

Sexuality & Culture

A MODEL OF ONLINE PROTECTION TO REDUCE ONLINE RISK FOR CHILDREN: EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM ASIA --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	SECU-D-17-00120
Full Title:	A MODEL OF ONLINE PROTECTION TO REDUCE ONLINE RISK FOR CHILDREN: EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM ASIA
Article Type:	Original Research
Keywords:	online risks for children; online risk perception; self-efficacy online; online privacy concerns; digital literacy
Corresponding Author:	Misha Teimouri, PhD Karaj Islamic Azad University E-campus IRAN, ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Karaj Islamic Azad University E-campus
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Misha Teimouri, PhD
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Misha Teimouri, PhD
	Seyed Rahim Benrazavi, PhD condidate
	Mark D Griffiths, Prof
	Salleh Hassan, Prof
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Funding Information:	
Abstract:	Children are surrounded by a variety of digital media and therefore they are exposed to potential risks that come with them. Learning how to be safe online is an important consideration for both children and their caregivers. The present study proposes an integrated model of online safety based on constructs from Protection Motivation Theory (PMT) and the Health Belief Model (HBM), namely perceived severity of (and susceptibility to) risk, online self-efficacy, online privacy concern, and digital literacy. A survey was conducted among 420 schoolchildren aged 9 to 16 years. Using Partial Least Squares-Structural Equation Modelling, the results illustrated the presence of a negative effect of 'perceived severity of online risk' toward online risks, whereas the effect of 'digital literacy' was found to be positive. Children, whose perception of online risks was more severe, would be less exposed to online risks if they had higher 'online privacy concerns' than the children with higher 'digital literacy' who are more exposed to online risk. In conclusion, engaging in safe online behaviour requires children to have a high perception of severity about online risks as well as knowledge of online privacy concerns. Online risks and opportunities are parallel. The factors that reduce/increase risk may also reduce/increase benefits, and therefore require further investigation.
Suggested Reviewers:	

Introduction

For a period of time, television and film were the only audio-visual medium to which most children were exposed (Clark, 2011). The risks associated with children's television viewing were primarily limited to exposure to sexual (Peterson, 1991) and violent content (Goldstein, 1998), the nature of which were known and relatively easy to control. Today, children are surrounded by a variety of digital media content, and therefore they are exposed to many risks that have not yet been fully identified or quantified. Within the academic literature, although studies indicate the risks of online activities for children have escalated substantively, it is difficult to get a clear picture of online risks and harms (Lareki, Martínez de Morentin, Altuna, & Amenabar, 2017; Slavtcheva-Petkova, Nash, & Bulger, 2015).

The existing literature claims protection practices have substantial effects on the negative consequences of Internet usage, depending on how much (i) individuals believe in their vulnerability to (and severity of) online risks (Camacho, Hassanein, & Head, 2014; Hongliang Chen, Beaudoin, & Hong, 2016; Yau et al., 2014), (ii) individuals believe in their ability to take online protective practices (H. Chen, Beaudoin, & Hong, 2016; Görzig, 2016), and (iii) their knowledge of Internet safety and safe behaviours online (Farrukh, Sadwick, & Villasenor, 2014).

Despite the high possibility of encountering online risk, there is no universally accepted definition of online risks and the way to keep children safe online. However, it is possible to diminish unpleasant consequences by means of educational strategies and training children about self-protection techniques. Risk perception mediated by protective action, together with children's beliefs about their ability to perform risk-reducing behaviour, are likely to help children to engage in coping behaviour and therefore protecting themselves (Youn, 2009). Empirical research on the effects of protection motivation constructs (e.g., self-efficacy, perceived severity, and susceptibility) and safety behaviour in reducing risks are inconclusive. While some researchers have found a significant relationship between self-efficacy and protective behaviour (Feng & Xie, 2014), others have found no significant relationship between these variables (Mohamed & Hawa, 2012).

Although studies defining the risks of online activity for children have increased substantially, within the academic literature, it is difficult to get a clear picture of online risks and safety practices. Risks and harms caused by using the Internet are varied and rather unidentified, as are safety practices (Dönmez, Ferhan Odabaşı, Kabakçı Yurdakul, Kuzu, & Girgin, 2017; Farrukh et al., 2014; Slavtcheva-Petkova et al., 2015). Considering this gap, the present study aims to identify the influence of children's self-protection techniques against online risks, in an attempt to contribute to a deeper perspective on the nature of the risks associated with Internet usage among children. More specifically this study is conducted to determine the effect of (i) "perceived severity of (and susceptibility to) online risk", (ii) "online self-efficacy", (iii) "digital literacy", and (iv) "online privacy concerns" on "online risk" as well as testing the mediation effect of (v) "online privacy concerns" on the relationship between "perceived severity of (and susceptibility to) online risk" and "online risk".

Definitions of online risk

There is a broad range of possible risks to children from online activities. Countries' definition of risks and means of protecting children against these risks are different according to culture, legal framework, and style of government. Little research has examined online risk using a standard measurement. However, as discussed by Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2012), a systematic approach to the classification of online risks to children has been developed by OSTWG, Internet Safety Technical Task Force (ISTTF), European Youth Protection Roundtable Toolkit (YPRT), and the Family Online Safety Institute (FOSI). The OSTWG defines the categories of online risks as predator danger, cyberbullying, sexting, and inappropriate content (OSTWG, 2010). The ISTTF identifies sexual solicitation, online harassment, and problematic content as a subgroup of online risks (Berkman Center for Internet & Society, 2008). The YPRP establishes the types of risks related to online content (e.g. violent/illegal content, racism, child pornography, etc.) (European Youth Protection Roundtable Toolkit, 2008). Finally, the FOSI introduced the classifications of teen identity theft, fraud, being tracked for marketing, being bullied, ugly/unflattering pictures posted, and security issues on the Internet (Family Online Safety Institute, 2013).

Another systematic study into online risk, which is repeated every five years in the United States, is conducted by the Youth Internet Safety Survey (YISS) in order to quantify the unwanted or problematic experiences of

younger Internet users, including unwanted exposure to pornography, and sexual solicitation/harassment (Jones, Mitchell, & Finkelhor, 2013; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2005).

The European Kids Online survey, was a research network, and utilized interviews with 25,000 children and their parents in 25 European countries from 2006 to 2009, and aimed to study the Internet and new online technologies and identify findings across Europe, with a view to evaluating online opportunities and risks for children, their responses along with parents' involvement (Livingstone, Haddon, Görzig, & Olafsson, 2011b). EU Kids Online developed a classification of child-related online risks including content risks (whereby the child is a recipient of unwelcome or inappropriate contents), contact risks (whereby the child participates in risky peer or personal communication), and conduct risks (whereby the child acts themselves to contribute to risky content or contact).

Although many studies have been conducted in various countries, Malaysia-specific classification of online risks have yet to be identified. While surveys have been conducted by the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation, MCMC, and the Women, Family and Community Development Ministry, most of them only share descriptive-based results (Salman & Hasim, 2011; MCMC, 2011, 2012).

As the number of children who access and use the Internet increases, the exposure to various forms of online risks also increases (Lareki et al., 2017; Teimouri et al., 2015). Conceptualized in prior studies outlined above, online risks refer to a set of wanted or unwanted inappropriate activities by children (as an actor, a receiver, or a participant), which includes (i) **unwanted Sexual solicitation**, such as requests to be exposed to unwanted sexual activities/sexual talk/divulging sexual information against their will (Chang et al., 2014; Lareki et al., 2017); (ii) **risky sexual online behaviour**, in which children participate in sexual behaviour online (Moore et al., 2017; Teimouri et al., 2014); (iii) **potentially harmful content**, where children are exposed to online violent content such as self-harm, suicide, pro-anorexia, drugs, hate/racism (Schilder, Brusselaers, & Bogaerts, 2016); **sexting**, which refers to sending/receiving sexual images/videos/texts online (Samimi & Alderson, 2014); (v) **cyber-bullying**, which refers to children being the victim of aggressive behaviour in the cyberspace (Vaillancourt, Faris, & Mishna, 2017), and (vi) **personal data misuse**, whereby children's information is misused or they are a victim of Internet fraud or theft (Teimouri et al., 2015). Online risks that children are exposed to, could generally be defined as any wanted or unwanted inappropriate activities by children (as an actor, a receiver, or a participant) which in the present study are specified as: unwanted sexual solicitation, risky sexual behaviour, potential harmful content, sexting, bullying, and personal data misuse.

Online risk and protection motivation behaviour

The literature claims protection practices have substantial effects on the negative consequences of Internet usage, and it depends on the level of (i) individuals belief in their vulnerability to (and severity of) online risks (Taddei & Contena, 2013), (ii) individuals belief in their ability to take protective practices, and (iii) their knowledge about safety behaviours (Shillair et al., 2015; Waddell et al., 2014). One of the factors that may influence willingness to adopt protective actions is risk perception. The perceived vulnerability or likelihood of encountering online risk combined with perceived severity can be viewed as online perceived risk (Zwart et al., 2009). Young Internet users are not always concerned about the negative consequences caused by online high-risk activities such as sharing information or making friends online. Higher perceived severity of (and susceptibility to) online risk clearly advocates that children need to protect themselves from online risks such as cyber-bullying (Camacho et al., 2014), unwanted online sexual solicitation, and risky online sexual behaviour (Baumgartner, Valkenburg, & Peter, 2010).

Although the awareness of privacy protection is raised by increasing Internet usage, children appear to have a different sense of privacy, subject to factors such as age and gender (Livingstone & Görzig, 2012). Most studies investigating online protection behaviour mainly focuses on disseminating information, but fail to consider how to protect oneself in a high-risk situation such as an online sexually-related threat. Together with beliefs about being vulnerable to risk and taking protected action, children need to acquire skills in dealing with high-risk situations while online. These skills are known as digital literacy (OECD, 2012; Wisniewski, Xu, Rosson, & Carroll, 2014). Digital literacy refers to a combination of knowledge, skills, and ability to use the Internet and being aware of the consequences. Children's level of digital literacy is highly associated with the way they use the internet (Livingstone & Görzig, 2012). While many children establish digital literacy skills, a lack of risk awareness may explain negligence regarding information security (OECD, 2012). This means that digital literacy may boost and improve children's online experience. However, it does not seem to increase awareness by itself.

To promote online protection behaviour, researchers have used the construct of online self-efficacy (Ekizoglu & Ozcinar, 2010). Online self-efficacy is an individual's belief that they are capable and confident of recognizing and dealing with the risky situation (Lee, Larose, & Rifon, 2008). Computer self-efficacy is increased by increasing computer use and could be improved by training (I.-S. Chen, 2017). It was also debated that by increasing self-efficacy, individuals can deal with some forms of online threats such as cyberbullying (Cross & Barnes, 2015). At the same time, a user's sense of personal responsibility has positive effects on online safety interventions (Shillair et al., 2015). Overall, children's online protection behaviour has been found to be an effective safeguard for children to be aware, prepared, and safe in the case of undesired, unpleasant, and/or hurtful experiences when using the Internet.

Theoretical perspectives

While there is no specific theory underlying how online safety should be implemented, researchers have borrowed constructs from theories that focus on health behaviour in order to generate models for promoting safe online behaviour. Hence, the theoretical framework for this study is based on aspects of the Protection Motivation Theory (PMT) and the Health Belief Model (HBM). The present authors specifically applied the constructs of perceived severity of (and susceptibility to) online risk, self-efficacy in relation to online safety concerns, and theories of behaviour change to promote healthy behaviour. These theories have considered three main areas: (i) individuals as a unit of change, (ii) changing the family, and (iii) changing the community (Glanz & Rimer, 2005). These types of theories have been borrowed from healthcare and they are known as the 'expectancy-value approach' that examine: (i) how well a person can perform a task, and (ii) the reason for performing a task or change (e.g., health belief model; protection motivation theory) (Ng, Kankanhalli, & Xu, 2009). In order to change some aspect of behaviour or carry out a healthy action, individuals need to be assured of the benefits they will get or the risks they may avoid.

The PMT was initially formulated by Rogers (1975). Later, Rogers, Cacioppo, and Petty (1983) extended the theory by highlighting cognitive processes to a general scheme of persuasive communication for behavioural change. In some studies, PMT was initiated as a result of two appraisal processes of health threat in adaptive and maladaptive coping behaviour. PMT originally proposed to share the HBM emphasis on the cognitive processes mediating attitudinal and behavioural change (Prentice-Dunn & Rogers, 1986). The HBM is one of the primary theories of health behaviour and is widely recognized in the field. It was developed in the 1950s by a group of U.S. Public Health Service social psychologists who wanted to explain why so few people were participating in tuberculosis detection and prevention programs (Janz & Becker, 1984). The HBM initially offered four key concepts (perceived susceptibility, perceived severity, perceived benefits, and perceived barriers). The concept of 'self-efficacy' was added to meet the challenges of unhealthy behaviours such as smoking and overeating. The PMT was an extension and re-working of HBM Intention to protect individuals from risky health behaviours by educating them about the threat appraisal (severity and susceptibility), and coping (response efficacy, self-efficacy) (Rosenstock, Strecher, & Becker, 1988).

The PMT model is widely employed as a model for safe decision-making and taking actions regarding health behaviour. Likewise, researchers have begun utilizing PMT to predict and identify online threats and suggest protective actions to understand children's perception of risks safeguards. Some examples of such predictive, preventive, and comprehensive behaviours could be (i) identifying online security behaviour such as password management and obtaining security training (Stanton, Mastrangelo, Stam, & Jolton, 2004); (ii) proposing a conceptual model of user security behaviour based on risk perception (Aytes & Conolly, 2003); (iii) attitudes towards online gambling and player protection (Wijesingha, Leatherdale, Turner, & Elton-Marshall, 2017); (iv) examining online privacy concern in *Facebook* users (Saeri, Ogilvie, La Macchia, Smith, & Louis, 2014) and teens' online privacy protection and subsequent online information disclosure on social network sites (Hongliang Chen et al., 2016); and (v) understanding individual email protection (Herath et al., 2014). The HBM has also been utilized to explore users' perceptions of being safe and secure online (Davinson & Sillence, 2014), and the impact of online and offline friendship networks on adolescent smoking and alcohol use (Huang et al., 2014). Youn (2005), tested the threat appraisal component of PMT to examine the context of online safety and found that higher levels of risk perception motivate teenagers to protect themselves from online privacy threats. Drawing from a number of related theories, the present study assessed children's level of privacy concerns, children's perception of online risks and safety in taking online protection behaviour, and online self-efficacy.

Method

Participants

A total of 420 Malaysian primary and secondary school students aged 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 16 years in eight schools participated in this study. The sample was selected using stratified sampling method. Students aged 12 and 15 years were excluded as they were sitting for national exams. The sample comprised 34% boys and 66% girls with the mean age of 12.6 years.

Materials

The survey was completed offline using a 'paper and pencil' method. Online risks were assessed using items from the final reports of two national studies in Europe (EU Kids Online Survey, among 25,142 children aged 9-16 and their parent/guardians in 25 European Countries 2006-9) and the United States (Youth Internet Safety Survey [YISS-1, 2000; YISS-2, 2005; YISS-3, 2010]). A total of 39 items across six constructs were adapted. Due to the sensitivity of the topic, the Malaysian Ministry of Education required that sensitive words to be replaced and/or removed from the children's questionnaire in order to be approved for data collection. Thus, "having sex" was replaced by "having an inappropriate intimate relationship"; "naked pictures" and "showing sexual acts and content" were replaced by "obscene pictures" and "obscene acts or materials" respectively.

Children were asked to answer 39 questions concerning online risks with 12 questions assessing perceived online safety, and 22 items assessing online protection motivation. The six constructs of online risks used in the study were: (i) a six-item scale for assessing 'unwanted exposure to pornography'; (ii) a four-item scale assessing 'risky sexual online behaviour' adapted from Youth Internet Safety Survey 1,2, and 3 (Finkelhor, Mitchell, & Wolak, 2008, 2011; Jones, Mitchell, & Finkelhor, 2012); (iii) an eight-item scale assessing 'sexting', (iv) a seven-item scale assessing 'potentially harmful user-generated content, (v) a nine-item scale assessing bullying, and (vi) a five-item scale assessing personal data misuse adapted from EU Kids Online Survey (Livingstone, Haddon, Görzig, & Olafsson, 2011).

Five constructs were identified to assess the level of children's online self-protection behaviour: (i) perceived severity of online risk was assessed by seven items adapted from EU Kids Online, (ii) perceived susceptibility of online risk was assessed by five items from Wirth et al. (2008) and Youn (2010), (iii) to assess online self-efficacy, two questions addressing "privacy self-efficacy" were adopted from Youn (2009) and four question from Ng et al. (2009) were used to address user's self-confidence in their ability to practice computer security, together with two items of Internet self-efficacy adapted from EU Kids Online Survey were used; (iv) online safety concern was assessed using the six-scale adopting from Youn (2009) which addresses the level of concerns for online privacy, and (v) for assessing digital literacy, eight items of children's digital literacy and safety skills adopted from EU Kids Online was used.

In the present study, data were analyzed using Partial Least Square-Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS.3. PLS-SEM was used because the model is less developed and is complex with many latent variables and indicators. Furthermore, the data are not normally distributed with a combination of formative and reflective measurement models (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2013). First, the measurement model including the convergent and discriminant validity was assessed. This was followed by a structural model to test the hypothesized paths between latent constructs.

Measurement model-PLS procedure

In order to assess the validity and reliability of measurement model, the reflective constructs were evaluated (i.e. perceived severity of [and susceptibility to] online risk, online self-efficacy, online safety concerns, and digital literacy), followed by the formative constructs (online risks to children). To check the validity of reflective measurement, the results for the outer loadings, composite reliability, and AVE were presented. Convergent validity and cross loading were checked applying Fornell-Larker criteria (Table 2). Based on Fornell-Larker criteria (Hair et al., 2014, p.111), the square root of AVE for each construct was higher than the construct's highest correlation with other constructs, which indicates the achievement of convergent validity. During the modification of the reflective measurement model, two indicators with lower loading were excluded for further procedures. The following (i) 'I am able to use a false name or false ID' from online privacy concerns; and (ii) 'I am able to find information to use the Internet safely' from digital literacy. The other indicators with loadings of between 0.4 to 0.7 were retained in the construct given that the deleting indicators did not significantly

increase AVE and composite reliability of constructs (Figure 1 and 2, and Table 1. Reflective measurement model assessment.




Figure 1. Measurement model (Initial)




Figure 2. Reflective measurement model (Modified)

Table 1. Reflective measurement model assessment

Constructs (Indicators)	Loading (Initial)	Loading (modified)
Perceived severity of online risk		
It is risky if I received inappropriate message	0.85	N.C
Upset about nasty or hurtful messages	0.74	N.C
Bothered if meeting someone I knew only online	0.42	N.C
It is risky if searched for someone online to talk about inappropriate relationship	0.90	N.C
It is risky if searched for someone online to do inappropriate intimate relationship	0.93	N.C
It is risky if I sent my naked photos to someone I knew online	0.91	N.C
It is risky if I sent my address or phone number to someone knew online	0.87	N.C
Composite Reliability	0.93	N.C
AVE	0.67	N.C
Perceived susceptibility to online risk (It is risky if...)		
Having conflict with parents	0.85	N.C
Getting junk or unwanted mail	0.88	N.C
Your personal information being misused	0.93	N.C
You experiencing financial loss	0.93	N.C
You experiencing identity theft	0.92	N.C
Composite Reliability	0.96	N.C
AVE	0.81	N.C
Online privacy Concern		
I am able to use a false name or false ID	0.48	Del
I am able to provide incomplete information about myself	0.73	0.69
I ask somebody (e.g., parents and teachers) what I should do	0.70	0.72
I am able to read the privacy statement provided by the site	0.73	0.74

I go to other websites that do not ask for my personal information	0.78	0.80
Usually, I do nothing and leave the website	0.69	0.72
Composite Reliability	0.84	0.85
AVE	0.48	0.54
Digital Literacy		
I am able to bookmark a website	0.66	0.67
I am able to block messages from someone unwanted	0.75	0.75
I am able to change privacy settings for my social networking profile	0.77	0.79
I am able to delete a record of websites visited	0.66	0.70
I am able to block unwanted ads or junk mail/spam	0.75	0.75
I am able to change filter preferences	0.67	0.71
I am able to find information on how to use the Internet safely	0.45	Del
I am able to compare websites to decide if information is true	0.71	0.64
C.R	0.87	0.88
AVE	0.47	0.52
Online self- Efficacy		
I feel confident dealing with the ways companies collect my personal information	0.50	N.C
I feel confident learning skills that protect my privacy online	0.56	N.C
I know more about the Internet than my parents	0.72	N.C
I know lots of things about the Internet	0.66	N.C
I am confident of recognizing a suspicious email	0.87	N.C
I am confident of recognizing suspicious email headers	0.86	N.C
I am confident of recognizing suspicious email attachment filename	0.87	N.C
I can recognize a suspicious email attachment even if there was no-one around to help me	0.83	N.C
Composite Reliability	0.91	N.C
Average Variance AVE	0.56	N.C
Variance inflation factor		

Note: Loading modified: factor loading after delete item with loaded less than .5; Del: Item which has been deleted; N.C: No changed: Loading is not changed after item has been deleted; AVE: Average Variance Extracted; CR: construct reliability

Table 2. Reflective discriminant validity (Fornell-Larker Criterium)

Constructs	1	2	3	4	5
1 Digital literacy	0.72				
2 Online protective behaviour	0.63	0.73			
3 Online self-efficacy	0.56	0.44	0.84		
4 Perceived severity of online risk	0.4	0.49	0.47	0.87	
5 Perceived susceptibility to online risk	0.19	0.22	0.23	0.58	0.9

For the evaluation of the formative measurement model, convergent validity, collinearity assessment, and significant of indicators were assessed. Online risks were defined as the higher-component formative measurement with six constructs. Firstly, convergent validity was examined using redundancy analysis by correlating indicators of each formative construct with a 'global item/measure' for that construct. Global item is summarized as the essence of the construct and the researcher can develop it (Hair et al., 2014). In the present study, all six formative constructs were tested by redundancy analyses and met the criteria of convergent validity since all exceeded the threshold (path coefficient above 0.8) (**Error! Reference source not found.**).

Table 3. Global item for formative construct

Construct global item	Single global item	Coefficient
Unwanted Sexual solicitation	Seen/talked about obscene materials	.88
Risky sexual behaviour	Talk/act intimately	.89
Potential harmful content	Seen violent/aggressive materials	.8
Sexting	Send/received obscene message	.8
Bullying	Experienced bullying online	.8
Misuse of personal data	Personal information has been misused online	.87

Next, collinearity of the indicators was detected by evaluating variance inflation factor (VIF). All VIF values were less than 0.5, which demonstrated there was no multicollinearity issue. High correlations are not expected among indicators since they are not interchangeable (Hair et al., 2014). Following this, the statistical significance of the outer weights was assessed using a bootstrapping option. The results of the online risk to

children's construct show that all formative indicators were significant except the "Seen anorexia or bulimia" indicator which has been deleted (Figure 3 and Table 4).




Figure 3. Formative measurement model

Table 4. Formative measurement model assessment

Constructs and its indicators		OW	T	P	OL	P
Unwanted exposure to pornography						
1	Unwanted obscene materials on web	0.26	3.85	0	0.65	0
2	Unwanted obscene materials on message or link	0.37	4.17	0	0.75	0
3	Unwanted e-mail or IM	0.35	4.31	0	0.7	0
4	Naked picture or inappropriate intimate relationship on message or link	0.1	0.92	0.3	0.63	0
5	Anyone ask to talk about inappropriate acts	0.24	2.72	0.01	0.62	0
6	Anyone ask to do inappropriate acts	0.17	1.67	0.1	0.53	0
Risky sexual online behaviour						
1	Searched for someone to talk about intimate relationship	0.39	2.33	0.02	0.56	0
2	Searched for someone to have an intimate relationship	-0.09	0.55	0.6	0.42	0
3	Sent obscene photos to someone you only knew online	0.5	3.76	0	0.62	0
4	Sent address or phone number to someone you only knew online	0.66	5.91	0	0.77	0
Sexting						
1	Seen obscene images or videos	0.29	2.91	0	0.65	0
2	Seen obscene images or videos about private parts	-0.02	0.29	0.7	0.5	0
3	Seen someone obscene images or videos	-0.04	0.52	0.6	0.51	0
4	Seen intimate images or videos in violent way	0.08	1.15	0.2	0.5	0
5	Been sent inappropriate messages	0.42	6.23	0	0.77	0
6	Posted inappropriate material	0.21	3.01	0	0.6	0
7	Seen other people perform obscene acts	0.01	0.2	0.8	0.41	0
8	Received inappropriate messages (words, pictures and videos)	0.42	4.43	0	0.83	0
Potentially harmful user-generated content						

1	Seen bloody movies or photos	0.28	3.08	0	0.68	0
2	Seen people beaten up	0.35	4.39	0	0.71	0
3	Seen hate messages	0.3	3.59	0	0.61	0
4	Seen anorexia or bulimic images	0.05	0.56	0.6	0.21	0.07
5	Talked about drugs	0.21	1.63	0.1	0.54	0
6	Seen ways of physical harming	0.32	3.92	0	0.68	0
7	Ways of committing suicide	0.13	1.12	0.3	0.31	0.01
Bullying						
1	Been asked to show my private part	0.16	2.33	0.02	0.34	0
2	Been asked to talk about nasty acts	0.07	0.82	0.41	0.42	0
3	Received nasty or hurtful messages	0.18	2.33	0.02	0.69	0
4	Received nasty or hurtful messages about yourself	0.24	2.74	0.01	0.66	0
5	Received other nasty or hurtful messages	0.18	1.98	0.05	0.68	0
6	Been threatened online	0.16	2.39	0.02	0.39	0
7	Been left out or excluded	0.21	3.22	0	0.52	0
8	Received inappropriate messages that bothered you	0.44	5.3	0	0.78	0
9	Received inappropriate messages that encourage you to run away	0.01	0.09	0.93	0.25	0.02
Personal Data misuse						
1	Misused password	0.57	4.28	0	0.81	0
2	Misused personal information you didn't like	0.2	1.17	0.24	0.75	0
3	Lost money and been cheated online	0.13	1.28	0.2	0.37	0
4	Misused personal information	0.34	1.99	0.05	0.61	0
5	Been hacked	0.21	1.58	0.12	0.62	0

Note: OW: outer weights; T: t-statistic; OL: outer loading; P: p value

Results of structural model-PLS procedure

The relationships between latent variables were assessed by running a PLS algorithm. The structural model result is presented in Table 5. To test the mediation effect, a common method of direct-indirect effect suggested by (Hair et al., 2014) was used through the relationship between independent and dependent variables with/without including the mediator (Table 6, Figure 4). The result of hypothesis testing showed that while perceived severity of an online risk reduced online risks to children ($\beta=-0.16$, $p=0.01$), perceived susceptibility to online risk was not significant predictor in reducing online risk to children ($\beta=0.088$, $p=0.07$). The effects of online self-efficacy were not significant in reducing online risks ($\beta=0.06$, $p=0.2$) and online privacy concerns ($\beta=-0.00$, $p=0.9$).

Table 5 Structural model

Name if constructs	Effect	T Statistics	P
Digital Literacy -> Online Risk to Children	0.46*	8.52	0
Online Privacy Concern -> Online Risk to Children	-0.00	0.05	0.96
Online Self-efficacy -> Online Risk to Children	0.06	1.26	0.21
Perceived Severity of online risk -> Online Privacy Concern	0.55*	10.98	0
Perceived Severity of online risk -> Online Risk to Children	-0.16*	2.63	0.01
Perceived Susceptibility to online risk -> Online Privacy Concern	-0.10	1.87	0.06
Perceived Susceptibility to online risk -> Online Risk to Children	0.09	1.81	0.07

In order to test the mediation effects, the indirect models were assessed separately and were compared with the direct model. The direct effect of perceived susceptibility to online risk was not significant ($\beta=0.05$, $p=0.1$), therefore the mediation effects of this predictor was not absorbed. The direct effect of perceived severity of online risk on online risks was significant ($\beta=-0.12$, $p=0.0$), the indirect effects mediated by online privacy concern on online risks was also significant ($\beta=-0.16$, $p=0.0$). Consequently, VIF for mediation effects “online privacy concern” was $[-0.16/(-0.16+ -0.12)] = 0.58$. The VIF for mediation effects were between .20 to .80, which indicates online privacy concern partially mediate the effect of “perceived severity of online risk” on online risks (Table 6). Overall, the proposed model was supported by the data showing that the model predicted a reduction in online risks even though it was not strong. The coefficient of determination r^2 showed that the proposed model predicted 21% of the risk involved ($r^2=0.21$).




Figure 4. Mediation effect (Direct-indirect model)

Table 6. Mediation effect

Hypothesis	Direct effect	Indirect effect	VAF	Result
Mediating effect of online privacy concern				
Perceived severity of online risk>Online risk to children	-0.12*	-0.16*	0.58	Partial mediation
Perceived Susceptibility to online risk>Online risk to children	0.05	0.09		No mediation

Findings and discussion

The present study suggests that although children who take online risks seriously are less exposed to those risks, there is no association between perceived susceptibility to online risks and online risk to children. The result of this study is similar to studies by (Lareki et al., 2017; Saeri et al., 2014) which illustrated perceived severity of online risks related to posting data and photos, and increase intentions to protect one's privacy online. In the PMT, perceived susceptibility and perceived severity are part of a first appraisal (threat) after exposure to a fear appeal message. If threat perception is relatively high for individuals, they will engage in a second appraisal (coping) attempt (Rogers, 1983). As mentioned, perceived susceptibility to online risks did not reduce the likelihood of children's exposure to risk in this study. A possible reason is found in an early argument by Ronis (1992), who distinguished between 'conditional susceptibility' versus 'unconditional susceptibility'. Unconditional susceptibility is when an individual does not experience a situation (e.g., non-smokers) while conditional susceptibility includes measuring a conditional behaviour of the form (e.g., smokers). Ronis (1992) argued the effect of conditional perceived susceptibility (for smokers) is higher than unconditional susceptibility (non-smokers) as a conditional behaviour. In the present study, given that children's level of online risks were reported to be low (unconditional behaviour), the effects of susceptibility were not found to be significant.

The present study also found that children's greater digital literacy and safety skills were associated with riskier online activities, which may cause them more risk. However, it must be noted that the effect of new media literacy on online risk is challenging because it increases the risks as well as the benefits of Internet use. Children were asked questions about their ability to use the Internet safely, deal with unpleasant/unsafe content, and protect their information. The results showed that children who have a higher level of digital literacy might be exposed to greater online risk because when they know more about the Internet, they use it more and therefore have a higher chance of encountering risk. The concept of media literacy has been long addressed. The term has been used within media education, and studies concerning the topic can be found in disciplines from education to communication, and psychology to sociology. However, some common ground for researchers was established in 1992 at the National Leadership Conference on Media Literacy. At this event, media literacy was defined as the ability to access, analyse, evaluate, and communicate messages in a variety of forms

(Aufderheide, 1993).

Media literacy was developed to express the accomplishment of the skills and ability to access, analyse, and appraise different forms of media. Today, children are growing up with much greater access to new forms media. They spend a great amount of time screening digital media even before they enter kindergarten. Digital literacy is usually associated with the positive side of media use, and users are encouraged to enjoy the maximum benefits of using new media. However, when it comes to the Internet, researchers are interested in investigating whether they can also minimize the risky consequences. As the present study demonstrates, digital literacy increases the online risks that children are exposed to. Yet, it must be stressed that most scientific research, including the present study, assess the self-acquired digital literacy which is more risk exploratory and less protective or preventive. Therefore, it can be concluded that the positive view over digital literacy or self-acquired digital literacy is not absolute, whereas it can potentially increase both benefits and the likelihood of exposure to online risks.

The present study rejected the idea that higher online self-efficacy predicted fewer online risks as well as online privacy concerns. The findings of the study suggest that the ability to recognize and deal with unpleasant/disturbing experiences online is not a predictor for reducing online risks. This is in contrary to many past findings in the literature, which posit that using virus protection has a positive impact on information security (Lee et al., 2008), or that privacy concerns have a positive impact on coping behaviours in preventing online risk (Youn, 2009). These studies provide evidence that Internet users who are concerned with information privacy can maintain their online privacy. However, the study did not find any association between privacy protection and online risk. Several alternative explanations are possible. First, it might be affected by the low level of online risks among children in this study (unconditional behaviour), discussed earlier. Self-confidence in the ability to protect oneself from undesired experience online might be stronger among children with higher levels of self-efficacy and perhaps self-assumed digital literacy. However; they might have little perception about the threats of information disclosure. This is perhaps because children think they are in control of their information privacy and online safety. As a result, their perception of privacy self-efficacy may not lead to reducing online risks. However, it may be questionable whether children are actually capable of coping with and averting privacy risks. Given that children are still at the earlier stages of forming and developing their online safety skills, it is important to examine possible erroneous beliefs held by the vulnerable applicants.

The mediation effect test shows that online privacy concern had a partial mediation effect of 'perceived severity of online risk' on online risks. The present study filled this knowledge gap by examining the mediation role of online privacy concerns concerning the association between perceived online risks and actual online risks. Given this expectation, it was hypothesized that individuals with the strongest perceived severity of online risk would be exposed to fewer online risks mediated by online privacy concerns. However, the study failed to find any association between perceived susceptibility to online risks and online risks to children. The results suggest that in order to reduce online risks among children, children need to have a strong perception of the severity of risks in relation to their concerns about privacy protection rather than susceptibility. In studies such as that of Yau et al. (2014), it is shown that perceived severity of online risk has controlling effects on online risks, in cases of online gambling. However, contrary to a promising theoretical framework by Lee et al., (2008) and Youn (2008), the findings of the present study demonstrated that there was no significant correlation between children with a high perception of susceptibility to risks and experiencing online risks. Consequently, this study suggests that in order to control online risks there is a greater need for the attention on the severity of online risks rather than perception of susceptibility to them.

Conclusion

The present study concludes that (i) online self-efficacy negatively influences the online risk of children; (ii) digital literacy is positively associated with online risk of children; and (iii) online privacy concerns are mediated by the negative effects of perceived severity to online risks on children's online risks. The results of this study confirm that an integrated model based on PMT and HBM can be a promising theoretical framework to decrease children's exposure to online risks. The model presented in this study contributes to the understanding of the factors affecting children's engagement in appropriate protection behaviour while using the Internet. Hence, children are advised to increase their level of awareness about the negative consequences of risky online behaviour as well as their risk perception and online safety knowledge.

In summary, PMT and HBM suggest that in order to take positive action, people need to believe in both severity and susceptibility of the threats caused by ignoring safe use. It is also important to improve recommendation

efficacy once it comes to promoting coping behaviours and protective action. Using the notion of these theoretical perspectives, the present study attempted to predict an online protection motivation method which specifically refers to the attenuation of online risks.

It is worth mentioning that while risk perceptions (severity and susceptibility) have been studied intensively in health research (de Zwart et al., 2009), little is known about risk perception of recently emerging new media. The present study demonstrates the need for increasing insight regarding risk perception and online privacy concern to reducing children's exposure to online risks.

The findings of this study provide a number of implications. Firstly, the true form of digital literacy for children is about being conscious of the possible online risks and learn how to be safe while using the Internet. Secondly, it is necessary to raise awareness among children regarding the negative consequences of risky online behaviour as well as teaching them how to cope with risky situations online. For policymakers, this will encourage continuous innovation and development of online safety strategies. For academicians, this study contributes to the application of PMT and HBM regarding children's new media application.

The study confirmed that a combination of digital literacy, self-protection, and awareness among children is effective in reducing the negative consequences of undesired online experiences, which is helpful for patrons in charge of policymaking. Policymakers are recommended to provide teaching materials for parents as well as updating services and guidelines for using the Internet safely. Digital natives easily share their personal information, start friendships over a social network, conduct online shopping without concern for financial information safety, and visit inappropriate websites with minimal concern towards safety and security. Promoting online safety depends on the cooperation of policymakers, practitioners, society, and family to pay greater attention to children's Internet usage. This study suggests that children need to be educated about how to use the Internet with a greater level of self-protection and awareness of online risks.

Furthermore, the study contributes to the literature concerning the measurement of Internet usage and online risks among children and young adults. It helps to increase children's awareness of the possible threats of online activities. It could also improve children's online protection and safety skills. In addition, the study presents the latest data on risk patterns of Internet usage among children. In terms of theoretical contributions, this study extends the application of Health Belief Model (HBM) and Protection Motivation Theory (PMT) to the area of digital risk protection and prevention. The study also suggests that integration between PMT and HBM functions more effectively in promotion of online risk protection behaviour among children. Health behaviour and health promotion theories have been applied to identify factors influencing individual's healthy behaviour adoption. These theories are proposed as explaining the behavioural changes for an individual (e.g., PMT and HBM) (Glanz & Rimer, 2005; Prentice-Dunn & Rogers, 1986; Rogers, 1975). The PMT is suggested to be one of the most applicable and influential risk learning theories, which helps to identify how people choose to behave when faced with various threats. The HBM also emphasizes individuals' perception of threats or actions to prevent the threats (Janz & Becker, 1984; Ronis, 1992; Rosenstock, 1974). Consequently, these two theories, initiated in health promotion context, proved to be applicable for practicing online safety or to prevent the online risks, and needs to be integrated with mediation effects of protection action.

Previous studies about online risks have used classical measurement approaches to estimate the relationship between latent constructs. Unlike the classical measurement methods, which measure a latent variable by effective (reflective) indicators, modern methods deal with the latent constructs which involve causal (formative) indicators. The application of causal indicators as formative measures has become a solution for researchers who are struggling with the implications of reflective indicators. In the present study, the researchers measured online risks latent variables by formative indicators given (i) the indicators are causes of constructs, (ii) indicators are a characteristic explaining construct, and (iii) indicators are not interchangeable (Hair et al., 2014). For example, for measuring the 'personal data misuse' indicator 'have you ever been hacked?' cannot be changed by the indicator 'have you ever lost money online?'. Consequently, the present study contributes to the application of Partial Least Squares to process the statistical analyses for the study.

The present study has several limitations. The instrument assessing children's online risk was adapted from a study conducted on children in Europe and the US. In terms of instruments used, there were sensitive words and phrases in the questions, such as "sexual content" or "having sex", and the researchers were required to replace them with other words or phrases (e.g. "inappropriate intimate relationship"). Changing the initial questionnaire may be one of the reasons that the children included in this study were found to have had less online experience than those of European countries or the US when it came to exposure to online risks.

Another possible issue with assessing online risks is that the risks caused by using the Internet are not specific or well defined. It is impossible to have a clear and defined designation of online risks; the changes caused in new media can be just as fast and reckless as their consequences. Even though researchers might have a common definition of online risks, parents, government and children might well view risk differently. Asian countries face challenges with conflicting context diversity when it comes to adoption of new media by children. The number of studies on this topic in the Asian context is minimal and there is a need for further extensive research. Another point that is worth noting is that most of the questions assessing online risks considered children being exposed to risks, or showing risky behavior against their will. However, the risks that children become deliberately involved in remain unexamined.

The other major challenge and concern about research regarding children and their Internet usage is the fact that online risks and opportunities are parallel. This study is limited due to the fact that it focuses only on risk due to typical research limitations (time, cost, etc.). The factors that reduce/increase risk may also reduce/increase benefits. For example, apart from negative consequences of children's participation in sex-related activities online, "it is developmentally appropriate for teenagers to be sexually curious and to be eager to know how sex works", and such exploration could provide the possibility of promoting growth and positive development (O'Sullivan, 2014, p 38).

When it comes to defining online risks, there is no clear literal or operational definition that all scholars agree upon. In fact, the nature of online risk is unclear, and the assessment of online risk is empirically difficult to develop (Livingstone et al., 2012). Since no validated instrument was found to assess online risk among children in the Asian context, the present study applied an instrument developed in Europe and the US. Consequently, there is a great need to explore the overall risks children are exposed to as an actor, recipient, and participant in the Asian context.

Some earlier findings suggest that it is unlikely for most risky behaviours to lead to negative consequences, unless children engage in such behaviours frequently (Baumgartner et al., 2010). The diversity of online-related risks and the different consequences that Internet use may cause suggest that there can be no one solution that promises to help overcoming the risks. In addition, the present study focused primarily on risks of which children are victims; risks that are perpetrated by children were of lesser concern in this study. At the same time, the available literature mostly concerns the major online risks that children are exposed to such as cyber-bullying, while there is minimal stress on the long-term effects of such threats (Slavtcheva-Petkova, Nash, & Bulger, 2015). Long-term effects of online risks demand further attention because exposure to an online risk might not instantly or even directly harm the child but it might traumatize the child or trigger long-term side effects that deserve greater attention from researchers.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

In order to collect the data, the researcher first contacted each school to brief them with details of the survey and request an appointment. The researcher then personally visited the schools and met the headmaster or deputy headmaster to provide them with details of the survey. An approval letter from University Putra Malaysia (Appendix 1), the Ministry of Education Malaysia, The Selangor State Education Department (Appendix 2), and the Gombak and Sepang Education Departments were submitted to the eight selected schools (Appendix 3). A sufficient number of parental consent letters (a sample of signed letter is presented in Appendix 4) were also submitted to the schools for distribution to the respective parents. Schools were also provided with the maximum number of respondents required. A sufficient number of students was then chosen by the respective schools. The selected children were asked to take the consent letter home to be signed by their parents. After approximately two weeks, data was collected from the children face to face at the schools. Those who received their parents' permission were gathered at the classroom/library/meeting room/restaurant, as arranged by the school, on the days that had been allotted for data collection. The researcher was accompanied by the class teacher and colleagues to help the researcher in answering any questions the children might have had, as well as to ensure that the children fully understand the questions. The questionnaires were distributed to those who submitted in person their parents' consent letter. Three primary school classes (one Year 3, one Year 4, and one Year 5) and three secondary school classes (one Form 3, one Form 4, and one Form 5) were pooled. The survey participants were assured of data privacy. The questionnaire was distributed in the two most popular languages in Malaysia, namely English and Malay, so that participants could choose according to their language

preferences. The children's questionnaire displayed cartoon characters that are popular with Malaysian children. The translation was carried out by a professional translator.

References

- Aufderheide, P. (1993). *Media Literacy*. A report of the national leadership conference on media literacy. Washington D.C: Aspen Inst.
- Aytes, K., & Conolly, T. (2003). A research model for investigating human behavior related to computer security. In 9th Americas Conference on Information Systems (pp. 2027–2031). Florida USA: Tampa.
- Baumgartner, S. E., Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2010). Unwanted online sexual solicitation and risky sexual online behavior across the lifespan. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 31(6), 439–447. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2010.07.005>
- Borders, A., Earleywine, M., & Huey, S. J. (2004). Predicting problem behaviors with multiple expectancies: expanding expectancy-value theory. *Journal of Adolescence*, 39(155), 539–50. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15673229>
- Camacho, S., Hassanein, K., & Head, M. (2014). Understanding the factors that influence the perceived severity of cyber-bullying. In *HCI in Business* (pp. 133–144). Hamilton, Canada: Springer International Publishing.
- Chan, Z. (2012). Protection against cyber crime. *The Star Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.thestar.com.my/Story/?file=/2012/7/7/sarawak/11617870>
- Chang, F.-C., Chiu, C.-H., Miao, N.-F., Chen, P.-H., Lee, C.-M., & Chiang, J.-T. (2014). Predictors of unwanted exposure to online pornography and online sexual solicitation of youth. *Journal of Health Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105314546775>
- Chen, H., Beaudoin, C. E., & Hong, T. (2016). Protecting oneself online: the effects of negative privacy experiences on privacy protective behaviors. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699016640224>
- Chen, H., Beaudoin, C. E., & Hong, T. (2016). Teen online information disclosure: Empirical testing of a protection motivation and social capital model. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 67(12), 2871–2881.
- Chen, I.-S. (2017). Computer self-efficacy, learning performance, and the mediating role of learning engagement. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 72, 362–370.
- Cross, D., & Barnes, A. (2015). Protecting and promoting young people's social and emotional health in online and offline contexts. In J. Wyn & H. Cahill (Eds.), *Handbook of Children and Youth Studies* (pp. 115–126). Melbourne: Springer-Verlag Singapur.
- Davinson, N., & Sillence, E. (2014). Using the health belief model to explore users' perceptions of "being safe and secure" in the world of technology mediated financial transactions. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 72(2), 154–168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2013.10.003>
- Dempsey, J. M., Kimiecik, J. C., & Horn, T. S. (1993). Parental influence on children's moderate to vigorous physical activity participation: An expectancy-value approach. *Pediatric Exercise Science*, 5(2), 151 – 167.
- Dönmez, O., Ferhan Odabaşı, H., Kabakçı Yurdakul, I., Kuzu, A., & Girgin, Ü. (2017). Development of a scale to address perceptions of pre-service teachers regarding online risks for children. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 17(3).

- Ekizoglu, N., & Ozcinar, Z. (2010). The relationship between the teacher candidates' computer and internet based anxiety and perceived self-efficacy. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 5881–5890. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.962>
- Family Online Safety Institute. (2013). Teen identity theft. Resource document. Family Online Safety Institute www.fosi.org/files/Teen-Identity-Theft-online.pdf
- Farrukh, A., Sadwick, R., & Villasenor, J. (2014). Youth Internet safety: Risks, responses, and research recommendations. http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/papers/2014/10/21-youth-internet-safety-farrukh-sadwick-villasenor/youth-internet-safety_v07.pdf
- Feng, Y., & Xie, W. (2014). Teens' concern for privacy when using social networking sites: An analysis of socialization agents and relationships with privacy-protecting behaviors. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 33, 153–162.
- Finkelhor, D., Mitchell, K. J., & Wolak, J. (2008). First Youth Internet Safety Survey (YISS-1). United States, New Hampshire, Durham. http://www.ndacan.cornell.edu/datasets/pdfs_user_guides/134user.pdf
- Finkelhor, D., Mitchell, K. J., & Wolak, J. (2011). Second Youth Internet Safety Survey (YISS-2). United States, New Hampshire, Durham. http://www.ndacan.cornell.edu/datasets/pdfs_user_guides/159user.pdf
- Glanz, K., & Rimer, B. K. (2005). *Theory at a glance: A guide for health promotion practice* (2nd ed.). Bethesda MD: U.S. Department of Health And Human Services National Institutes of Health. <http://www.cancer.gov/PDF/481f5d53-63df-41bc-bfaf-5aa48ee1da4d/TAAG3.pdf>
- Goldstein, J. (1998). *Why we watch: The attractions of violent entertainment*. Oxford University Press.
- Görzig, A. (2016). Adolescents' experience of offline and online risks: Separate and joint propensities. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 56, 9–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.11.006>
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). *A primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*. United States: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2013). Partial least squares structural equation modeling : Rigorous applications , Better Results and Higher Acceptance. *Long Range Planning*, 46, 1–12.
- Herath, T., Chen, R., Wang, J., Banjara, K., Wilbur, J., & Rao, H. R. (2014). Security services as coping mechanisms: An investigation into user intention to adopt an email authentication service. *Information Systems Journal*, 24(1), 61–84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2575.2012.00420.x>
- Huang, G. C., Unger, J. B., Soto, D., Fujimoto, K., Pentz, M. A., Jordan-Marsh, M., & Valente, T. W. (2014). Peer influences: The impact of online and offline friendship networks on adolescent smoking and alcohol use. *The Journal of Adolescent Health*, 54(5), 508–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.07.001>
- Janz, N. K., & Becker, M. H. (1984). The health belief model: A decade later. *Health Education Quarterly*, 11(1), 1–47. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6392204>
- Janz, N. K., & Becker, M. H. (1984). The health belief model: A decade later. *Health Education & Behavior*, 11(1), 1–47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109019818401100101>
- Jones, L. M., Mitchell, K. J., & Finkelhor, D. (2012). Trends in youth internet victimization: findings from three youth internet safety surveys 2000-2010. *The Journal of Adolescent Health: Official Publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine*, 50(2), 179–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2011.09.015>
- Jones, L. M., Mitchell, K. J., & Finkelhor, D. (2013). Online harassment in context: Trends from three Youth Internet Safety Surveys (2000, 2005, 2010). *Psychology of Violence*, 3(1), 53–69. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030309>
- Lareki, A., Martínez de Morentin, J. I., Altuna, J., & Amenabar, N. (2017). Teenagers, perception of risk

- behaviors regarding digital technologies. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 68, 395–402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.12.004>
- Lee, D., Larose, R., & Rifon, N. (2008). Keeping our network safe: A model of online protection behaviour. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 27(5), 445–454. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01449290600879344>
- Livingstone, S., & Görzig, A. (2012). Sexting: The exchange of sexual messages online among European youth. In S. Livingstone, L. Haddon, & A. Görzig (Eds.), *Children, Risk and Safety on the Internet: Kids online in comparative perspective* (pp. 151–164). Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.
- Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Görzig, A., & Olafsson, K. (2011a). Risks and safety on the Internet: The perspective of European children Kids Online network. London, UK. [https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CB8QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.lse.ac.uk%2Fmedia%40lse%2Fresearch%2FEUKidsOnline%2FEU%2520Kids%2520II%2520\(2009-11\)%2FSurvey%2FTechnical%2520report.PDF&ei=A_0lVMbpEdSgugTMkIG4BA&usg=AFQjC](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CB8QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.lse.ac.uk%2Fmedia%40lse%2Fresearch%2FEUKidsOnline%2FEU%2520Kids%2520II%2520(2009-11)%2FSurvey%2FTechnical%2520report.PDF&ei=A_0lVMbpEdSgugTMkIG4BA&usg=AFQjC)
- Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Görzig, A., & Olafsson, K. (2011b). Technical report and user guide: The 2010 EU kids online survey their parents in 25 countries kids online network. LSD, London, UK.
- Mohamed, N., & Hawa, I. (2012). Information privacy concerns, antecedents and privacy measure use in social networking sites: Evidence from Malaysia. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28, 2366–2375.
- Moore, A. A., Overstreet, C., Kendler, K. S., Dick, D. M., Adkins, A., & Amstadter, A. B. (2017). Potentially traumatic events, personality, and risky sexual behavior in undergraduate college students. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 9(1), 105.
- Ng, B.-Y., Kankanhalli, A., & Xu, Y. C. (2009). Studying users' computer security behavior: A health belief perspective. *Decision Support Systems*, 46(4), 815–825.
- Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). (2012). *The Protection of Children Online*.
- Peterson, J. L. (1991). Television viewing and early initiation of sexual intercourse: Is there a link? *Journal of Homosexuality*, 21(1–2), 93–118.
- Prentice-Dunn, S., & Rogers, R. W. (1986). Protection motivation theory and preventive health: Beyond the health belief model. *Health Education Research*, 1(3), 153–161. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/1.3.153>
- Rogers, R. W. (1975). A protection motivation theory of fear appeals and attitude change1. *The Journal of Psychology*, 91(1), 93–114.
- Rogers, R. W., Cacioppo, J. T., & Petty, R. (1983). Cognitive and physiological processes in fear appeals and attitude change: A revised theory of protection motivation. In J. T. Cacioppo & R. Petty (Eds.), *Social psychophysiology: A sourcebook* (pp. 153–177). New York, USA: Guilford press.
- Ronis, D. L. (1992). Conditional health threats: Health beliefs, decisions, and behaviors among adults. *Health Psychology*, 11(2), 127.
- Rosenstock, I. M. (1974). Historical origins of the health belief model. *Health Education & Behavior*, 2(4), 328–335. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109019817400200403>
- Rosenstock, I. M., Strecher, V. J., & Becker, M. H. (1988). Social learning theory and the Health Belief Model. *Health Education Quarterly*, 15(2), 175–83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109019818801500203>
- Saeri, A. K., Ogilvie, C., La Macchia, S. T., Smith, J. R., & Louis, W. R. (2014). Predicting facebook users' online privacy protection: risk, trust, norm focus theory, and the theory of planned Behavior. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 154(4), 352–369. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2014.914881>

- 1 Samimi, P., & Alderson, K. G. (2014). Sexting among undergraduate students. *Computers in Human Behavior*,
2 31, 230–241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.10.027>
- 3 Schilder, J. D., Brusselaers, M. B. J., & Bogaerts, S. (2016). The Effectiveness of an Intervention to Promote
4 Awareness and Reduce Online Risk Behavior in Early Adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*,
5 45(2), 286–300. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-015-0401-2>
- 6
- 7 Shillair, R., Cotten, S. R., Tsai, H. S., Alhabash, S., Larose, R., & Rifon, N. J. (2015). Online safety begins with
8 you and me: Convincing Internet users to protect themselves. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 48, 199–
9 207.
- 10
- 11 Slavtcheva-Petkova, V., Nash, V. J., & Bulger, M. (2015). Evidence on the extent of harms experienced by
12 children as a result of online risks: implications for policy and research. *Information, Communication &*
13 *Society*, 18(1), 48–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2014.934387>
- 14
- 15 Stanton, J., Mastrangelo, P., Stam, K., & Jolton, J. (2004). Behavioral information security: Two end user
16 survey studies of motivation and security practices. *AMCIS 2004 Proceedings*, 175.
- 17
- 18 Stern, T. (2011). User behavior on online social networks and the Internet: A protection motivation perspective.
19 The City University of New York.
- 20
- 21 Taddei, S., & Contena, B. (2013). Privacy, trust and control: Which relationships with online self-disclosure?
22 *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29, 821–826. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.11.022>
- 23
- 24 Teimouri, M., Hassan, M., Griffiths, M., Benrazavi, S., Bolong, J., Daud, A., & Adzharuddin, N. (2015).
25 Assessing the validity of western measurement of online risks to children in an Asian context. *Child*
26 *Indicators Research*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-015-9316-4>
- 27
- 28 Teimouri, M., Hassan, M. S., Bolong, J., Daud, A., Yussuf, S., & Adzharuddin, N. A. (2014). What is upsetting
29 our children online? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 155(October), 411–416.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.10.314>
- 31
- 32 Vaillancourt, T., Faris, R., & Mishna, F. (2017). Cyberbullying in children and youth: implications for health
33 and clinical practice. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 706743716684791.
- 34
- 35 Waddell, J. C., McLaughlin, C., LaRose, R., Rifon, N., Wirth-Hawkins, C., Crouse, J., ... Christina, R. (2014).
36 Promoting online safety among adolescents: Eancing coping self-efficacy and protective behaviors
37 through enactive mastery. *Communication and Information Technologies Annual (Studies in Media and*
38 *Communications) Emerald Group Publishing Limited*, 8, 133–157.
- 39
- 40 Wijesingha, R., Leatherdale, S. T., Turner, N. E., & Elton-Marshall, T. (2017). Factors associated with
41 adolescent online and land-based gambling in Canada. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 1–8.
- 42
- 43 Wirth, C. B., Rifon, N. J., LaRose, R., & Melissa L. Lewis. (2008). Promoting teenage online safety with an I-
44 safety intervention. In *Annual meeting of the International Communication Association* (pp. 1–28). TBA,
45 Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- 46
- 47 Wisniewski, P., Xu, H., Rosson, M. B., & Carroll, J. M. (2014). Adolescent online safety: The “moral” of the
48 story. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work & social*
49 *computing* (pp. 1258–1271). Baltimore, MD, USA.
- 50
- 51 Yau, Y. H. C., Pilver, C. E., Steinberg, M. a, Rugle, L. J., Hoff, R. a, Krishnan-Sarin, S., & Potenza, M. N.
52 (2014). Relationships between problematic Internet use and problem-gambling severity: findings from a
53 high-school survey. *Addictive Behaviors*, 39(1), 13–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2013.09.003>
- 54
- 55 Ybarra, M. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2005). Exposure to internet pornography among children and adolescents: a
56 national survey. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior: The Impact of the Internet, Multimedia and Virtual*
57 *Reality on Behavior and Society*, 8(5), 473–86. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cpb.2005.8.473>
- 58
- 59
- 60
- 61
- 62
- 63
- 64
- 65

- 1 Youn, S. (2009). Determinants of online privacy concern and its influence on privacy protection behaviors
2 among young adolescents. *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 43(3), 389–418.
- 3 Youn, S. (2010). Teenagers' perceptions of online privacy and coping behaviors: A risk–benefit appraisal
4 approach. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 49(1), 37–41.
- 5
- 6 Zwart, O., Veldhuijzen, I. K., Elam, G., Aro, A. R., Abraham, T., Bishop, G. D., ... Brug, J. (2009). Perceived
7 threat, risk perception, and efficacy beliefs related to SARS and other (emerging) infectious diseases:
8 results of an international survey. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 16(1), 30–40.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12529-008-9008-2>
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60
- 61
- 62
- 63
- 64
- 65

**A MODEL OF ONLINE PROTECTION TO REDUCE ONLINE RISK FOR CHILDREN:
EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM ASIA**

Misha Teimouri^{a,*}, Md Salleh Hassan^a,
Seyed Rahim Benrazavi^b, Mark D. Griffiths^c

^a*Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Department of Communication, Universiti
Putra Malaysia, 43400 Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia*

^b*Faculty of Philology, Institute for Media Studies, Ruhr University Bochum, Bochum Süd,
Universitätsstraße 150, 44801 Bochum, Germany*

^c*Director, International Gaming Research Unit, Psychology Department, Nottingham Trent
University Burton Street, Nottingham, NG1 4FQ*

**Correspondence: Misha Teimouri, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication,
Department of Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia,
E-mail: misha.teimoury@gmail.com*

A MODEL OF ONLINE PROTECTION TO REDUCE ONLINE RISK FOR CHILDREN: EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM ASIA

Abstract

Children are surrounded by a variety of digital media and therefore they are exposed to potential risks that come with them. Learning how to be safe online is an important consideration for both children and their caregivers. The present study proposes an integrated model of online safety based on constructs from Protection Motivation Theory (PMT) and the Health Belief Model (HBM), namely perceived severity of (and susceptibility to) risk, online self-efficacy, online privacy concern, and digital literacy. A survey was conducted among 420 schoolchildren aged 9 to 16 years. Using Partial Least Squares-Structural Equation Modelling, the results illustrated the presence of a negative effect of 'perceived severity of online risk' toward online risks, whereas the effect of 'digital literacy' was found to be positive. Children, whose perception of online risks was more severe, would be less exposed to online risks if they had higher 'online privacy concerns' than the children with higher 'digital literacy' who are more exposed to online risk. In conclusion, engaging in safe online behaviour requires children to have a high perception of severity about online risks as well as knowledge of online privacy concerns. Online risks and opportunities are parallel. The factors that reduce/increase risk may also reduce/increase benefits, and therefore require further investigation.

Keywords: online risks for children; online risk perception; self-efficacy online; online privacy concerns; digital literacy

Appendix 1 Letter from MK



FAKULTI BAHASA MODEN DAN KOMUNIKASI
FACULTY OF MODERN LANGUAGES AND COMMUNICATION

29 Januari 2013

UPM/FBMK/GS31727

Pengarah,
Bahagian Perancangan dan Penyelidikan Dasar Pendidikan
(Sektor Penyelidikan dan Penilaian)
Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia
Aras 1-4, Blok E8, Kompleks E
Pusat Pentadbiran Kerajaan Persekutuan
62604 Putrajaya

Nombor Telefon: 603-8884 6591

Tuan,

SURAT PENGESAHAN PELAJAR

Dengan segala hormatnya saya merujuk perkara di atas. Saya ingin mengesahkan bahawa pelajar seperti nama di bawah adalah pelajar Ph.D di Jabatan Komunikasi, Fakulti Bahasa Moden dan Komunikasi, UPM.

Nama : Misha Teimmoury
Nombor Matriks : GS31727
Kursus : Ph.D Komunikasi Massa
Semester : Tiga (3)

Untuk makluman tuan, pelajar ini akan menjalankan penyelidikan bertajuk "*Children online risks, protection motivation and Parental Mediation*" sebagai kajian Ph.D beliau. Kajian ini adalah sebahagian daripada Projek Geran Penyelidikan RUGS bertajuk "*Internet Usage and Online Risks among Malaysian Children*" yang telah diluluskan oleh UPM.

Sekian terima kasih.

Yang menjalankan tugas,

PROF. MADYA DR. AIN NADZIMAH ABDULLAH
Timbalan Dekan (Siswazah dan Antarabangsa)

Appendix 2 An approval letter from Ministry of education



BAHAGIAN PERANCANGAN DAN PENYELIDIKAN DASAR PENDIDIKAN
KEMENTERIAN PELAJARAN MALAYSIA
ARAS 1-4, BLOK E-8
KOMPLEKS KERAJAAN PARCEL E
PUSAT Pentadbiran Kerajaan Persekutuan
62604 PUTRAJAYA.

Telefon : 03-88846591
Faks : 03-88846579

Ruj. Kami : KP(BPPDP)603/5/JLD. 12(231)
Tarikh : 28 Februari 2013

Misha Teimmoury
Fakulti Bahasa Moden dan Komunikasi
Universiti Putra Malaysia
43400 UPM Serdang
Selangor

Kelulusan Khas Untuk Menjalankan Kajian Di Sekolah, Institut Perguruan, Jabatan Pelajaran Negeri Dan Bahagian-bahagian Di Bawah Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia

Adalah saya dengan hormatnya diarah memaklumkan bahawa permohonan tuan/puan untuk menjalankan kajian bertajuk :

"The Relationship Between Child Online Privacy Protection and Child Online Risk Mediated by Parental Mediation Among Malaysian Children" diluluskan.


2. Kelulusan ini adalah berdasarkan kepada cadangan penyelidikan dan instrumen kajian yang tuan/puan kemukakan ke Bahagian ini. **Kebenaran bagi menggunakan sampel kajian perlu diperolehi dari Ketua Bahagian/Pengarah Pelajaran Negeri yang berkenaan.**

3. Sila tuan/puan kemukakan ke Bahagian ini senaskhah laporan akhir kajian/laporan dalam bentuk elektronik berformat Pdf di dalam CD bersama naskhah *hardcopy* setelah selesai kelak. Tuan/Puan juga diingatkan supaya **mendapat kebenaran terlebih dahulu** daripada Bahagian ini sekiranya sebahagian atau sepenuhnya dapatan kajian tersebut hendak dibentangkan di mana-mana forum atau seminar atau diumumkan kepada media massa.

Sekian untuk makluman dan tindakan tuan/puan selanjutnya. Terima kasih.


"BERKHIDMAT UNTUK NEGARA"

Saya yang menurut perintah,



(Dr MAIMUNAH BT MUDA)

Ketua Unit
Sektor Penyelidikan dan Penilaian
b.p. Pengarah
Bahagian Perancangan dan Penyelidikan Dasar Pendidikan
Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia

Appendix 3 An approval letter from Selangor State



Appendix 4 Sample of signed consent letter

 **PENGUNAAN INTERNET DAN RISIKO ATAS TALIAN' (ONLINE) DI KALANGAN KANAK-KANAK MALAYSIA**

Surat Kebenaran Mengambil Bahagian Dalam Kajian

Kepada Ibubapa/ Penjaga,

Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM) kini sedang menjalankan projek penyelidikan untuk menentukan penggunaan Internet di kalangan kanak-kanak Malaysia (bagi Tahun 3, 4, 5 dan Tingkatan 1, 2, 4) terutamanya mengenai kebaikan dan risiko yang dibawa oleh Internet. Projek ini dibawah tajaan dana universiti (RUGS) dan akan dijalankan di sekolah-sekolah di sekitar Selangor. Sekolah anak anda telah dipilih untuk menyertai projek ini dan anak anda telah terpilih sebagai peserta. Sebagai peserta, nama dan kerahsiaan data anak anda akan dilindungi.

Pasukan penyelidik projek ini diketuai oleh **Prof. Dr. Md Salleh Hassan**, bersama empat orang ahli-ahlinya iaitu **Prof. Dr. Ezhar Tamam**, **Prof. Madya Dr. Siti Zobidah Omar**, **Prof. Madya Dr. Jusang Bolong** dan **Dr. Nor Azura Adzharuddin**. Ia juga melibatkan penyertaan empat pelajar-pelajar Doktor Falsafah (**Azlina Daud**, **Misha Teimmoury** **Seyedeh Somayeh Naeemi** dan **Elaheh Taheri**).

Projek ini amat penting kerana hasil kajian nanti dapat membekalkan maklumat kepada pihak-pihak berkuasa mengenai tabiat penggunaan Internet kanak-kanak Malaysia, kebaikan dan risiko yang dihadapi mereka. Hasil kajian ini juga membolehkan pembangunan program pengajaran mengenai keselamatan Internet dijalankan di kalangan pelajar-pelajar sekolah di seluruh negara. Penyertaan anak anda dalam kajian ini amat dialu-alukan dan kami berharap mendapat kebenaran anda untuk tujuan ini.


Untuk maklumat lanjut, anda boleh menghubungi Pasukan Penyelidik di nombor telefon **03-89468784/89468777** **Jabatan Komunikasi, Fakulti Bahasa Moden dan Komunikasi, Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM)**:

Prof. Dr. Md Salleh Hassan – Ketua Projek (mdsalleh@putra.upm.edu.my)
Prof. Dr. Ezhar Tamam – Ahli
Prof. Madya Dr. Siti Zobidah Omar – Ahli
Prof. Madya Dr. Jusang Bolong – Ahli
Dr. Nor Azura Adzharuddin – Ahli

Azlina Daud – Pelajar (daudazlina@yahoo.com)
Misha Teimmoury – Pelajar (misha.teimmoury@gmail.com)
Seyedeh Somayeh Naeemi – Pelajar (somayeh.naeemi@gmail.com)
Elaheh Taheri – Pelajar (taheri1981@yahoo.com)

Borang yang dikembalikan berserta tandatangan anda, nama anda dan nama anak anda, menandakan anda telah memberikan kebenaran untuk anak anda menyertai kajian ini.

Saya (NGAPINAS BIN HUSSIN) bersetuju membenarkan
anak saya (MUHAMMAD MUAZZIM) mengambil bahagian
dalam kajian "Penggunaan Internet dan Risiko Atas Talian (Online) di kalangan Kanak-Kanak Malaysia".

Tandatangan Ibubapa/Penjaga:  Tarikh: 11/07/11




Figure 1. Measurement model (Initial)




Figure 1. Reflective measurement model (Modified)




Figure 1. Formative measurement model




Figure 1. Mediation effect (Direct-indirect model)

Table 1. Reflective measurement model assessment

Constructs (Indicators)	Loading (Initial)	Loading (modified)
<i>Perceived severity of online risk</i>		
It is risky if I received inappropriate message	0.85	N.C
Upset about nasty or hurtful messages	0.74	N.C
Bothered if meeting someone I knew only online	0.42	N.C
It is risky if searched for someone online to talk about inappropriate relationship	0.90	N.C
It is risky if searched for someone online to do inappropriate intimate relationship	0.93	N.C
It is risky if I sent my naked photos to someone I knew online	0.91	N.C
It is risky if I sent my address or phone number to someone I knew online	0.87	N.C
Composite Reliability	0.93	N.C
AVE	0.67	N.C
<i>Perceived susceptibility to online risk (It is risky if...)</i>		
Having conflict with parents	0.85	N.C
Getting junk or unwanted mail	0.88	N.C
Your personal information being misused	0.93	N.C
You experiencing financial loss	0.93	N.C
You experiencing identity theft	0.92	N.C
Composite Reliability	0.96	N.C
AVE	0.81	N.C
<i>Online privacy Concern</i>		
I am able to use a false name or false ID	0.48	Del
I am able to provide incomplete information about myself	0.73	0.69
I ask somebody (e.g., parents and teachers) what I should do	0.70	0.72
I am able to read the privacy statement provided by the site	0.73	0.74
I go to other websites that do not ask for my personal information	0.78	0.80
Usually, I do nothing and leave the website	0.69	0.72
Composite Reliability	0.84	0.85
AVE	0.48	0.54
<i>Digital Literacy</i>		
I am able to bookmark a website	0.66	0.67
I am able to block messages from someone unwanted	0.75	0.75
I am able to change privacy settings for my social networking profile	0.77	0.79
I am able to delete a record of websites visited	0.66	0.70
I am able to block unwanted ads or junk mail/spam	0.75	0.75
I am able to change filter preferences	0.67	0.71
I am able to find information on how to use the Internet safely	0.45	Del
I am able to compare websites to decide if information is true	0.71	0.64
C.R	0.87	0.88
AVE	0.47	0.52
<i>Online self- Efficacy</i>		
I feel confident dealing with the ways companies collect my personal	0.50	N.C

information		
I feel confident learning skills that protect my privacy online	0.56	N.C
I know more about the Internet than my parents	0.72	N.C
I know lots of things about the Internet	0.66	N.C
I am confident of recognizing a suspicious email	0.87	N.C
I am confident of recognizing suspicious email headers	0.86	N.C
I am confident of recognizing suspicious email attachment filename	0.87	N.C
I can recognize a suspicious email attachment even if there was no-one around to help me	0.83	N.C
Composite Reliability	0.91	N.C
Average Variance AVE Variance inflation factor	0.56	N.C

Note: Loading modified: factor loading after delete item with loaded less than .5; Del: Item which has been deleted; N.C: No changed: Loading is not changed after item has been deleted; AVE: Average Variance Extracted; CR: construct reliability

Table 1. Reflective discriminant validity (Fornell-Larker Criterrium)

Constructs		1	2	3	4	5
1	Digital Literacy	0.72				
2	Online Protection behaviour	0.63	0.73			
3	Online Self-efficacy	0.56	0.44	0.84		
4	Perceived Severity of online risk	0.4	0.49	0.47	0.87	
5	Perceived Susceptibility to online risk	0.19	0.22	0.23	0.58	0.9

Table 1. Global item for formative construct

Construct global item	Single global item	Coefficient
Unwanted Sexual solicitation	Seen/talked about obscene materials	.88
Risky sexual behaviour	Talk/act intimately	.89
Potential harmful content	Seen violent/aggressive materials	.8
Sexting	Send/received obscene massage	.8
Bullying	Experienced bullying online	.8

Table 1. Formative measurement model assessment

Constructs and its indicators		OW	T	P	OL	P
Unwanted exposure to pornography						
1	Unwanted obscene materials on web	0.26	3.85	0	0.65	0
2	Unwanted obscene materials on message or link	0.37	4.17	0	0.75	0
3	Unwanted e-mail or IM	0.35	4.31	0	0.7	0
4	Naked picture or inappropriate intimate relationship on message or link	0.1	0.92	0.3	0.63	0
5	Anyone ask to talk about inappropriate acts	0.24	2.72	0.01	0.62	0
6	Anyone ask to do inappropriate acts	0.17	1.67	0.1	0.53	0
Risky sexual online behaviour						
1	Search someone to talk about intimate relationship	0.39	2.33	0.02	0.56	0
2	Search someone to do intimate relationship	-0.09	0.55	0.6	0.42	0
3	Sent obscene photos to someone you only knew online	0.5	3.76	0	0.62	0
4	Sent address or phone number to someone you only knew online	0.66	5.91	0	0.77	0
Sexting						
1	Seen obscene images or videos	0.29	2.91	0	0.65	0
2	Seen obscene images or videos about private parts	-0.02	0.29	0.7	0.5	0
3	Seen someone obscene images or videos	-0.04	0.52	0.6	0.51	0
4	Seen intimate images or videos in violent way	0.08	1.15	0.2	0.5	0
5	Being sent inappropriate messages	0.42	6.23	0	0.77	0
6	Being posted inappropriate material	0.21	3.01	0	0.6	0
7	Seen other people perform obscene acts	0.01	0.2	0.8	0.41	0
8	Received inappropriate messages (words, pictures and videos)	0.42	4.43	0	0.83	0
Potentially harmful user-generated content						
1	Seen bloody movies or photos	0.28	3.08	0	0.68	0
2	Seen people beaten up	0.35	4.39	0	0.71	0
3	Seen hate messages	0.3	3.59	0	0.61	0
4	Seen anorexia or bulimic	0.05	0.56	0.6	0.21	0.07
5	Talk about drugs	0.21	1.63	0.1	0.54	0
6	Ways of physical harming	0.32	3.92	0	0.68	0
7	Ways of committing suicide	0.13	1.12	0.3	0.31	0.01
Bullying						
1	Being asked to show my private part	0.16	2.33	0.02	0.34	0
2	Being asked to talk about nasty acts	0.07	0.82	0.41	0.42	0
3	Received nasty or hurtful messages	0.18	2.33	0.02	0.69	0
4	Received nasty or hurtful messages about yourself	0.24	2.74	0.01	0.66	0
5	Received other nasty or hurtful messages	0.18	1.98	0.05	0.68	0
6	Being threatened online	0.16	2.39	0.02	0.39	0
7	Being left out or excluded	0.21	3.22	0	0.52	0
8	Received inappropriate messages that bothered you	0.44	5.3	0	0.78	0
9	Received inappropriate messages encourage you to run away	0.01	0.09	0.93	0.25	0.02
Personal Data misuse						
1	Misuse of password	0.57	4.28	0	0.81	0
2	Misuse of personal information you didn't like	0.2	1.17	0.24	0.75	0
3	Lost money being cheat online	0.13	1.28	0.2	0.37	0
4	Misuse of personal information	0.34	1.99	0.05	0.61	0
5	Being hacked	0.21	1.58	0.12	0.62	0

Note: OW: outer weights; T: t-statistic; OL: outer loading; P: p value

Table 1. Structural model

Name if constructs	Effect	T Statistics	P
Digital Literacy -> Online Risk to Children	0.46*	8.52	0
Online Privacy Concern -> Online Risk to Children	-0.00	0.05	0.96
Online Self-efficacy -> Online Risk to Children	0.06	1.26	0.21
Perceived Severity of online risk -> Online Privacy Concern	0.55*	10.98	0
Perceived Severity of online risk -> Online Risk to Children	-0.16*	2.63	0.01
Perceived Susceptibility to online risk -> Online Privacy Concern	-0.10	1.87	0.06
Perceived Susceptibility to online risk -> Online Risk to Children	0.09	1.81	0.07

Table 1. Mediation effect

Hypothesis	Direct effect	Indirect effect	VAF	Result
Mediating effect of online privacy concern				
Perceived severity of online risk>Online risk to children	-0.12*	-0.16*	0.58	Partial mediation
Perceived Susceptibility to online risk>Online risk to children	0.05	0.09		No mediation