

Cyberbullying and Thai Generation Z Youths in Bangkok, Thailand

Adipon Euajarusphan
College of Innovation, Thammasat University, Thailand
E-mail: adipon.citu@gmail.com

Article History

Received: 19 October 2021 **Revised:** 31 October 2021 **Published:** 1 November 2021

Abstract

This research has the objective to study the behavior of using online media, awareness, attitudes, and intentions that lead to cyberbullying among Thai Generation Z youths. This includes the attitude towards handling cyberbullying and the relationship between awareness, attitude, and cyberbullying intention and the attitude towards handling cyberbullying of Thai Generation Z youths. The study is quantitative research, utilizing a questionnaire for data collection from 400 Thai youths aged between 19-24 years in Bangkok. The statistical analysis included percentage, mean, standard deviation, t-test, F-test, One-way ANOVA, LSD, and Pearson's Correlation Coefficient. The analysis of personal factors at the significance level of 0.05 indicated that gender has an impact on online media usage, location of online media usage, and time of online media use are statistically different. Age has an impact on online media usage, location of online media usage, time of online media use, online social media network used, and reason for using online social media are statistically different. Education level has an impact on online media usage, and the location, time, and online social media network used are statistically different. In addition, the analysis of cyberbullying experience revealed that most of the respondents have experienced cyberbullying, awareness about cyberbullying behavior and a negative attitude towards cyberbullying at a high level. Regarding cyberbullying intention, the respondents are highly unlikely to engage in such behaviors. The respondents reported that they are highly capable of handling cyberbullying behavior. Examination of the relationship between awareness, attitude, and cyberbullying intention and the attitude in handling cyberbullying of Thai youths in Generation Z found that awareness of cyberbullying has a relationship with attitude in handling cyberbullying is quite low. The relationship between cyberbullying intention and attitude in handling cyberbullying is quite low.

Keywords: Cyberbullying, Generation Z, Youth

Introduction

In the digital era driven by technology, communications are easy and much faster. The use of the Internet has spread widely among children and youths. Examination of the Internet usage behavior in Thailand in 2019 revealed that in the past decade, Thais have increased their use of the Internet by 150%. This has resulted in Thailand having 47.5 million people or 70% of the population online. It is found that Generation Y (born between 1980-1987) used Internet the most. They spend 10 hours 36 minutes online. This is followed by Generation Z (born between 1987-1991), who spend 10 hours 36 minutes (Electronic Transactions Development Agency, 2019). There are many forms of Internet usage behavior that include both positive and negative aspects. However, a problematic behavior in Thai society today is cyberbullying. It is a problem focused on media use that is becoming more significant and violent.

Cyberbullying is defined as threatening, making fun of, or abusing others repeatedly to cause them pain through online channels such as mobile phones or other electronic devices (Hinduja

Citation Information: Euajarusphan, A. (2021). Cyberbullying and Thai Generation Z Youths in Bangkok, Thailand. *International Journal of Crime, Law and Social Issues*, 8(2), 43-55. <https://doi.org/10.14456/ijclsi.2021.5>.

& Patchin, 2012). The aggressor does not need to have strength or wield higher social power like physical bullying. They use various communications in the online world such as sound clips, messages, images, and video clips to abuse others or use the actions as an outlet for vengeance. Although there is no physical abuse, it has particular dangerous aspects. This is because the actions could be taken immediately. There are no limitations of time and location. Also, it is made public so its effects are broader within a short period of time. The abuser might cover up their identity, which leads to violence without any responsibility for the consequences. Youths are at an age where they are vulnerable to stress and pressures. They lack the maturity to manage their life problems in a suitable manner. When faced with cyberbullying, they have the possibility to be highly affected mentally and socially. The abuser would absorb this habit and become addicted to violence, thus repeating such behavior. This is particularly true on cyber channels that allow immediate response and allow abusers to cover up their identity. Thus, it promotes the behavior to be done without restraint when compared to physical abuse. Cyberbullying is not only limited to online abuse, or a small problem compared to physical abuse as most people seem to understand (Hinduja & Patchin, 2012). From Weber and Pelfrey (2014) the findings indicated that youths, who are the victims of cyberbullying wrote explaining about the mental abuse they suffered including fear, depression, not wanting to go to school, loneliness, feeling of being watched by friends in school, and not having concentration. In addition, they are afraid of being physically hurt because cyberbullying makes them feel afraid and unsafe. This results in changes to their life in various ways such as losing their identity online, having to move schools, and moreover, some of the youths don't even know who their abusers are. They don't even know the reason. Yet, the violence continues becoming a vicious cycle.

From the analysis of Thai children and youth attitudes towards cyberbullying, the findings indicated that cyberbullying in Thailand has the tendency to become more violent. The study was conducted among youths aged no more than 25 years from education institutions all over the country. It is found that 5.24% reported having bullied others online and been subject to cyberbullying. About 2.15% have reported abusing others online. The findings indicated that that 12.4% have been abused (National Institute of Development Administration, 2017). This is in line with the survey indicating online safety for children index (COSI: Child Online Safety Index), developed by DQ (DQ Institution). A study was conducted to assess the Internet usage behavior of Thai children and youths from 2017-2019. The results showed that 2 out of 3 children and Thai youths have experienced cyberbullying. The results showed that children and youths in Thailand are at risk online. They are susceptible to verbal abuses or ganging up to stonewall or get others not to speak with a victim online. This includes reputation risks, shaming posts, and posting images or video clips that are not suitable to create shame. Consequently, this includes having risky contacts involved in fraud to get money or information as well as abuses that might lead to real life threats (Electronic Transactions Development Agency, 2019). In 2017 Charnwit Pornnopadol collected data about cyberbullying from 14 countries around the world. The study found that 45% of Thai youths have experienced cyberbullying. Thailand ranks 5 in 14 countries, which is 4 times more than the USA, Europe, and Japan (Pornnopadol, 2017). Bangkok is the capital of Thailand and the most densely populated province in the country (National Statistical Office of Thailand, 2019) and also has the highest cybercrime statistics in Thailand (Office of Justice Affairs, 2014). From statistics of global digital users in 2018 conducted by "We Are Social Digital Agency and Hoot suite", "Bangkok" is Facebook's most active city with as high as 22,000,000 users (WP, 2018). In addition, from the survey of cyberbullying in undergrad students from various faculties of a university in Bangkok, it was found that the prevalence of cyberbullying encountered by the sample group was 18.5 percent, which was considered high and created concerns for mental health effects, and the most frequent channels of cyberbullying were

Facebook (45.8 percent), Instagram (41.7 percent), Line (8.3 percent) and Twitter (4.2 percent), which are all online channels in the cyber world (Wang & Teaukul, 2019). The findings were consistent with the research on “Harassment of students in secondary and vocational education levels in Bangkok and its vicinity”. It was found that cyberbullying began with verbal intimidation or harassment and then lead to physical and social and, eventually, cyberbullying. In this regard, technology has intensified level and forms of harassment as well as increase the number of harassments. Even this form of harassment may cause less physical pain, but the victims tend to experience more emotional distress. It is because the nature of the online harassments tended to be spread widely and incurred in endless loops. It was also found that social harassments were highly associated with cyberbullying. This showed that students use social media as a part of their communities. Thus, cyberbullying has become a new and serious problem for Thailand (Chaiwat, 2019).

The results of the aforementioned survey show that Thai youths especially in Bangkok are exposed to more violent cyberbullying threats. Thus, it is important to remedy the situation quickly particularly in this era where the Internet technology is getting more advanced. Youths, who were born in this time of technological development are known as Generation Z. They are more susceptible to the problem of cyberbullying. However, regarding the frequency of cyberbullying occurrence it is unclear whether children or youth differ in this regard. This depends on the form of abuse that might occur at different ages (Kowalski et al., 2014). In the Thai context it is found that high school and vocational school students have experienced cyberbullying at 43% (Pokpong & Musikaphan, 2010). Based on the guidelines for development youths aged 15 years and above, importance is given to sexual relationships with members of the opposite sex. They spend more time with their friends than with their parents. They are more emotionally fragile and susceptible to depression. Likewise, they are at risk to personal problems more than other age groups. Thus, youths in Generation Z are at risk of succumbing to complex factors. They might be strongly affected particularly when exposed to cyberbullying.

From the aforementioned problems, the study examines cyberbullying behavior and the attitude that Thai youths and Generation Z , aged between 19-24 years have in dealing with the situation. These youths are at risk to experiencing cyberbullying. The study is beneficial to individuals, organizations, and the authorities that control, protect, and assist youths. This would foster better understanding that leads to the creation of a body of knowledge and planning to remedy such behavior or create guidelines in solving the problems of cyberbullying faced by children and youths.

Research Problem

- 1) To study the awareness, attitude, and intention to engage in cyberbullying behaviors of youths in the Generation Z.
- 2) To study the attitude towards handling cyberbullying of Thai youths and Generation Z.

Research Objectives

- 1) To study the online usage behavior of Thai youths and Generation Z.
- 2) To study the awareness, attitude, and intention to engage in cyberbullying behaviors of Thai youths in Generation Z.
- 3) To study the attitude towards handling cyberbullying of Thai youths in Generation Z.
- 4) To study the relationship between awareness, attitude, and intention to engage in cyberbullying and attitude towards handling cyberbullying of Thai youths in Generation Z.

Research Methodology

The research methodology used is a quantitative study using a questionnaire to collect data.

Population and sample: The populations in the study are 447,916 youths aged between 19-24 years, who were exposed to cyberbullying behavior in Bangkok (National Statistical Office of Thailand, 2019).

Therefore, size of the sample group was calculated based on Taro Yamane formula in case of finite population (1973), with 95% confidence level and acceptable tolerance value of 0.05, the calculated sample size was 399.64 persons. Therefore, the researcher used an appropriate sample size of 400 youths aged between 19-24 years, who are at risk of cyberbullying in Bangkok. The sampling methodology used for this study is purposive sampling.

Research Tool: The questionnaire is comprised of close-ended questions. It is a self-administered questionnaire where respondents answer the questions on their own. The questionnaire is divided into seven parts. The first part includes general questions regarding the respondents profile. The second part includes questions about online usage behavior. The third part includes questions about awareness of cyberbullying behavior. The fourth part includes questions about attitudes towards cyberbullying. The fifth part includes questions regarding cyberbullying Behavior Intention. The sixth part is the cyberbullying experience. The seventh part is the attitude towards handling cyberbullying.

This study utilized a questionnaire for data collection; thus, the validity and reliability has been checked. The procedures are explained in the following section.

1) Validity is the test to measure the accuracy of the instrument for data collection. The construct validity by having experts, who have the knowledge and expertise consider the data collection tool based on its structure and suitability of the language used. Three experts were used. The scores showing the match between the questions and objectives all exceed the criteria of 0.5 for all 53 questions. All of the questions registered a score between 0.67-1.00. The questionnaire was then modified before use in actual data collection.

2) The questionnaire reliability was measured using the Pre-Test collected from Thai youths aged 19-24 years, who are at risk from cyberbullying. Fifty questionnaires were collected for the pre-test to modify the data prior to actual data collection. The reliability for questions in parts 3-6 were tested using Cronbach Alpha measures. The results ranged from 0.79-0.95 (Table1).

Table 1 Cronbach Alpha measures

Domain	α -Coefficient
Awareness of Cyberbullying Behavior	0.95
attitudes towards cyberbullying	0.86
Cyberbullying Behavior Intention	0.88
cyberbullying experience	0.79
Total	0.87

There are four main variables in this study, which are awareness of cyberbullying, attitudes towards cyberbullying, intention to engage in cyberbullying behavior, and attitude towards handling cyberbullying. Each of these variables are measured as follows:

1) Awareness of cyberbullying: the awareness of cyberbullying scale from the study of Patchin and Hinduja (2012). The validity score was 79. The variable is measured using a five-point Likert Scale.

2) Attitude towards cyberbullying: the cyberbullying scale from Aaker, Jennifer & Durairaj (1997). The validity score was 95. The variable was measured using a seven-point Likert Scale, which was modified to become a five-point Semantic Differential Scale.

3) Intention to engage in cyberbullying behavior: the intention to engage in cyberbullying from Liang et al., (2013). The validity score is 84. The variable was measured using a seven-point Likert Scale, which was modified to become a five-point Likert Scale.

4) Cyberbullying experience: the cyberbullying experience scale by Srisa-ard (2010). It is measured in 4 levels, which was measured using a 4-point Likert Scale.

5) Attitude towards handling cyberbullying: the scale was taken from Aaker, Jennifer & Durairaj (1997). The validity score was 87. The variable was measured using a seven-point Semantic Differential Scale, which was modified to be a five-point Semantic Differential Scale.

Statistics Used for Data Analysis

1) The respondents profile including gender, age, and level of education was analyzed using frequency and percentage.

2) The analysis of awareness of cyberbullying, attitudes towards cyberbullying, intention to engage in cyberbullying behavior, and attitude towards handling cyberbullying were analyzed using mean and standard deviation. The means were then analyzed for meaning interpretation.

3) The analysis of cyberbullying experience utilized means and standard deviation. The means were then analyzed for meaning interpretation.

4) The analysis of different respondent characteristics that impact online usage behavior. These characteristics are based on gender, age, and education level. The analysis used include t-test, F-test, and One-way ANOVA. If differences are found, pairwise comparison would be conducted using LSD.

5) The analysis of the relationship between awareness, attitude, and cyberbullying engagement intention and the attitude towards handling cyberbullying utilized the Pearson's Correlation Coefficient, which used the five level relationship criteria (Hinkle et al., 1998).

The ethical clearance procedure for conducting this research was first obtained from The Human Research Ethics Committee of Thammasat University, Thammasat University, Bangkok, Thailand (Ethical Clearance number 062/2564).

Research Findings

The online usage behavior of Thai youths and Generation Z

The research findings indicate that the online media use of Thai youths and Generation Z revealed that most of them know the definition of cyberbullying (88.30%). The remaining 11.80% claim not to know the definition of cyberbullying. Most of them use online media more than 3 times per day (48.30%) followed by 2-3 times per day (32.30%). They spend less than 1 hour per time (30.80%) followed by 1-2 hours per time (27.30%). Most of them access online media at home (45.80%) followed by at work (29.30%). They usually spend 16.01-20.00 hrs. (49.50%) followed by 20.01-00.00 hrs. (32.30%). Most of them use mobile/smartphones in accessing the Internet (89%). The most used social media is Facebook (36%) followed by Line (30.30%), Twitter (15.30%), and Instagram (12%). Most of them use social media to connect with people they know (19%), meet new friends (15.50%), search information/exchange information (16.50%), and update status/personal information/images/achievements (12.50%). In terms of the analysis of personal characteristics effect on online media user behavior, the results revealed that respondents of different gender have different online usage behavior, location of usage of online media, and time of day in using online media at the statistical significance level of 0.05. In terms of frequency in using online media, time spent using online media, device for accessing online media, social network used, and reason for using social media, there is no difference.

Different age has an effect on using online media in terms of location of using online media, time of day in using online media, social network used, and reason for using social media are different at the statistical significance level of 0.05. The frequency of using online media, time spent using online media, and device for accessing online media, there is no difference.

Different levels of education have an impact on media usage behavior, location of using online media, time of day in using online media, and social network used at the statistical significance level of 0.05. The frequency of using online media, time spent using online media, device for accessing online media, and reason for using social media, there is no difference.

In addition, analysis of cyberbullying experience, the data revealed that the respondents have experienced cyberbullying with a mean of 2.77 (SD = 0.292). They have experienced cyberbullying at a high level. Consideration of each of the statements revealed that flaming has the highest mean of 3.00 (SD = 0.766), which is interpreted as a high level. This is followed by impersonation with a mean of 2.97 (SD = 0.711) which is interpreted as a high level, denigration with a mean of 2.85 (SD = 0.847) which is interpreted as a high level, harassment with a mean of 2.80 (SD = 0.813) which is interpreted as a high level, sexting with a mean of 2.79 (SD = 0.853) which is interpreted as a high level, outing and trickery with a mean of 2.72 (SD = 0.853) which is interpreted as a high level, video recording of assaults with a mean of 2.65 (SD = 0.774) which is interpreted as a high level, exclusion/ostracism with a mean of 2.63 (SD = 0.928) which is interpreted as a high level, and cyber stalking with a mean of 2.57 (SD = 0.973) which is interpreted as a high level respectively.

The awareness, attitude, and intention to engage in cyberbullying behaviors of Thai youths in Generation Z

Table 2 Mean and Standard Deviation Awareness of Cyberbullying Behavior

Awareness of Cyberbullying Behavior	Level of Agreement		
	\bar{x}	SD	Interpretation
1) Cyberbullying is an important issue.	4.06	0.760	Agree
2) Cyberbullying encroaches on personal privacy.	4.61	0.517	Strongly Agree
3) Cyberbullying tarnishes the reputation of others.	4.55	0.513	Strongly Agree
4) Cyberbullying today can be done easily.	4.43	0.637	Strongly Agree
5) Cyberbullying is widespread in online social media.	4.31	0.596	Strongly Agree
6) Cyberbullying is normal in the online world.	3.16	0.831	Moderately Agree
7) Have the right to post anything online.	2.41	0.848	Not Agree
8) People who engage in cyberbullying should be punished.	4.20	0.751	Agree
9) People around me engage in actions considered as cyberbullying.	2.82	0.914	Moderately Agree
Total	3.84	0.263	Agree

From Table 2, the results revealed that awareness about cyberbullying behavior in total is at the agree level. When considering each of the items, it is found that cyberbullying is considered as encroaching on personal privacy at the strongly agree level with the highest mean at 4.61 (SD = 0.517). This is followed by cyberbullying tarnishes the reputation of others with a mean of 4.55 (SD = 0.513), which is interpreted as strongly agree. This is followed by cyberbullying today can be done easily with a mean of 4.43 (SD = 0.637), cyberbullying is widespread in online social media with a mean of 4.31 (SD = 0.596), which is interpreted as strongly agree. This is followed by people who engage in cyberbullying should be punished with a mean of 4.20 (SD = 0.751), which is interpreted as strong agree respectively. This is followed by cyberbullying is an important issue with a mean of 4.06 (SD = 0.760), which is interpreted as strongly agree respectively. This is followed by cyberbullying is normal in the online world with a mean of 3.16 (SD = 0.831), which is at the level of moderately agree. This is followed by people around me engage in actions considered as cyberbullying with a mean of 2.82

(SD = 0.914), which is interpreted as moderately agree. This is followed by people have the right to post anything online, with a mean of 2.41 (SD = 0.848), which is interpreted as not agree.

Table 3 Mean and Standard Deviation Attitude towards Cyberbullying

Attitude towards Cyberbullying	Level of Agreement		
	\bar{x}	SD	Interpretation
Cyberbullying is wrong.	4.24	0.655	Strongly Agree
Cyberbullying problem is interesting.	3.72	0.798	Agree
Cyberbullying behavior should not be done.	4.39	0.573	Strongly Agree
Cyberbullying is an important issue.	3.94	0.728	Agree
Cyberbullying is cruel.	4.10	0.716	Agree
Cyberbullying is a violent behavior.	4.08	0.568	Agree
Cyberbullying is considered a threat.	4.23	0.675	Strongly Agree
Total	4.10	0.277	Agree

From Table 3, the data revealed that that attitude towards cyberbullying in total has a mean of 4.10 (SD = 0.277). When considering each of the items, it is found that cyberbullying should not be done has the highest mean of 4.39 (SD = 0.573), which is interpreted as strongly agree. This is followed by cyberbullying behavior should not be done with a mean of 4.24 (SD = 0.655), which is interpreted as strongly agree. This is followed by cyberbullying is considered a threat, with a mean of 4.23 (SD = 0.675), which is interpreted as strongly agree. This is followed by cyberbullying is cruel, with a mean of 4.10 (SD = 0.716), which is interpreted as agree. This is followed by cyberbullying is a violent behavior with a mean of 4.08 (SD = 0.568), which is interpreted as agree. This is followed by cyberbullying is an important issue with a mean of 3.94 (SD = 0.728), which is interpreted as agree. This is followed by cyberbullying problem is interesting, with a mean of 3.72 (SD = 0.798), which is interpreted as agree.

Table 4 Mean and Standard Deviation Cyberbullying Behavior Intention

Cyberbullying Behavior Intention	Level of Agreement		
	\bar{x}	SD	Interpretation
1) Have tendency to engage in cyberbullying behavior in the future.	2.14	0.787	Not Agree
2) Should consider well before posting any comments online.	4.35	0.593	Strongly Agree
3) Recommend others to consider before posting any comments.	4.26	0.681	Strongly Agree
4) Would certainly not engage in cyberbullying intention.	4.59	0.555	Strongly Agree
5) It is impossible to engage in cyberbullying behavior.	4.32	0.676	Strongly Agree
6) Don't think of engaging in cyberbullying behavior.	4.45	0.537	Strongly Agree
Total	4.02	0.295	Agree

From Table 4, the data revealed that cyberbullying behavior intention in total has a mean of 4.02 (SD = 0.295), which is interpreted as agree. When considering each of the items, it is found that would certainly not engage in cyberbullying intention with a mean of 4.59 (SD = 0.555), which is interpreted as strongly agree. This is followed by don't think of engaging in cyberbullying behavior with a mean of 4.45 (SD = 0.537), which is interpreted as strongly agree. This is followed by should consider well before posting any comments online with a mean of 4.35 (SD = 0.593), which is interpreted as strongly agree. This is followed by

it is impossible to engage in cyberbullying behavior with a mean of 4.32 (SD = 0.676), which is interpreted as strong agree. This is followed by recommend others to consider before posting any comments with a mean of 4.26 (SD = 0.681), which is interpreted as strongly agree. This is followed by have tendency to engage in cyberbullying behavior in the future with a mean of 2.14 (SD = 0.787), which is interpreted as not agree.

The attitude towards handling cyberbullying of Thai youths in Generation Z

Table 5 Mean and Standard Deviation Attitude towards Handling Cyberbullying

Attitude towards Handling Cyberbullying	Level of Agreement		
	\bar{x}	SD	Interpretation
1) Don't respond to bullying posts. Let it pass.	3.14	0.705	Moderately Agree
2) Confront to ask reason for posting.	3.58	0.542	Agree
3) Close-off cyberbullies by deleting or blocking bullies in every channel.	4.17	0.647	Agree
4) Collect evidence or record cyberbullies' behavior and situation to report to law enforcement.	4.05	0.764	Agree
5) Report violence, send information about violence to the system administrator.	4.12	0.698	Agree
6) Request advise from experts or consultation units.	3.90	0.674	Agree
7) Request advise from circle of acquaintances.	4.09	0.768	Agree
8) Retaliation	3.61	0.519	Agree
Total	3.83	0.245	Agree

From Table 5, the data revealed that attitude towards handling cyberbullying in total has a mean of 3.83 (SD = 0.245), which is interpreted as strongly agree. When considering each of the items, it is found that close-off cyberbullies by deleting or blocking bullies in every channel has the highest mean of 4.17 (SD = 0.647), which is interpreted as agree. This is followed by report violence, send information about violence to the system administrator with a mean of 4.12 (SD = 0.698), which is interpreted as agree. This is followed by request advise from circle of acquaintances with a mean of 4.09 (SD = 0.768), which is interpreted as agree. This is followed by collect evidence or record cyberbullies' behavior and situation to report to law enforcement with a mean of 4.05 (SD = 0.764). This is followed by request advise from experts or consultation units with a mean of 3.90 (SD = 0.674), which is interpreted as agree. This is followed by retaliation with a mean of 3.61 (SD = 0.519), which is interpreted as agree. This is followed by confront to ask reason for posting with a mean of 3.58 (SD = 0.542), which is interpreted as agree. This is followed by don't respond to bullying posts or let it pass, with a mean of 3.14 (SD = 0.705), which is interpreted as moderately agree.

The relationship between awareness, attitude, and intention to engage in cyberbullying and attitude towards handling cyberbullying of Thai youths in Generation Z

From Table 6, the findings indicated that that awareness of cyberbullying behavior has a positive relationship with attitude towards handling cyberbullying at a significant level of 0.00 at quite a low level ($r = 0.227$).

Cyberbullying Behavior Intention has a positive relationship at a significant level of 0.04 at quite a low level ($r = 0.102$).

Attitude towards cyberbullying has no relationship with awareness of cyberbullying behavior, cyberbullying intention, and attitude towards handling cyberbullying.

Table 6 The relationship between awareness, attitude, behavior intention, and attitude towards handling cyberbullying

The relationship between awareness, attitude, behavior intention, and attitude towards handling cyberbullying.		Aware-ness	Attitudes towards Cyberbullying	Behavior Intention	Attitude towards handling
Awareness	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.029	-0.001	.227**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.569	0.99	0.00
	n	400	400	400	400
Attitudes towards Cyberbullying	Pearson Correlation	-0.029	1	-0.034	0
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.569		0.493	0.994
	n	400	400	400	400
Behavior Intention	Pearson Correlation	-0.001	-0.034	1	.102*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.99	0.493		0.04
	n	400	400	400	400
Attitude towards handling	Pearson Correlation	.227**	0	.102*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	0.994	0.04	
	n	400	400	400	400

Conclusion and Discussion

The study of the online media usage behavior of Thai Generation Z youths, revealed that most of them access online media through mobile phone/smart phone the most. This is because youths today mostly own a mobile phone/smart phone enabling Internet access all the time. They choose to use social networks such as Facebook and Line to communicate with others. In addition, it is convenient and easy to use, thus it could be accessed through other devices such as tablet and computer. This is in line with Field (2006), who explained that the communications channel through the Internet that is highly popular among teenagers is the mobile phone/smart phone. Teenagers often used Facebook, Line, and Twitter to communicate (Senkaew, 2015). This is also in line with Deniz & Geyik (2015), who found that undergraduate students preferred Facebook the most. The findings are also in line with the survey of Internet usage behavior in Thailand (2020), which found that Internet users access through mobile devices the most for communicating on social networks. It is also found that Facebook is the most popular social network followed by Line application.

The research examining the awareness of cyberbullying of Thai Generation Z youths revealed that respondents are aware most that cyberbullying is considered as “encroaching on personal privacy” ($\bar{x} = 4.61$). This is in line with the research of Sirisomrutai and Samoh, who found that the awareness of cyberbullying is about invasion of personal privacy creating damage and irritation to the victim (Sirisomrutai, 2017; Samoh, 2013). In the same vein Fowler (2016) found that respondents viewed that cyberbullying can be considered as violation of privacy through the use of phone, messages, images, or moving images to harass or threaten repeatedly. It is a mental torment with the intent to affect or cause harm to the victim. Awareness is the process of receiving information from external stimulus through exposure and feelings that have been given meaning through experience and learning. The body responds to stimulus. Thus, the feeling and awareness become important components leading to behavior. If the feelings and responses are impaired or faulty, the physical behavior would also become abnormal. In this study, the respondents have direct and indirect experience through exposure to messages in the cyberworld (Etzel & Stanton, 2001; Gray, 2004; Solomon, 2007). For instance, the creation of news in the cyberworld, wherein the person sharing does not know the truth or whether the information has been twisted. This results in both direct and indirect negative consequences to the victim. From such experience, the respondents would be exposed

to stimulus thus resulting in the interpretation that such behavior is cyberbullying and is an invasion of privacy.

From the research findings, attitude towards cyberbullying of Thai Generation Z youths revealed that “cyberbullying behavior should not be done” ($\bar{x} = 4.39$) and “cyberbullying is wrong” ($\bar{x} = 4.24$) and “cyberbullying is considered a threat” ($\bar{x} = 4.23$). This is in line with (Sirisomrutai, 2017), who studied awareness, attitude, and intention to engage in cyberbullying behavior. The findings indicated that respondents have the attitude that cyberbullying should not be done. This is because the respondents may have experienced such behavior as abuser or seeing someone in the cyberworld, who has been bullied with their own eyes. In addition, most of the youth have received information about the effects of cyberbullying through media. Thus, they view cyberbullying as something that should not be done.

The research findings regarding cyberbullying behavior intention of Thai Generation Z youths, the findings indicated that most of the youths, “consider well before posting any comments” ($\bar{x} = 4.35$). They would “certainly not engage in cyberbullying intention” ($\bar{x} = 4.59$). The results reflect that most of the youths have awareness and attitude towards cyberbullying as something negative that should not be done. Therefore, they are careful to prevent cyberbullying action. This is in line with Assael (1998), who explained that awareness is the process in which individuals collect information from various sources or situations. Consequently, this would be interpreted as a cohesive understanding to facilitate ease of understanding. Awareness leads to response behavior. In the same vein, Uecharasphan (2021) explained that attitude towards cyberbullying is defined as the feeling towards cyberbullying. It motivates behavior or the possible response to cyberbullying in a particular direction. This could be support or refutation, depends on the social learning process.

Analysis of the research findings regarding cyberbullying experience of Thai Generation Z youths indicate that cyberbullying forms that youths experience the most is flaming. They might be attacked with rude words, treated with contempt, and impersonation such as the creation of fake accounts to impersonate the youth in order to post messages or images that are inappropriate on social media. This would cause harm to the youth, which is in line with the research by Jinyamaitree and Sripha (2020), who studied the prevention of social deviant behavior of youths, who have been victims of cyberbullying. The study was conducted as a case study of one school in Samut Prakarn province. The findings indicated that the most prevalent type of cyberbullying behavior is flaming, sarcastic remarks, and making accusations through inbox conversations. This behavior is categorized as comments that are contemptuous, which is in line with the research conducted by Amaraphibal (2016) examined the causation relationship model of cyberbullying victims. The study found that most cyberbullying behaviors include flaming, gossip, contempt, threat, accusation, impersonation, exclusion, exposure of secrets or personal information, and passing on pornographic material. Attacking people with rude words or denigration and impersonation causes deep seated pain that is longer lasting than physical abuse.

The examination of attitude towards handling cyberbullying of Thai Generation Z youths revealed that most of them “close-off cyberbullies by deleting or blocking bullies in every channel” ($\bar{x} = 4.17$) or “report violence, send information about violence to the system administrator” ($\bar{x} = 4.12$), and “request advice from circle of acquaintances” ($\bar{x} = 4.09$). This is because deleting or blocking or reporting to the system administrator is easy and much faster than other means of handling the situation. This shows digital media literacy and using of technology to solve the problem, which is in line with Hinduja & Patchin (2008) and Notar et al., (2013). The researchers explained that the means to protect oneself from cyberbullying is when the individual realizes they are being bullied, they should request assistance from the relevant authorities to request advice and the necessary assistance. In addition, they request advice from people close to them such as close friends. This is because when a person is

experiencing cyberbullying, they feel uncomfortable and mentally hurt. Thus, they would discuss with their friends first. They are afraid and pressured when seeking advice from their parents. This is in line with the research of Sittichai & Tudkuea (2017), which found that seeking advice from close friends makes them feel more at ease. They do not feel pressured and stressed from the questions asked by adults. Moreover, this is in line with Lertratthamrongkul (2021), which found that most students solve their problems by asking their friends first. This is because students view parents, teachers, or adults cannot solve their problems at all. They are also afraid to be viewed in a negative light.

Recommendations

The findings indicated that Generation Z youths are aware of cyberbullying behavior at a very high level. They have an attitude that cyberbullying is not good and should not be done. This reflects their attitude in preventing cyberbullying behavior. They have the intention of not engaging in cyberbullying behavior. They also have good attitude in handling cyberbullying. Thus, the following recommendations are made.

- 1) Generation Z spend most of their time at home playing social media. Therefore, parents need to explain to them so that they would understand the cyberbullying problem. They should be informed of means for handling the problem. In addition, parents should closely observe behavior in order to tackle the problem in time so that their children would not fall victim to cyberbullying.
- 2) Schools, the Ministry of Education, and Ministry of Science, Research, and Innovation should inoculate the youths with broad knowledge so they have immunity to cyberbullying. Knowledge and activities that build awareness about cyberbullying in curriculums for creating broad awareness among youths. Having more awareness would result in negative attitude towards inappropriate behaviors in cyberbullying. This would inhibit cyberbullying behavior in the future.
- 3) The Ministry of Social Development and Human Stability, Ministry of Digital Economy and Society, service providers, and NBTC, government agencies, and private enterprises that have a role to play in the problem should use the research findings to control and prevent cyberbullying behavior. This includes management of the problem when it does occur in a timely manner.

References

- Amaraphibal, A. (2016). Cyber-bullying victimization among youths: Risk factor, mental health impacts and reporting to the third person. *Research Methodology and Cognitive Science*, 14(1), 59-73.
- Assael, H. (1998). *Consumer Behavior and Marketing Action*. 6th ed. Ohio: South-Western College Publishing.
- Chaiwat, T. (2019). *DTAC-Harassment of students in secondary and vocational education levels in Bangkok and its vicinity*. Retrieved from www.bangkokbiznews.com/tech/838579.
- Deniz, M., & Geyik, S. (2015). An Empirical Research on General Internet Usage Patterns of Undergraduate Students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 195, 895-904.
- Electronic Transactions Development Agency. (2019). *Average internet usage time of Thai people has increased to 10 hours 22 minutes, Gen Y has been the number one for 5 years*. Retrieved from www.etcha.or.th/th/NEWS/ETDA-Revealed-Thailand-Internet-User-Behavior-2019.aspx.
- Etzel, W., & Stanton. (2001). *Marketing*. 12th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Field, D. (2006). *Cyber bullying and victimization: Psychosocial characteristics of bullies, victims, and bully/victims*. Master of Arts Thesis, University of Montana.

- Fowler, D. (2016). *Back to school-let's keep our kids safe online*. Retrieved from www.act-on.com/blog/back-to-school-lets-keep-our-kids-safe-online.
- Gray. (2004). *Knowledge sourcing effectiveness*. Virginia: University of Virginia.
- Hinkle, D., William, W., & Stephen G. (1998). *Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. 4th ed. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. (2008). Cyberbullying: An Exploratory Analysis of Factors Related to Offending and Victimization. *Deviant Behavior*, 29(2), 129-156.
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. (2012). *Cyberbullying Prevention and Response: Expert Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Jennifer, A., & Durairaj. (1997). The Effect of Cultural Orientation on Persuasion. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 3(24), 315-328.
- Kowalski, R., & Limber, S. (2014). Psychological, physical, and academic correlates of cyberbullying and traditional bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 53(1), 13-20.
- Lertratthamrongkul, W. (2021). Cyberbullying among Secondary School Students: Prevalence, Problemsolving and Risk Behaviors. *NEU Academic and Research Journal*, 1(11), 275-289.
- Liang, S., Ekinci, Y., Occhiocupo, N., & Whyatt, G. (2013). Antecedents of travellers' electronic word-of-mouth communication. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 29(5), 584-606.
- National Institute of Development Administration. (2017). *Attitude of Thai children and teenagers toward cyber bullying*. Retrieved from https://nidapoll.nida.ac.th/data/survey/uploads/FILE-1603871_940213.pdf.
- National Statistical Office of Thailand. (2019). *Statistics of population in Bangkok*. Retrieved from <http://statbbi.nso.go.th/staticreport/page/sector/th/01.aspx>.
- Notar, C., Padgett, S., & Roden, J. (2013). Cyberbullying: A Review of the Literature. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 1(1), 1-9.
- Office of Justice Affairs. (2014). *Crime Report*. Retrieved from www.oja.go.th/TH/wpcontent/uploads/2017/07/cjs-b4.pdf.
- Pokpong, S., & Musikaphan, W. (2010). *Factors influencing the aggressive attitude and behavior both physical and cyber bullying of Thai people*. Bangkok: The Wisdom Society for Public Opinion Research of Thailand.
- Pornnopadol, C. (2017). *"DTAC-Path 2 Health Foundation" established Stop Bullying Chatroom, according to the research, online bullying in Thailand skyrockets to the top 5 of the world*. Retrieved from www.dtac.co.th/pressroom/news/dtac-stop-bullying.html.
- Samoh, N. (2013). *Youth Perceptions on Cyberbullying*. Master of Arts Thesis, Mahidol University.
- Senkaew, G. (2015). *Social Network Usage Behaviours of X Generation in Bangkok*. Master of Business Administration Thesis, Bangkok University.
- Sirisomrutai, C. (2017). *Perception, Attitude, and Behavioral Intension towards Cyberbullying*. Master of Communication Arts Thesis, Bangkok University.
- Sittichai, R., & Tudkuea, T. (2017). Cyberbullying Behavior among Youth in the Three Southern Border Provinces, Thailand. *Academic Services Journal, Prince of Songkla University*, 28(1), 86-99.
- Srisa-ard, B. (2010). *The initial research*. 8th ed. Bangkok: Suweeriyasan.
- Solomon, M. (2007). *Consumer Behavior: Buying, Having, and Being*. 9th ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Wang, S., & Teaukul, S. (2019). Cyber Bullying in Undergrad Students of Health Science Programs. *Thai Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 50(2), 17-28.

- Weber, N., & Pelfrey, W., Jr. (2014). *Cyberbullying: Causes, Consequences, and Coping Strategies*. Texas: LFB Scholarly Publishing.
- WP. (2018). *"Thailand" most addicted to internet user in the world-"Bangkok" the city that has the highest Facebook user*. Retrieved from www.brandbuffet.in.th/2018/02/globaland-thailand-digital-report-2018.