Smith, P. K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., & Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 49 (4), 376–385. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01846.x.
39. Srivastava, A., Gamble, R., & Boey, J. (2013). Cyberbullying in Australia: Clarifying the Problem, Considering the Solutions. *International journal of Children's Rights*, 2(1), 25-45.
40. Tokunaga, R.S. (2010). Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of research on cyberbullying victimization. *Comput Hum Behav*, 26(3), 277-287.
41. Truitt, K. (2013). Quoted in article by Jill Tucker, *Cruelty gone digital*, San Francisco Chronicle, October 28, 2013, p. A1.

42. Vlachou,M., Andreou,E., Botsoglou,K., & Didaskalou,E. (2011). Bully/Victim Problems Among Preschool Children: a Review of Current Research Evidence. *Educ Psychol Rev*, 23,329-358.
43. Von Marées, N., & Petermann, F. (2012). Cyberbullying: An increasing challenge for schools. *School Psychology International*. 33,467–476.
44. Walsh-Sarnecki, P. (2009). Policing kids' online behavior: Some schools monitor off-campus conduct. *Detroit Free-Press*, A1.
45. Weber, M., Ziegele, M., & Schnauber, A. (2013). Blaming the victim: The effects of extraversion and information disclosure on guilt attributions in cyberbullying. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 16, 254–259. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2012.0328
46. Wong-Lo, M., Bullock, L. M., & Gable, R. A. (2009). Cyberbullying: Facing digital aggression. Paper presented at the Conference of the Teacher Education Division of the Council of Exceptional Children, Charlotte, NC.
47. Zalaquett, C.P. & Chatters, S. J. (2014). Cyberbullying in college: Frequency, characteristics, and practical implications. *SAGE Open*, 1-8. Retrieved from <http://sgo.sagepub.com/content/4/1/2158244014526721>