Lambros Lazuras

South-East European Research Centre
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Jacek Pyżalski

Instytut Medycyny Pracy
prof. J. Nofera w Łodzi

Vassilis Barkoukis, Haralambos Tsorbatzoudis

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

EMPATHY AND MORAL DISENGAGEMENT IN ADOLESCENT CYBERBULLYING: IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL INTERVENTION AND PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE

Abstract. Lazuras Lambros, Pyżalski Jacek, Barkoukis Vassilis, Tsorbatzoudis Haralambos, *Empathy and Moral Disengagement in Adolescent Cyberbullying: Implications for Educational Intervention and Pedagogical Practice* [Empatia i rozhamowanie moralne jako predykatory cyberbullyingu: implikacje dla interwencyjnych i profilaktycznych działań edukacyjnych]. Studia Edukacyjne nr 23, 2012, Poznań 2012, pp. 57-69. Adam Mickiewicz University Press. ISBN 978-83-232-2520-1. ISSN 1233-6688

Cyberbullying represents an emerging form of adolescent aggression that is channelled contemporary through information and communications technologies (ICTs). Research on the psychosocial correlates is still growing but the available evidence highlights the importance of moral disengagement and empathy in predicting cyberbullying behavior. Educators can benefit from this research and accordingly develop curricula and employ practices that tap moral and empathic beliefs in young people, in order to curb the onset and prevalence of cyberbullying among students. The present article discusses the nature of cyberbullying, reviews the studies assessing the relationships between empathy, moral disengagement and cyberbullying in adolescents, and presents the implications for educational interventions and pedagogical practice.

Key words: moral disengagement, empathy, cyberbullying, adolescents, education

Introduction

Cyberbullying as an emerging form of adolescent aggression. Within the last decade there has been a growing scientific interest in the use of emerging information and communication technologies (ICTs), and particularly social media and social networking sites, by young people. This research can be broadly distinguished between studies focusing on the positive aspects of ICT use, such as curriculum development and enhanced teaching and learning experiences[1], and studies assessing the negative side effects of ICT use by young people, such as gaming addiction, aggressiveness and online games, dangerous content, and cyberbullying.[2]

Adolescent aggression and bullying are not new to psychologists and educators. In fact, there is large body of research on these topics and many educational programs have been developed based on relevant empirical findings over the past 30 years.[3] However, the maladaptive use of ICTs may radically transform adolescent deviant behaviors, and make aggressiveness and bullying harder to detect or control. It may also be associated with new pasychological and social mechanisms, as well as different risk and protective factors.[4] Cyberbullying is an emerging form of aggression that is realized through new social media and ICTs, including chatting rooms, personalized communication (e.g., emails, sms), blogging, and social networking services.[5] It may appear in several forms,

---

[1] C. Greenhow, B. Robelia, J.E. Hughes, *Learning, teaching, and scholarship in a digital age*, Educational Researcher, 2009, nr 38, s. 246-259; L. Miller, H. Schweingruber, R. Oliver, J. Mayes, D. Smith, *Teaching neuroscience through web adventures: adolescents reconstruct the history and science of opioids*, The Neuroscientist, 2002, nr 8, s. 16-21.

[2] S.M. Gruser, R. Thalemann, M.D. Griffiths, *Excessive computer gaming: evidence for addiction and aggression?* CyberPsychology and Behavior, 2007, nr 10, s. 290-292; Q. Li, *New bottle but old wine: A research of cyberbullying in schools*, Computers in Human Behavior, 2007, nr 23, s. 1777-1791; K.S. Young, *Internet addiction: the emergence of a new clinical disorder*, CyberPsychology and Behavior, 1998, nr 1, 237-244.

[3] D. Olweus, *Bullying at school: what we know and what we can do*, Oxford 1993; K. Rigby (ed.), *New perspectives on bullying*, London-Philadelphia 2002; J.D. Smith, B.H. Schneider, P.K. Smith, K. Ananiadou, *The effectiveness of whole-school antibullying programs: a synthesis of evaluation research*, School Psychology Review, 2004, nr 33, s. 547--560; P.K. Smith, K. Ananiadou, H. Cowie, *Interventions to reduce school bullying*, Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 2003, nr 48, s. 591-599.

[4] J.J. Dooley, J. Pyżalski, D. Cross, *Cyberbullying versus face-to-face bullying: A theoretical and conceptual review*, Zeitschrift fuer Psychologie, 2009, nr 217, s. 182--188; J. Pyżalski, *Agresja elektroniczna i cyberbullying jako nowe ryzykowne zachowania młodzieży*, Kraków 2012.

[5] J.W. Patchin, S. Hinduja, *Bullies move beyond the schoolyard*, Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 2006, nr 4, s. 148-169; R. Slonje, P.K. Smith, *Cyberbullying: another main type of bulling?* Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 2008, nr 49, s. 147-154.

such as flaming and online fighting, sending aggressive and threatening emails or SMS, posting libelous information against others, stealing personal data, and humiliating others in social networking sites and media.[6] While cyberbullying was initially thought of as a phenomenon relevant only within the adolescent population, studies have shown that teachers and educators may as well be cyber-victimized by their students.[7] It appears that the maladaptive use of ICTs and social media for bullying purposes is an emerging challenge for educators and school leaders, and there is a need for the development of evidence-based preventive educational interventions and pedagogical practices that will curb cyberbullying trends.

Cyberbullying: Nature and impact on adolescents. Several scholars have noted that cyberbullying is very common to traditional face-to-face bullying, and is nothing more than just an 'old wine in a new bottle'.[8] Indeed, there are many similar features between bullying and cyberbullying behavior.[9] Specifically, both types of bullying aim to hurt their potential victims and are expressed as aggressive and violent acts. Secondly, both face-to-face bullying and cyberbullying are often intentional acts that require deliberation and planning – even more so in cyberbullying, where potential aggressors may need to plot a strategy on how to attack their victims online, such as setting up fake accounts in social media, or even breaching personal codes and 'stealing' sensitive data.[10] Thirdly, in both face-to-face and online bullying, the victims in majority know their perpetrators.[11] Unlike face-to-face bullying, however, cyberbullying is more likely to be addressed to a larger audience, the victim of cyberbullying may not be aware of the moment of attack, and

---

[6] T. Beran, Q. Li, *The relationship between cyberbullying and school bullying*, Journal of Student Wellbeing, 2007, nr 1, s. 15-33; S. Hinduja, J.W. Patchin, *Bullying, cyberbullying, and suicide*, Archives of Suicide Research, 2010, nr 14, s. 206-221; J.W. Patchin, S. Hinduja, *Bullies move beyond.*

[7] S.C. McQuade, J.P. Colt, N. Meyer, *Cyber bullying: Protecting kids and adults from online bullies*, California 2009; J. Pyżalski, D. Merecz (red.), *Psychospołeczne warunki pracy polskich nauczycieli. Pomiędzy wypaleniem zawodowym a zaangażowaniem*, Kraków 2010.

[8] Q. Li, *New bottle but old wine.*

[9] T. Beran, Q. Li, *The relationship between cyberbullying*, s. 15-33; J. Pyżalski, *Agresja elektroniczna wśród dzieci i młodzieży*, Kraków 2011; R. Slonje, P.K. Smith, *Cyberbullying: another main type.*

[10] J. Pyżalski, *Agresja elektroniczna wśród dzieci.*

[11] S. Hinduja, J.W. Patchin, *Bullying, cyberbullying, and suicide*; J. Juvonen, E. Gross, *Extending the school grounds? Bullying experiences in cyberspace*, Journal of School Health, 2008, nr 78, s. 496-505; G. Steffgen, A. König, J. Pfetsch, J.A. Melzer, *Are cyberbullies less empathic? Adolescents' cyberbullying behavior and empathic responsiveness*, Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking, 2011, nr 14, s. 643-648.

cyberbullying aggressors do not need to be physically stronger than their victims, as all aggression takes place online and does not necessarily involve physical confrontation.[12] Regarding the impact of cyberbullying in adolescents several studies have shown that cyberbullying victims show many common morbidity features with victims of traditional bullying, including emotional problems, academic failure, depression, social isolation, and suicidal thoughts and attempts.[13] However, due to the fact that most studies on those issues have been cross-sectional two main methodological problems occur. Firstly, all the conclusions on casual links are speculative and the observed effects can be bidirectional – that means we can observe also the mechanism whereby young people with mental health problems are more likely to be victimized. Secondly, some studies show great overlap of cyberbullying and traditional bullying as well as the roles young people adopt in each case.[14] That makes the differentiation of negative effects stemming from both forms of bullying very complicated.

Empathy, moral disengagement and cyberbullying in adolescence

Empathy and adolescent cyberbullying. Research on individual differences has consistently shown that people do not only differ physically, they also differ psychologically. Individual psychological differences explain why some people tend to adopt different coping strategies or even draw on different emotional and self-regulatory resources when faced with adverse situations. For instance, whereas some people tend to experience and express hostile and negative emotions in response to stressful situations, others tend to experience negative emotions and inhibit them, whereas still others tend to be more easy going and experience no nega-

---

[12] D.L. Hoff, S.N. Mitchell, *Cyberbullying: causes, effects, and remedies*, Journal of Educational Administration, 2009, nr 47, s. 652-665; J.W. Patchin, S. Hinduja, *Bullies move beyond*; Ybarra M., Mitchell K., *Online aggressor/targets, aggressors, and targets: a comparison of associated youth characteristics*, Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 2004, nr 45, s. 1308-1316.

[13] M. Fekkes, F.I.M. Pijpers, A.M. Fredriks, T. Vogels, S.P.Verloove-Vanhorick, *Do bullied children get ill, or do ill children get bullied? A prospective cohort study on the relationship between bullying and health-related symptoms*, Pediatrics, 2006, nr 117, s. 1568-1574; S. Hinduja, J.W. Patchin, *Bullying, cyberbullying, and suicide*.

[14] S. Low, D. Espelage, *Differentiating cyber-bullying perpetration from non-physical bullying: commonalities across race, individual and family predictors*, Psychology of Violence, 2013, nr 3, s. 39-52.

tive emotions at all.[15] In a similar vein, individual differences partly can explain why, how, and where young people and adolescents display aggressive and violent behaviors, such as cyberbullying. Although research on the effects of individual differences in cyberbullying is still at an embryonic state, the available studies suggest that trait empathy plays an important role in cyberbullying behavior.

Empathy is assumed to be a rather stable trait of human personality, and is defined as the person's capacity to feel another person's emotions and accordingly display compassion and assimilate emotional states of other people. For instance, a person interacting with a friend who feels sad may also feel sad or experience negative emotions in response to the friend's sorrow.[16] This way emotional sharing and communication among people is facilitated, and empathy is regarded as a vicarious and involuntary response to emotional cues.[17] While this approach emphasizes the role of emotional assimilation and sharing, another perspective views empathy as comprising both an emotional and a cognitive component.[18] Affective empathy is similar to Hoffman's (2001) conceptualization of involuntary emotional sharing, whereas cognitive empathy reflects the tendency to understand another person's emotions, and accordingly induce prosocial tendencies.[19] As Jolliffe and Farrington (2006) noted, however, independently of whether empathy is viewed as cognitive, affective, or both, it is an essential component of prosocial behavior and moral development, and lower scores of empathy tend to be consistently associated with higher scores of antisocial and aggressive behaviors.[20]

Many studies have shown that lower empathy is predictive of traditional, face-to-face bullying behavior in adolescence.[21] The explanation is

---

[15] J. Denollet, *Type D personality: a potential risk factor refined*, Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 2000, nr 49, s. 255-266; S.S. Pedersen, J. Denollet, *Type D personality, cardiac events, and impaired quality of life: a review*, European Journal of Cardiovascular Prevention and Rehabilitation, 2003, nr 10, s. 241-248.

[16] M.L. Hoffman, *Is altruism part of human nature?* Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1981, nr 40, s. 121-137; tenże, *Toward a comprehensive empathybased theory of prosocial moral development*, [in:] *Constructive and destructive behavior: implications for family, school and society*, eds A. Bohart, D. Stipek, New York 2001.

[17] J. Decety, P.L. Jackson, *A social neuroscience perspective on empathy*, Current Directions in Psychological Science, 2006, nr 15, 54-58.

[18] E.g. M. Davis, *A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy*, Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1980, nr 10, s. 85.

[19] G. Steffgen, A. König, J. Pfetsch, J.A. Melzer, *Are cyberbullies less empathic? Adolescents' cyberbullying behavior and empathic responsiveness*, Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking, 2011, nr 14, s. 643-648.

[20] Ibidem.

[21] I.M. Endresen, D. Olweus, *Self-reported empathy in Norwegian adolescents*; D. Jolliffe, D. Farrington, *Development and validation of the Basic Empathy Scale*, Journal of

that adolescents who bully others tend to display less empathic understanding and emotional sharing are less likely to inhibit their aggressive tendencies and empathize the pain and feelings of their victims.[22] However, Jolliffe and Farrington (2006) showed that bullying behavior was differentially predicted by the distinct features of empathy. Specifically, affective empathy predicted frequent bullying in both male and female adolescents, cognitive empathy (i.e., understanding other people's emotions) was unrelated to bullying behavior.

Nevertheless, Ang and Goh (2010) found that, unlike the case of face-to-face bullying, cognitive empathy played a role in shaping cyberbullying trends in young people. Specifically, an interaction between gender, affective and cognitive empathy was highlighted, whereby lower cognitive empathy predicted cyberbullying behaviour among male adolescents, independently of their scores in affective empathy. In contrast, affective empathy buffered the effect of lower cognitive empathy on cyberbullying among female adolescents. Another study used a context-specific empathy scale that assessed the lack of empathy in direct relation to cyberbullying incidents (e.g., whether websites making fun of other people are fun or amusing), and showed that lower empathy scores predicted cyberbullying behaviour, independently of media type (e.g., internet vs. cell phone cyberbullying) or location (inside vs. outside school). Finally, Schultze-Krumbholz and Scheithauer (2009) showed that lower empathy scores predicted both cyberbullying behaviour and victimization in adolescents. It is noteworthy that the aforementioned studies have demonstrated a negative association between empathy and cyberbullying involvement by using different measures of empathy. Thus, the noted relationship between empathy and cyberbullying is unlikely to be attributed to measurement error relevant to specific empathy measurements.

Moral disengagement and adolescent cyberbullying. The relationship between moral reasoning and behaviour is not always straightforward. Although people's moral beliefs should guide their behaviour according to personal moral standards and norms, this relationship is tenuous when people act in contrast to their moral values and beliefs. Bandura (2002) argued that the relationship between moral reasoning and action is mediated by moral disengagement: a self-regulatory process that enables moral agency, and helps individuals reduce the tension

---

Adolescence, 2006, nr 29, s. 589-611; D. Warden, S. Mackinnon, *Prosocial children, bullies and victims: an investigation of their sociometric status, empathy and social problem-solving strategies*, British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 2003, nr 21, s. 367-385.

[22] P.K. Smith, D. Thompson, *Practical approaches to bullying*, London 1991.

created when enacted behaviours do not match personal standards and moral norms.[23] According to Bandura (2002) moral disengagement is facilitated by eight distinct mechanisms, such as diffusing or displacing responsibility, misattributing blame, dehumanization, advantageous comparison, and minimizing or misconstruing the consequences of immoral and inhumane acts.[24] Several studies have shown that higher levels of moral disengagement predicted violent and aggressive behaviours in adolescents.[25]

In relation to cyberbullying behaviour, the available empirical studies have not provided equivocal findings. Specifically, a couple of studies showed that moral justification mechanisms predicted offline (traditional) bullying but not cyberbullying behaviour.[26] On the other hand, one study showed that moral disengagement related to both offline and online bullying.[27] Also, Bauman (2010) found that moral disengagement predicted cyberbullying behavioural tendencies in response to a hypothetical scenario, but did not predict self-reported engagement in cyberbullying. As Pornari and Wood (2010) as well as Walrave and Heirman (2009) pointed out, perhaps the nature of cyberbullying (e.g., distance from the victim, lack of visibility, secrecy of cyberbullying perpetration) does not activate the need to self-regulate and moralize behaviour in the same way traditional bullying would do. Given that the literature on the psychosocial correlates of cyberbullying, and especially on the role of moral disengagement, is still small, these studies show that future research is needed in this area.

---

[23] A.L. McAlister, A.A. Bandura, S.V. Owen, *Mechanisms of moral disengagement in support of military force: the impact of Sept.9.11*, Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 2006, nr 25, 141-165.

[24] A. Bandura, C. Barbaranelli, G.V. Caprara, C. Pastorelli, *Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency*, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1996, nr 71, s. 364-374.

[25] E.g., G. Gini, *Social cognition and moral cognition in bullying: what's wrong?* Aggressive Behavior, 2006, nr 32, s. 528-539; M. Paciello, R. Fida, C. Tramontano, C. Lupinetti, G.V. Caprara, *Stability and change of moral disengagement and its impact on aggression and violence in late adolescence*, Child Development, 2008, nr 79, s. 1288-1309.

[26] S. Bauman, H. Pero, *Bullying and cyberbullying among deaf students and their hearing peers: an exploratory study*, Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 2011, nr 16, s. 236-253; S. Perren, E. Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, *Cyberbullying and traditional bullying in adolescence: Differential roles of moral disengagement, moral emotions, and moral values*, European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 2012, nr 9, s. 195-209.

[27] C.D. Pornari, J. Wood, *Peer and cyber aggression in secondary school students: the role of moral disengagement, hostile attribution bias, and outcome expectancies*, Aggressive Behaviour, 2010, nr 36, s. 81-94.

Implications for educational interventions and pedagogical practice

The need for positive interventions on new social media use. Before beginning with a detailed discussion about the implications of the aforementioned studies on empathy, moral disengagement and cyberbullying, it is important to present the general framework and context of new social media use by adolescents. To begin with, the web has transgressed physical boundaries and the available web services and applications have radically changed the way people socialize and connect with each other. Emails, chat rooms, social networking sites and blogging are just few of the ways we can communicate with others and make our opinions and thoughts visible, in ways we could not easily consider in the past.[28] Currently, at least 90% of all American teenagers aged between 12 and 17 years are online, and this trend in likely to be adopted in most developed and developing countries in the worlds that have access to the internet.[29] More interestingly, Dooley, Pyżalski, and Cross (2009) pointed out that the use of ICTs and social media is initiated as early as pre-adolescence.

As it turns out, going online is part of everyday life and feels no strange to young people who were born and raised in the digital revolution of the past decade. So, trying to educate adolescents and their teachers or parents/caregivers only about the illegal and maladaptive uses of new social media, or trying to 'demonize' the web would at least be ineffective and reflect a 'techno-phobic' approach to social media education. It appears that pedagogical practice should be developed within the framework on new social media expansion, and aim to understand maladaptive uses of the web, such as cyberbullying, by taking a sound note on the positive aspects and benefits of web technology. In short, preventing cyberbullying and similar forms of deviant behaviors that take place in the virtual world, should be based on a positive education approach that shifts away from what's wrong with technology, and promotes what's good with it, and how technology can help people lead better lives.

Focusing on empathy and moral reasoning training. The positive approach to cyberbullying prevention was also highlighted by Ang and Goh (2010), who argued that positive caregiver-child relationships and positive role modeling by teachers (e.g., teachers showing innovative

---

[28] T.G. Ryan, *Schools, teachers, training, victims, prevention and community: a cyberbullying collage*, [in:] *Social media and teacher learning*, eds S. Van Nuland, J. Greenlaw, Oshawa 2012.

[29] Ibidem.

and creative ways to use the web in teaching and learning; game-based learning) can curb the prevalence of cyberbullying incidents.[30] Additionally, Ang and Goh (2010) reflected on their findings and argued that school leaders and educators can benefit from empathy training in adolescents. Exercises and workshops on perspective taking, and learning how to understand and display compassion for the emotions and grievances of victims, can inhibit cyberbullying tendencies and prevent adolescents from engaging in typical moral disengagement processes, such as blaming or dehumanizing the victim.

Taking a more cognitive approach, one could work on a netiquette understood as the rules concerning online behaviour. This normative approach may focus on cyberspace as a part of social world where some rules, and formal and informal consequences for breaking those rules are implemented. In this context, increasing awareness about the legal consequences for certain online behaviours could be taught.

In a similar vein, the mixed empirical findings on the role of moral disengagement imply that adolescents do not necessarily view cyberbullying behaviour as an immoral act.[31] Raskauskas and Stoltz (2007) showed that approximately 36% of cyberbullying perpetrators said they were doing it for 'fun', and hence, cyberbullying can just be construed as another form of web-based entertainment. These findings underscore the need to educate young people about the actual side effects of cyberbullying on victims, and minimize the use of 'sanitizing' language and reasoning among aggression perpetrators. On the other hand a Polish study[32] has shown that a lot of adolescents engage in cyberbullying without negative intentions. Almost 37% of Polish 15 years-olds admitted that they have sent something by the Internet or mobile phone as a joke but it ended up as a great suffering for another person. This highlights the need to design educational activities that explore the different aspects of computer mediated communication that make Internet users more prone to become "unaware" perpetrators. For example young people should understand that online written communication lacks a non-verbal channel that may result in the situation when an assumed perpetrator is joking while the other side (i.e., potential victim) experiences his/her behavior as hostile.

---

[30] See also M. Ybarra, K. Mitchell, *Online aggressor/targets, aggressors, and targets: a comparison of associated youth characteristics*, Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 2004, nr 45, s. 1308-1316; ibidem.

[31] C.D. Pornari, J. Wood, *Peer and cyber aggression*.

[32] J. Pyżalski, *From cyberbullying to electronic aggression: typology of the phenomenon*, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 2012, nr 17, s. 305-317.

The role of educator and parental involvement. Educators should also feel empowered and be especially trained in new social media and in identifying and coping with cyberbullying incidents. A recent study of trainee teachers in Canada showed that while the vast majority of respondents (> 2/3) were aware that cyberbullying was a problem in schools and that it can adversely impact their students, only 33% felt confident they could accurately identify cyberbullying, and a much smaller group (15%) were confident about managing and coping with cyberbullying incidents.[33] Thus, while there is an understanding of the seriousness of cyberbullying and of the need for systematic preventive interventions, educators display low self-efficacy to lead such interventions, and actually help their students cope effectively or overcome cyberbullying episodes. Likewise there is a need to empower families and involve parents/caregivers in cyberbullying preventive efforts. A recent international study showed that adolescent victims of cyberbullying were more likely to feel alienated from their families as compared to non-victims.[34] Thus, fostering positive and close relationships with parents and caregivers can increase the level of parental control in internet use, but also reduce the feelings of loneliness and alienation in adolescents. This approach can be also accompanied by increasing the knowledge of the teachers and parents/caregivers on specific technical aspects to defend against cyberbullying, such as blocking the aggressive users and managing privacy in social networking sites.

Conclusion

Cyberbullying is an emerging form of aggression utilized through contemporary ICTs and new social media. The available studies indicate that cyber-aggression is related to personal characteristics, such as empathy, and to self-regulatory processes involving moral reasoning and justification of deviant behaviors. Positive interventions that employ a whole-school approach, and maximize parental involvement can benefit educators in their task to curb cyberbullying trends among students. Shifting away from a techno-phobic approach, teaching students about the actual side effects of cyberbullying on victims, and embedding empathy training and moral reasoning in the curriculum can minimize the risk for cyberbullying.

---

[33] T.G. Ryan, *Schools, teachers, training, victims*.
[34] A. Brighi, A. Guarini, G. Melotti, S. Galli, M.L. Genta, *Predictors of victimization across direct bullying*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ang R.P., Goh D.H., *Cyberbullying among adolescents: the role of affective and cognitive empathy, and gender*, Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 2010, nr 41.

Bandura A., *Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency*, Journal of Moral Education, 2002, nr 31.

Bandura A., Barbaranelli C., Caprara G.V., Pastorelli C., *Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency*, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1996, nr 71.

Bauman S., Pero H., *Bullying and cyberbullying among deaf students and their hearing peers: an exploratory study*, Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 2011, nr 16.

Beran T., Li Q., *The relationship between cyberbullying and school bullying*, Journal of Student Wellbeing, 2007, nr 1.

Brighi A., Guarini A., Melotti G., Galli S., Genta M.L., *Predictors of victimization across direct bullying, indirect bullying and cyberbullying*, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 2012, nr 17.

Davis M., *A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy*, Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1980, nr 10.

Decety J., Jackson P.L., *A social neuroscience perspective on empathy*, Current Directions in Psychological Science, 2006, nr 15.

Denollet J., *Type D personality: a potential risk factor refined*, Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 2000, nr 49.

Dooley J.J., Pyżalski J., Cross D., *Cyberbullying versus face-to-face bullying: A theoretical and conceptual review*, Zeitschrift fuer Psychologie, 2009, nr 217.

Endresen I.M., Olweus D., *Self-reported empathy in Norwegian adolescents: Sex-differences, age trends, and relationship to bullying*, [in:] *Constructive and destructive behavior: implications for family, school and society*, eds A. Bohart, D. Stipek, American Psychological Association, New York 2001.

Fekkes M., Pijpers F.I.M., Fredriks A.M., Vogels T., Verloove-Vanhorick S.P., *Do bullied children get ill, or do ill children get bullied? A prospective cohort study on the relationship between bullying and health-related symptoms*, Pediatrics, 2006, nr 117.

Gini G., *Social cognition and moral cognition in bullying: what's wrong?* Aggressive Behavior, 2006, nr 32.

Greenhow C., Robelia B., Hughes J.E., *Learning, teaching, and scholarship in a digital age*, Educational Researcher, 2009, nr 38.

Gruser S.M., Thalemann R., Griffiths M.D., *Excessive computer gaming: evidence for addiction and aggression?* CyberPsychology and Behavior, 2007, nr 10.

Hinduja S., Patchin J.W., *Bullying, cyberbullying, and suicide*, Archives of Suicide Research, 2010, nr 14.

Hoff D.L., Mitchell S.N., *Cyberbullying: causes, effects, and remedies*, Journal of Educational Administration, 2009, nr 47.

Hoffman M.L., *Is altruism part of human nature?* Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1981, nr 40.

Hoffman M.L., *Toward a comprehensive empathybased theory of prosocial moral development*, [in:] *Constructive and destructive behavior: implications for family, school and society*, eds A. Bohart, D. Stipek, American Psychological Association, New York 2001.

Joliffe D., Farrington D., *Development and validation of the Basic Empathy Scale*, Journal of Adolescence, 2006, nr 29.

Juvonen J., Gross E., *Extending the school grounds? Bullying experiences in cyberspace*, Journal of School Health, 2008, nr 78.

Li Q., *New bottle but old wine: A research of cyberbullying in schools*, Computers in Human Behavior, 2007, nr 23.

Low S., Espelage D., *Differentiating cyber-bullying perpetration from non-physical bullying: commonalities across race, individual and family predictors*, Psychology of Violence 2013, nr 3.

McAlister A.L., Bandura A.A., Owen S.V., *Mechanisms of moral disengagement in support of military force: the impact of Sept.9.11*, Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 2006, nr 25.

McQuade S.C., Colt J.P., Meyer N., *Cyber bullying: Protecting kids and adults from online bullies*, Praeger, California 2009.

Miller L., Schweingruber H., Oliver R., Mayes J., Smith D., *Teaching neuroscience through web adventures: adolescents reconstruct the history and science of opioids*, The Neuroscientist, 2002, nr 8.

Olweus D., *Bullying at school: what we know and what we can do*, Blackwell, Oxford 1993.

Paciello M., Fida R., Tramontano C., Lupinetti C., Caprara G.V., *Stability and change of moral disengagement and its impact on aggression and violence in late adolescence*, Child Development, 2008, nr 79.

Patchin J.W., Hinduja S., *Bullies move beyond the schoolyard*, Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 2006, nr 4.

Pedersen S.S., Denollet J., *Type D personality, cardiac events, and impaired quality of life: a review*, European Journal of Cardiovascular Prevention and Rehabilitation, 2003, nr 10.

Perren S., Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger E., *Cyberbullying and traditional bullying in adolescence: Differential roles of moral disengagement, moral emotions, and moral values*, European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 2012, nr 9.

Pornari C.D., Wood J., *Peer and cyber aggression in secondary school students: the role of moral disengagement, hostile attribution bias, and outcome expectancies*, Aggressive Behaviour, 2010, nr 36.

Pyżalski J., *Agresja elektroniczna wśród dzieci i młodzieży*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls, Kraków 2011.

Pyżalski J., *Agresja elektroniczna i cyberbullying jako nowe ryzykowne zachowania młodzieży*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls, Kraków 2012.

Pyżalski J., *From cyberbullying to electronic aggression: typology of the phenomenon*, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 2012, nr 17.

Pyżalski J., Merecz D. (red.), *Psychospołeczne warunki pracy polskich nauczycieli. Pomiędzy wypaleniem zawodowym a zaangażowaniem*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls, Kraków 2010.

Raskauskas J., Stoltz A.D., *Involvement in traditional and electronic bullying among adolescents*, Developmental Psychology, 2007, nr 43.

Rigby K. (ed.), *New perspectives on bullying*, Jessica Kingsley, London-Philadelphia 2002.

Ryan T.G., *Schools, teachers, training, victims, prevention and community: a cyberbullying collage*, [in:] *Social media and teacher learning*, eds S. Van Nuland, J. Greenlaw, University of Ontario, Institute of Technology E-Press, Oshawa 2012.

Schultze-Krumbholz A., Scheithauer H., *Social-behavioural correlates of cyberbullying in a German student sample*, Journal of Psychology, 2009, nr 217.

Slonje R., Smith P.K., *Cyberbullying: another main type of bulling?* Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 2008, nr 49.

Smith J.D., Schneider B.H., Smith P.K., Ananiadou K., *The effectiveness of whole-school antibullying programs: a synthesis of evaluation research*, School Psychology Review, 2004, nr 33.

Smith P.K., Ananiadou K., Cowie H., *Interventions to reduce school bullying*, Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 2003, nr 48.

Smith P.K., Thompson D., *Practical approaches to bullying*, David Fulton Publishers, London 1991.

Steffgen G., König A., Pfetsch J., Melzer J.A., *Are cyberbullies less empathic? Adolescents' cyberbullying behavior and empathic responsiveness*, Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking, 2011, nr 14.

Walrave M., Heirman W., *Assessing the impact of cyberbullying*, Child Abuse: Theory, Research, Practice, 2009, nr 26.

Warden D., Mackinnon S., *Prosocial children, bullies and victims: an investigation of their sociometric status, empathy and social problem-solving strategies*, British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 2003, nr 21.

Ybarra M., Mitchell K., *Online aggressor/targets, aggressors, and targets: a comparison of associated youth characteristics*, Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 2004, nr 45.

Young K.S., *Internet addiction: the emergence of a new clinical disorder*, CyberPsychology and Behavior, 1998, nr 1.

Empatia i rozhamowanie moralne jako predykatory cyberbullyingu: implikacje dla interwencyjnych i profilaktycznych działań edukacyjnych

Streszczenie

Cyberbullying stanowi formę agresji rówieśniczej, realizowanej za pomocą współczesnych technologii informacyjno-komunikacyjnych. Badania dotyczące psychospołecznych korelatów tego zjawiska dynamicznie się rozwijają, a dotychczasowe rezultaty wskazują na istotność rozhamowania moralnego i empatii jako predykatorów sprawstwa cyberbullyingu.

Osoby zajmujące się edukacją mogą wykorzystać wyniki badań w tej dziedzinie, konstruując programy i realizując działania edukacyjne oraz profilaktyczne dotyczące cyberbullyingu, uwzględniające przekonania normatywne, jak i poziom empatii młodych ludzi.

W artykule charakteryzowany jest cyberbullying jako zjawisko, w kontekście przeglądu badań dotyczących jego relacji z rozhamowaniem moralnym i empatią adolescentów.

Słowa klucze: rozhamowanie moralne, empatia, cyberbullying, adolescenci, edukacja