# An Interdisciplinary Investigation of Temporal Aspects of Cyberbullying on Instagram

# Wenxi Yang, Divya Prakash Sivakumar, Lu Cheng, Kaitlyn Schodt, Chun Shao, **Deborah Hall, Yasin Silva Arizona State University**

# Motivation

Cyberbullying, the use of online digital media to communicate false, embarrassing, or hostile information about another person is the most common online risk for adolescents. A key characteristic of cyberbullying is the repetitive nature, yet little is known about temporal aspects of cyberbullying. Drawing on a range of interdisciplinary techniques, the purpose of this study was to (1) identify the core temporal cyberbullying (CB) trends and properties in a large, realworld Instagram dataset and (2) investigate how temporal factors predict whether the media session was perceived as CB in this dataset.



session, from Hosseinmardi et al. (2015)

The dataset, initially used by Hosseinmardi et al. (2015), consisted of 2,218 Instagram social media sessions that had been coded (by humans) based on whether each session (the original Instagram post and its associated comments) was a CB or non-CB session, as a whole. Roughly 20% of the sessions had been coded as CB sessions.

The previous research did not, however, include information at the individual comment-level about CB. To address this, we employed an eXtreme Gradient Boosting Model (XGBoost, a tree-based model) to predict comment-level CB. The three features that were used in the prediction model are Word Count Vectors, Word Level TF-IDF, and Linguistic Inquiry & Word Count (LIWC). After integrating the three features to train the model, the accuracy level was about 91%.

After removing the sessions with temporal inconsistencies (e.g. comments with timestamps prior to their main post's timestamp), the final dataset consisted of 130,900 comments across 1,980 Instagram social media sessions, with 17,245 (15%) of the comments identified as CB by the prediction model.

				Analysis ar	nd Results					
Logistic regression	Variables Per Session	Min	Max	Mean	Median	SD				
Proportion of CB comments to total comments in a session ( $b = 8.35$ , $SE = 0.53$ , $p$					#CB comments	0	94	8.705	5	10.02
< .001, positive relationship) and average time interval between all CB comments					#Total Comments	7	147	63.03	51	41.94
and a session's original post ( $b = -3.02 * 10^{-8}$ , $SE = 1.03 * 10^{-8}$ , $p < .001$ , negative					#non-CB Comments	1	139	54.33	44	36.85
relationship) emerged as significant predictors of a media session being perceived as CB overall.					Proportion of CB comments to total comments	0	93.33%	14.51%	11.96%	11.22%
Proportion of CB comments within a media session was the most influential predictor.					Time interval between first and last CB comments	0	1,452,409 (1008.62 days)	82,726.07 (57.45 days)	3,300 (2.29 days)	169530.88 (117.73 days)
<b>Random Forest</b>					(minutes)					
A random forest analysis using the variables presented in Table 1 was performed to (1) predict session-level CB identification, and (2) indicate the importance of each of the variables listed in predicting session-level CB. The model was trained and					Average interval between all CB comments (minutes)	0	1,532,085 (1063.95 days)	2,128.57 (1.48 days)	41,061.37 (28.51 days)	114187.22 (79.30 days)
tested using a 10-fold cross-validation method. The highest accuracy level was				# Likes	1	782,434	9,698	2,001	29120.36	
used to select the optimal model.					Session-level CB					
> The optimal prediction model was achieved when mtry (number of variables					Comment-level CB					
randomly sampled at each split) was 2 and ntree (number of trees to be grown) was 200. The final value used for the model was $cp = 0.01015038$ . Accuracy level					Posting time of first CB comment   Posting time of last CB comment					
	Ranking	of the Pred	dictors			Cla	assificatio	n Tree		
				240 186		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Proportion of CB Comments per Session	-		Number of CB Comments ≥ 7.5							
Number of CB Comments	24									
Interval Between First and Last CB Comment		•								
Average Interval among CB Comments	•				Proportion of CB to Total Comments ≥ 0.20					
Number of Total Comments	•			Non-CB						
Number of Non-CB Comments	•									
Number of Likes					СВ		II-CB			
	0 20	40	60	80 100						
		Importance	ļ							

### Dataset



Longest Consecutive Sequence of CB Comments in Non-CB Sessions Longest Consecutive Sequence of CB Comments





**Time Interval Between Consecutive CB Comments Time Interval in Minutes** 





Longest Consecutive Sequence of CB Comments in CB Sessions Longest Consecutive Sequence of CB Comments

Number of Non-CB Comments Between Consecutive CB Comments Number of Comments

## This work was supported by National Science Foundation Award # 1719722