EKUAD JETPR
Eğitim Kuram ve Uygulama Araştırmaları Dergisi

ISSN 2149-7702
e-ISSN 2587-0718

DOI: 10.38089/ekuad.2021.84

Vol 7 (2021) Issue 3, 406-421

Investigation of the Effect of Cyber Bullying Awareness Training for Parents[1]

Emel DUMAN[2], Nuray YILMAZ[3]

Abstract

The content of "Cyberbullying Awareness Training for Parents" was developed by the researcher in order to raise awareness of the families about the prevention of cyberbullying, which is a major threat to families and their children. This study aims to examine the effects of the content of prepared education on parents. In the study, the change in the awareness of parents towards cyberbullying and their opinions on training was investigated. A total of 80 parents, 72 femal, and 8 male, participated in the study. In the study, a single group pre-test-post-test model among weak experimental models was used. Designed with Keller's ARCS motivation theory and adult education methods and techniques in mind, the training consists of two parts: "virtual world & cyberbullying" and "recommendations to families". The "Cyber Bullying Sensitivity Scale" was used to determine the change in the parents 'sensitivity towards cyberbullying at the end of the training, and the "Cyber Bullying Awareness Training Evaluation Questionnaire" was prepared by the researcher to determine the parents' opinion on the education they attended. Research findings show that cyberbullying awareness training is effective on the participants. The effect size is at the "big" level. At the end of the training, it was determined that there was no difference in the cyberbullying levels of the participants according to age, education level, and gender. These findings can be considered as an indication that the cyberbullying awareness training program prepared for parents can be applied to parents of different age groups and different education levels, male or female, with different characteristics. In order to determine the effect of Cyber Bullying Awareness Training, parents' opinions on education were consulted second. Many of the participants who gave their opinions by participating in the training program stated that the training program was very beneficial for them and they were pleased to participate in the training and requested the repetition of the training. Based on these findings, it can be said that the program met the participants' needs on this issue by contributing to the awareness of the participants about cyberbullying at the end of the training.

Keywords

Cyberbullying Awareness Training, Cyberbullying Intervention, Cyberbullying Prevention, Parents Education, Parents' Views

Article Info

Received: 03.04.2021
Accepted: 03.10.2021
Online Published: 31.12.2021

[1] This article was produced from the master's thesis of the first author under the supervision of the second author. This study is the full text of the paper presented at FMGTEK 2020 (2nd International Congress on Science, Mathematics, Entrepreneurship and Technology Education) and whose abstract was published.

[2] PhD Student, Bursa Uludag University, Institute of Educational Sciences, emelozduman@gmail.com, 0000-0001-5939-3476
[3] Assoc. Prof. Dr., Bursa Uludag University, Faculty of Education, Turkey, npyilmaz@uludag.edu.tr, 0000-0001-8368-4556

Introduction

The unconscious use of information technologies and the internet without family control can have negative effects on children. Especially as a result of the increasing frequency of use of social networking sites and the ability of people to express their feelings and thoughts easily and fearlessly on these platforms, problematic behaviors encountered in daily life can be moved to the virtual environment. Behaviors such as bullying, threats, intimidation, and abuse in such environments can lead to serious problems that can lead to irreversible destruction in the lives of individuals.

Malicious use of information and communication technologies in schools has led to the emergence of a new type of bullying called 'cyber bullying' among students (Serin, 2012). Campbell (2005) defines cyberbullying as a new medium in which bullies engage in bullying using e-mail, text, chat rooms, cell phones, cell phone cameras, and websites. Belsey (2008), defines cyberbullying as the deliberate and repeated use of communication technologies by a group or individual to harm others in a hostile manner. Heyeres and his colleagues (2020) mention that it is difficult to find an accepted definition of cyberbullying in the cyberbullying research field due to different paradigms and perceptions (Heyeres et al., 2020).

Although cyberbullying is thought of at first glance as a reflection of bullying in the virtual environment, in many ways it is separated from traditional bullying. However, some research results have shown that the anti-cyberbullying intervention program can reduce traditional bullying in addition to cyberbullying (Aizenkot, & Kashy-Rosenbaum, 2020; Garaigordobil & Martínez-Valderrey, 2015) Olweus (1994) says bullying is when a student is subjected to intentional and repetitive behavior with the intention of harming one or more people stronger than him. One of the characteristics that distinguish virtual bullying from other types of bullying is that after a while it becomes unsavory (Kocashahan, 2012). When a photo or video uploaded to the Internet without permission is transferred by many to personal computers, an unlimited number of people can access and reproduce this data. In addition, the bully cannot ensure that the data is completely destroyed and deleted, even if he wants to later (Shariff, 2008).

Cyberbullying, which is becoming a major threat to all countries, is causing more emotional harm to victims than traditional bullying (Hutson, Kelly, & Militello, 2018; Willard, 2007). In addition, the negative consequences of cyberbullying on adolescents can be long-term (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2016). In this respect, cyberbullying is seen as a public health problem affecting all segments of society (Heyeres et al., 2020; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2016; Roberto et al., 2017).

With the increase in awareness on the subject, there has been an increase in the number of studies on combating bullying and cyberbullying in schools. The enactment of laws and policies related to bullying has also led to a greater focus on such studies. Studies on combating cyberbullying are discussed in the form of prevention and intervention. While prevention studies aim to prevent cyberbullying experiences before they occur, intervention studies aim to intervene in cyberbullying events and evaluate the programs implemented (Tanrikulu, 2017). Most of these programs took place in K-12 schools (Hutson, Kelly, & Militello, 2018).

With the increase in awareness on the subject, while studies on tackling the problem increase, there is an increase in the number of studies evaluating the effectiveness of the studies carried out (e.g. Aizenkot, & Kashy-Rosenbaum, 2020; Bradshaw , 2015 ; Cantone et al., 2015; Gaffney et al., 2019; Garaigordobil, & Mart´ınez-Valderrey, 2015; Hutson, Kelly, & Militello, 2018; Jiménez-Barbero et al., 2016; Roberto et al., 2017; Schultze-Krumbholz et al., 2012; Tanrikulu, 2017; Topcu-Uzer, & Tanrıkulu, 2017; Williford et al., 2013; Wölfer et al., 2014). Some of these studies are literature analysis and meta-analysis studies (e.g. Gaffney et al., 2019; Heyeres et al., 2020; Hutson, Kelly, & Militello, 2018; Tanrikulu, 2017; Topcu- Uzer, & Tanrıkulu, 2017). In his analysis, Tanrikulu (2017) found that all programs examined, technological or not, were effective in preventing and responding to cyberbullying.

In a meta-analysis of the effectiveness of school-based anti-cyberbullying programs, Gaffney and his colleagues found that the programs effectively reduced both the crime of cyberbullying and the victimization of cyberbullying among school-age participants (Gaffney et al., 2019). The nine

programs Hutson and his colleagues examined found a significant drop in cyberbullying. Ten programs examined found a significant decrease in the frequency of cyberbullying, while other programs found no significant decreases in cyberbullying, cyber-victimization, or intention to commit cyberbullying. (Hutson, Kelly, & Militello, 2018).

Despite the increase in research on combating cyberbullying, the need for assessment research to increase the generality of cyberbullying intervention programs continues, given the prevalence of cyberbullying around the world and the negative consequences it causes (Ortega-Barón et al., 2019; Tanrıkulu, 2017).

There are findings that it is more effective to carry out cyberbullying programs as holistic school activities that include all school stakeholders (teachers, parents, etc.) (Aboujaoude, Savage, Starcevic & Salame, 2015; Cantone et al., 2015; Hutson, Kelly & Militello, 2018). Mason (2008) says it's vital for schools to work with families to educate adolescents about cyberbullying prevention. The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2016) supported the inclusion of parents in cyberbullying education. In addition, the importance of parent education has been discussed in the traditional bullying intervention literature (Ttofi &Farrington, 2011).

Research findings on the importance of the role of parents in preventing cyberbullying are increasing day by day. A systematic review of the effectiveness of Cantone and his colleagues on the effectiveness of school interventions on bullying and cyberbullying has demonstrated the importance of involving parents in cyberbullying education (Cantone et al., 2005). Less than half (n = 7) of the programs Hutson and his colleagues examined included the education of the parents of the children participating in the program. These programs are among the successful programs in reducing cyberbullying and victimization (Hutson, Kelly & Militello, 2018). Roberto and his colleagues (2017) experimentally evaluated the short-term effects of the presentation promoting cybersecurity on parents' perceptions of sensitivity and behavioral intentions. Compared to those in the control group, parents in the experimental group reported that when their child was cyberbullied, they were more likely to talk about the importance of recovering evidence and telling an adult they trust rather than retaliating (Roberto et al., 2017). Kowalski and his colleagues found that positive parenting dimensions are a protective factor for both cyber victimization and cyberbullying crime (Kowalski et al., 2019). Parental control in technology use is also a protective factor in cyberbullying accusations (Zych, Farrington, & Ttofi, 2019). Willard (2007) recommends that intervention strategies, such as installing monitoring software to monitor their children's Internet activities, restricting their children's computer access, and helping victims of cyberbullying make a complaint, should be included in parent education (as cited in Roberto et al., 2017). Research reveals that the number of cyberbullies and cyber victims is increasing in Turkey. Erdur-Baker and Kavşut (2007) found in their study with students aged 14-19 that 30% of the students experienced cyber victimization and 28% of the bullied (Erdur-Baker, & Kavşut, 2007). In the study conducted by Arıcak, Siyahhan, and his colleagues (2008) with 269 students, they found the rate of being exposed to cyberbullying to be 5.9% and the rate of cyberbullying to be 35.7% (Arıcak et al., 2008).

Few studies are evaluating the content of cyberbullying education in Turkey (Kavuk, 2016; Korkmaz, 2018; Nedim-Bal, & Kahraman, 2015; Peker, 2013). Topcu-Uzer and Tanrıkulu (2017) made a similar finding in their study in which they evaluated cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs developed in Turkey (Topcu-Uzer, & Tanrıkulu, 2017). Many researchers examine the impact of cyberbullying prevention programs that they have prepared, not others. In addition, the target audience of these programs is usually students. The program developed by Kavuk (2016) is an exception as it includes all school stakeholders. However, the researcher left the parent part of the cyberbullying training out of the study because this group could not participate in the seminars. In the light of all these, it is necessary to prepare cyberbully prevention and intervention programs adequate our own culture and education system and investigating their effects (Topcu-Uzer, & Tanrıkulu, 2017). In this study, the effect of the cyberbullying training program for parents prepared by the researcher on parents' awareness was examined.

The research sought answers to the following questions:

1. Is there a significant difference in the sensitivity of parents participating in the cyberbullying awareness training program?
    a. Is there a significant difference in parents' cyberbullying sensitivity according to age groups?
    b. Is there a significant difference in parents' cyberbullying sensitivity according to their educational status?
    c. Is there a significant difference in parents' cyberbullying sensitivity according to gender?
2. What are the opinions of the parents about the training program prepared?
    a. What are the opinions of parents about the duration of the program?
    b. What are the opinions of parents about the content of the program?
    c. What are the opinions of parents about the method used in the program?
    d. What are the opinions of parents about the materials used in the program?

Method

Research Pattern

A mixed-method was used in the research. Although the mixed method involves combining quantitative and qualitative data used in a study, it makes an important contribution to making the research problem more understandable (Creswell, 2017). Mixed method research is an integration study that allows balancing the strengths of qualitative and quantitative methods together with their shortcomings (Firat, Yurdakul & Ersoy, 2004).

In the first stage of the research, a single group pretest-posttest model was used from weak experimental models, which are quantitative research methods, in order to determine the awareness levels of parents. In this model, a single group (G) is first pre-test measured (O1), then the experimental operation is applied (X) and the final test (O2) is performed at the end of the experimental operation (Creswell, 2017). In the study, the effect of education prepared for parents (X) on the sensitivity of parents to cyberbullying (dependent variable) was examined.

At the end of the educational program applied to parents, qualitative research methods and techniques were used to determine the effectiveness of the program. Frequency and percentage calculations were used to analyze the closed-ended questions in the questionnaire used in the study. The analysis of the open-ended questions in the questionnaire was carried out using the descriptive analysis technique. In the descriptive analysis, the data are separated logically and meaningfully according to the determined themes, and the data related to each other are related and analyzed depending on the cause-effect relationship (Karagöz, 2017). After the data obtained from the answers to the open-ended questions were grouped under the headings determined by the researcher, the frequency and percentage calculations and the distribution of the data were numerically revealed.

Study group

A total of 80 parents, 72 female and 8 male, whose children are studying in a primary school and two secondary schools in Nilüfer district of Burda (Eşref Ergin Primary School, Süleyman Cura Secondary School, Meral Muammer Ağım Secondary School) and a primary school in Osmangazi district (Şehit Üsteğmen Mesut Beyazıtlı Primary School) in the 2017-2018 academic year, participated in the research.

Designing Cyberbullying Awareness Training

The stages of designing the cyberbullying training program developed for parents are as follows:

1. Needs Analysis: In this part of the study, the “literature review technique” used within the scope of the data/source review technique, one of the data collection techniques used in needs analysis, was used. A literature review is the study of recent studies and determining what the need is (Şeker, 2014). It has been determined that there is a need for parent training programs that will enable us to raise awareness about cyberbullying, developed through literature review and according to the findings

of the research (Kavuk,2016; Korkmaz,2018; Nedim-Bal &Kahraman, 2015; Robinson,2012; Tanrıkulu,2013; StopBullying,n.d) examining the effect of bullying and cyberbullying prevention and intervention training programs.

2. Purpose and Objectives of the Educational Program: The purpose, objectives and content of an educational/training program can be revealed as a result of a needs analysis. In this study, the purpose, objectives and content of the program were determined as a result of the needs analysis conducted with the literature review.

The main purpose of the educational program is to raise awareness among parents about what needs to be done to prevent and intervene in cyberbullying, which is one of the dangers posed by the Virtual World and is classified as an information crime. In this direction, the objectives of the program were determined as follows. The participant:

- Becomes aware of the dangers that can be encountered in the virtual world.
- Understands that cyberbullying is a cybercrime related to the concept of bullying.
- Gains knowledge about the reasons for the emergence of cyberbullying, its forms, and cyberbullying tools.
- Becomes aware of what cyberbullies and victims are going through.
- Understands the duties and responsibilities of parents in preventing and responding to cyberbullying.

3. Determining the Content of the Education: The content of the education was determined by taking into account the determined goals and objectives, and it was finalized after being submitted to the opinion of an expert from the Curriculum Development field, who is also working in the CITE department. An inquiry-centered programming approach has been adopted in the regulation of educational content. In the inquiry-centered programming approach, the content is determined and organized according to the needs of the students (Demirel, 2015).

4. Development of Educational Methods and Techniques: The target audience of the developed program is adults. Therefore, when determining the methods and techniques to be used in the program, the characteristics of adult learners and andrological approaches were taken into account. The education given to adults should be in a way that answers the questions in the minds of individuals, contributes positively to their lives and directs them to practice more than theory (Gökkaya, 2014). In the training program developed taking into account the characteristics of adult learners, Keller's ARCS Motivational Design Theory was also taken into account. Keller's (2009) ARCS Motivation Theory consists of the components of Attention, Relevance, Confidence, and Satisfaction. The use of these components in the program is as follows.

- Attention: To attract the attention of the participants to the training, a question-and-answer method was used. At the beginning of the training, the participants were asked questions about understanding what the Virtual World is like and tried to draw attention to the topic.
- Relevance: Cyberbullying events and results were presented to the participants using case studies videos and news from news sites. The scenarios created by the researcher, inspired by daily life, were conveyed using the discussion method to ensure that the participants were included in the problem situations. Thus, the motivation and interest of the participants were tried to be kept at the desired level.
- Confidence: Based on his own experiences, the researcher made examples and suggestions about what families can do. Thus, it was tried to ensure that the participants saw that what was told was applied by the researcher himself, and to trust the researcher and the education. Information activities have been embodied in the example sites given to families in the section on combating cyberbullying.
- Satisfaction: Open-ended questions were included in the Cyberbullying Awareness Training Assessment Questionnaire so that participants could easily express their learning experiences related to the educational program.

5. Material selection/development: A presentation has been prepared in a PowerPoint program within the scope of the training program. The presentation prepared for use in education was submitted

to the opinion of three faculty members from the Department of Media and Communication of Bandırma University and an expert from the department of CITE, and was revised and re-edited with the provided feedback. The principles of target audience and visual design were taken into account in the preparation of the presentation. During the training, one social experiment video ("How Safe Are Your Children on the Internet?"), case studies (eg."Şeniz, a Turkish Girl is a Victim of Virtual Bullying!") and scenarios adapted from everyday life were also used.

6. The choice of evaluation method and tools: Varış (1978) emphasizes program evaluation as the evaluation of the effectiveness of the program to make it more efficient. The evaluation of the developed training program was made by adopting the Stake's Need-Based Evaluation Model. In the program evaluation model developed by Stake, program evaluators consider the program activities and whether the program meets the needs rather than the aims of the program (Saylor, Alexander ve Lewis, 1981).

To determine the effect of the training developed using this evaluation model, the "Cyber Bullying Sensitivity Scale" was applied as a pretest before the training and as a posttest after the training. Thus, the effect of the training on the cyberbullying sensitivity levels of the participants was measured. Again, immediately after the training, the "Cyber Bullying Awareness Training Evaluation Questionnaire" was used to determine the effect of the training on the participants in line with the participant opinions.

7. Planning the transfer of learners to the study: The participants were asked to take note of the sample videos and information sites given during the training to transfer what has been learned. It is thought that watching the exemplary sites and videos together with children will benefit both the transfer of the acquired information to the children and the reinforcement of the information for the parents.

Pre-trial Trial and Implementation of Cyberbullying Awareness Training

The first pre-trial of the training was conducted in a secondary school (Süleyman Çelebi İmam Haitp Secondary School) for three weeks with a total of 20 parents. The second trial of the training was carried out with a group of 10 people who attended the mobile computer course for women (Ataevler Region) by Bursa Municipality. Meanwhile, a subject expert took part as an observer. In line with the needs determined at the end of both trials, the duration of the training was determined as 1,5 hours in total.

When the actual implementation stage of education was started, some schools preferred to send a short information letter to parents stating the importance of education, that it is free, where and when the education will be given, to increase the number of participants in the education. Some schools have made the necessary announcements to parents with the message system (WhatsApp) that teachers use to communicate with their classrooms. Training were held in the school conference rooms at the hours determined by the school administrations. The training was conducted in one session based on the presentation prepared by the researcher.

Data Collection Tool

To determine the change in parents' sensitivity to cyberbullying, the " Cyber Bullying Sensitivity Scale " (CSS) developed by Tanrıkulu, Kınay, and Arıcak (2011) was used as a pretest-posttest before and after the training.

In the study, the "Cyberbullying Awareness Training Assessment Questionnaire" prepared by the researcher was applied to the participants after the training to determine the opinions of the parents about the education they attended. A total of fifteen questions are included in the questionnaire, twelve of which are closed-ended and three are open-ended. Questions containing demographic information (gender, age, education level) of the participants are included at the end of the questionnaire.

Validity and Reliability

The validity and reliability study of the CSS was conducted by Tanrıkulu, Kınay and Arıcak (2011). As a result of the exploratory factor analysis, the researchers determined that the scale has a factor and there is a structure explaining %27.70 of the total variance under this factor. Factor loadings

under a single factor ranged from.31 to .73. Confirmatory factor analysis was performed to test the accuracy of the resulting structure and it was found that the fit values were sufficient for the fit of the model (Chi-square χ^2/sd= 3.220, RMSEA= .082). Reliability studies of the scale were calculated with internal consistency (Cronbach Alpha), test-half and test-retest methods. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated for the entire scale. 79, test-retest reliability coefficient of the scale is .63. In addition, it was found that the item-total correlations of the scale were ranked between .42 and .63 the integrated group, and all differences between the averages of the lower and upper groups of 27% were significant. This shows that the items in the scale have high validity and have a distinctive quality in terms of measuring the sensitivity to cyberbullying. According to these results, it was concluded that the scale is a valid and reliable measurement tool (Tanrikulu et al.,2013).

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the sensitivity scale for cyberbullying, calculated from the data of the participants in this study, is .651. Since this value is between $0.60 \leq \alpha \leq 0.80$, it is concluded that the scale is decisively safe for this research (Karagöz,2017). In the scale consisting of thirteen items, triple rating (Yes, Sometimes, No) was used. Scoring of the scale is yes=three (3) sometimes=two (2) no=one (1).

To ensure the content validity of the prepared questionnaire, the opinions of two field experts from the CITE department were taken. In addition, the language suitability and comprehensibility of the questionnaire items to be administered to adults were examined by two experts from the field of Media and Communication. At the end of the review, some questions and options were changed.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed with the help of SPSS program and Excel program. The normality of the data was tested using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in order to determine the statistical method to be used in the study of the effect of education prepared within the scope of the research on parents. As a result of the normality test, it was determined that the data did not show a normal distribution. Analyzes to determine the effect of education on parents' sensitivity levels were made using the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test, one of the non-parametric tests, and the effect size was calculated to calculate the size of the difference between the two means. While calculating the effect size (r) used for the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test, the formula $r = Z \sqrt{n}$ is used.

r = Effect size

Z=Test value

n= Sample size (Connolly, 2007,s.218).

According to Field (2009), it is evaluated regardless of the effect size sign (r) and takes a value between 0 (no effect) and 1 (perfect effect). Cohen (2013) interpreted the effect size values as follows:

r = 0.10 Small Effect

r = 0.30 Medium Effect

r = 0.50 Big Effect

Kruskal-Wallis H test was used to determine whether there were differences in the sensitivity levels of the parents according to age and education status from the demographic variables. In the same way, Mann-Whitney U Test was used for non-parametric tests in gender-related analyses. In the study, the statistical analysis of the findings was based on the significance level of 0.05.

Frequency and percentage calculations were used to analyze the closed-ended questions in the questionnaire used in the study. The analysis of the open-ended questions in the questionnaire was carried out using the descriptive analysis technique. In the descriptive analysis, the data are separated logically and meaningfully according to the determined themes, and the data related to each other are related and analyzed depending on the cause-effect relationship (Karagöz, 2017). After the data obtained from the answers to the open-ended questions were grouped under the headings determined by the researcher, the frequency and percentage calculations and the distribution of the data were numerically revealed.

Findings

Findings on the Effect of Cyberbullying Awareness Training on Parents' Sensitivity to Cyberbullying

The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test used to examine the normality of the data obtained from the CSS are given in Table 1.

Table 1. The Results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Normality Test of the Pretest-Posttest and Difference Scores of the CSS

	Statistics	p
Pre-test	.213	.00
Post-test	.392	.00
Difference	.222	.00

As seen in Table 1, pretest and posttest significance values were found to be p=0.00 in normality tests. According to the K-S test result, it can be said that the data do not show a normal distribution, since the significance value found is less than 0.05.

The results of the analyzes made using the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test to reveal the change in the sensitivity of the parents towards cyberbullying at the end of the training is shown in the table below.

Table 2. Results of CSS Pretest-Posttest Scores Difference According to Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Pretest-Posttest Measurement	N	Rank Average	Rank Sum	Z	p
Negative Rows	0[a]	0	0	-6.29	.00
Positive Ranks	52[b]	26,50	1378.00		
No Difference	28[c]				
Effect Size				-0.704	

a= posttest < pretest, b= posttest > pretest, c= posttest = pretest

As seen in Table 2, there is a statistically significant difference between the sensitivity levels of the parents participating in the program (z=-6.29, p<0.05). The post-test scores of 52 of the parents were higher than the pretest scores. The average rank of those whose posttest score was higher than the pretest score was calculated as 26.50, and the total rank was calculated as 1378.00. There was no change in the pretest-posttest scores of 28 of the parents. The fact that the difference scores are in favor of positive rankings means that the participants' post-training scores are higher than their pre-training scores. This shows that the participants' sensitivity to cyberbullying increased after the training. The fact that the effect size calculated as a result of the test is r =-0.704 (r>0.5), shows that the difference between the pretest and the posttest has a large effect. Based on these findings, it can be said that the education they receive has a great effect on the cyberbullying sensitivity levels of the parents.

Findings on the Effect of Education on Parents' Cyberbullying Sensitivity Levels by Age Groups

According to the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test (see Table 3), which was conducted to reveal whether there is a significant difference between the cyberbullying sensitivity levels of parents in different age groups, there is no statistically significant difference in the cyberbullying sensitivity levels of the parents participating in the program according to age groups (x^2= 3.836, p>0.05).

Table 3. Kruskal Wallis H Test Results Regarding the Differences in CSS Pretest-Posttest Difference Scores According to Age Variable

Age	N	Rank Average	sd	x^2	P
21-30	17	46.66	2	3.83	.147
31-40	40	42.33			
41-50	23	33.55			
Total	80				

Accordingly, it can be said that the education given does not cause a significant difference in the cyberbullying sensitivity levels of the parents according to the age variable.

Findings on the Effect of Education on Parents' Cyberbullying Sensitivity Levels by Educational Status

According to the results of the Kruskal Wallis H test (see Table 4), which was conducted to reveal whether there is a significant difference between the cyberbullying susceptibility levels of parents from different educational backgrounds, there is no statistically significant difference in the cyberbullying sensitivity levels of the parents who attended the education (x^2== 4.73, $p>0.05$).

Table 4. Kruskal Wallis H Test Results Regarding the Differences in CSS Pretest-Posttest Difference Scores According to Education Status Variable

Education Status	N	Rank Average	sd	x^2	P
Primary school	35	45.06	4	4.73	.316
Middle School	7	42.93			
High school	19	32.68			
University	17	40.71			
Graduate	2	24.75			
Total	80				

Accordingly, it can be said that the education given does not cause a significant difference in the cyberbullying sensitivity levels of the parents according to the educational status variable.

Findings on the Effect of Education on Parents' Cyberbullying Sensitivity Levels by Gender

According to the results of the Mann-Whitney U test (see Table 5), which was conducted to reveal whether there is a difference between the cyberbullying susceptibility levels of the parents according to gender, there is no statistically significant difference in the cyberbullying susceptibility levels of the parents who participated in the training ($U=201.5$, $z=-1.449$, $p>0.05$).

Table 5. Mann-Whitney U Test Results Regarding the Differences in CSS Pretest-Posttest Difference Scores According to Gender Variable

Gender	N	Rank Average	Rank Sum	U	P
Female	72	41.72	3004.00	201.5	.147
Male	8	29.50	236.00		

Accordingly, it can be said that the education given does not cause a significant difference in the cyberbullying sensitivity levels of the parents according to the gender variable.

Findings of Parents' Opinions on the Education Program

The program evaluation questionnaire, in which the opinions of the parents are taken, consists of five main parts including the duration, content, method, material, and general evaluation of the program. Table 6 shows the frequency and percentage values of the parents' opinions on the duration of the program.

Table 6. Frequency and Percentage Values of Opinions on the Duration of the Program

Duration of the Program	f	%
The duration of the program was enough.	69	86. 25
The duration of the program was long.	1	1.25
The duration of the program was short.	10	12. 50

As seen in Table 6, while many of the participants (n= 69, 86.25%) found the duration of the training program enough, small of number participants (n= 10, 12.5%) stated that the duration of the program could be longer. Just one participant found the duration of the program long In the light of these findings, it can be said that the training duration, which is planned as 1, 5 hours and in a single session, is suitable for the participants.

Table 7 shows the frequency and percentage values of parents' opinions on the content of the program.

Table 7. Frequency and Percentage Values of Opinions on the Content of the Program

Content	f	%
The content caught my attention.	76	95
Partly intrigued me.	4	5
I found some things in the content unnecessary.	0	0
What is explained in the content can be used in daily life.	72	90
I can use some of what is explained in the content in daily life.	5	6.25
What is explained in the content cannot be used in daily life.	3	3.75
The program was useful.	78	97. 50
The program was partially useful.	1	1.25
The program was not useful.	1	1.25

As seen in Table 7, many of the participants (n=76, 95%) stated that what was explained in the training program attracted their attention. None of the participants ticked the option "I found what was told unnecessary" in the questionnaire. Many of the participants (n=72, 90%) stated that the information contained in the training content can be used in daily life. Likewise, many of the participants (n=78, 97.50%) said that they found what was explained in the training program useful. Adults from such training programs expect that the content of the program is oriented to their needs. According to this finding, it can be said that the content of the training program is determined by taking into account the characteristics of the target audience of the program.

Table 8 shows the frequency and percentage values of the parents' opinions on the method of the program.

Table 8. Frequency and Percentage Values of Opinions

On the Method of the Program	f	%
Examples		
Examples are chosen from daily life.	77	96.25
Some of the examples were chosen from daily life.	3	3.75
Examples are not chosen from daily life.	0	0
Examples are explanatory.	80	100
Examples were not relevant to what was described.	0	0
Questions and Discussion		
Sufficient time was allocated for questions and discussions.	75	93.75
Not enough time was allocated for questions and discussions.	5	6.25
The questions helped me to understand what was explain.	79	98.75
The questions led to the dispersion of the subjects.	1	1.25

As seen in Table 8, many of the participants (n=77, 96. 25%) stated that they could encounter all the examples used in the training program in their daily life. The few of participants who stated that they might encounter some of the examples is low (n=3, 3.75%). In addition, all of the participants

(n=80, 100%) think that the examples used during the training are clear and concise to support the explanations. Many of the participants (n= 75, 93.75%) think that enough time is allocated for questions and discussions during the training. A small number of participants (n=5, 6.25%) think that more time should be devoted to questions and discussions. Many of the participants (n=79, 98.75%) stated that being asked questions during the training contributed significantly to the understanding of the subjects. Only one participant thought that the questions asked during the training led to the dispersion of the subjects. Based on these findings, it can be said that the selected examples and the methods used in the training largely fit the program participants/target audience.

Table 9 shows the frequency and percentage values of the parents' opinions on the materials used in the program.

Table 9. Frequency and Percentage Values of Opinions

On the Materials Used in the Program	f	%
All pictures were understandable.	79	98.75
I couldn't understand some pictures.	1	1.25
I followed the presentation with ease.	79	98.75
I had a hard time following the presentation.	1	1.25

As seen in Table 9, many of the participants (n=79, 98.75%) found the pictures used during the presentation understandable. Again, many of the participants (n=79, 98.75%) stated that they could follow the presentation used in the training from beginning to end. Based on these findings, it can be said that the participants can easily follow the presentation because they can understand the visuals in the presentation and what is explained in the presentation.

Findings on Open-Ended Questions

In the two open-ended questions in the questionnaire, the parents were asked to indicate the two subjects that they were most affected by during the education and the two subjects that they felt lacking. Parents were also asked for their opinions and suggestions they would like to add. Only 50 of the 80 participants who participated in the training stated that they were affected by the training content. Table 10 shows the opinions of the parents. Parents stated that they were most impressed by the social experiment video, which includes the misbehaviors that children can display on the Internet. Considering the content of the video, it can be said that parents are most affected by the issues related to the safety of their children in the training program. Secondly, parents have listed the dangers children may face online. Some parents (n= 3, 6%) also stated the dangers of online games among the subjects they were affected. Topics such as cyberbullying and its consequences (n= 17, 34%), cyber victimization (n=3, 6%) are among the topics listed by parents.

Another topic that affects parents in the training program is the recommendations made to families (n= 15, 30%). Some of the participants stated that they were influenced by the examples given by the trainer from his own life (n= 3, 6%) and the case studies he used (n= 4, 8%). According to this result, it can be said that the methods used during the training are suitable for the target audience.

Table 10. Frequency and Percentage Values Showing the Distribution of the Subject That Parents are Most Affected

Subjects	**f**	**%**
Social experiment video that includes misbehaviors that children on the internet.	22	44
The dangers that children may encounter on the Internet	17	34
Cyberbullying and its consequences	17	34
Recommendations for families	15	30
Importance of safe Internet use	3	6
Examples	3	6
Cases	4	8
Dangers in games	3	6
Cyber victimization	3	6

According to Kurt (2000), although many techniques are used in adult education, the most used techniques are narration, discussion, demonstration, role-playing, case, observation, and brainstorming. The social experiment video used within the scope of the case (How safe your children are the Internet?) is one of the most affected topics of the participants. One participant said that the cases and scenarios used during the training were beneficial for parents as follows:

"The use of scenarios and videos is helpful as it helps parents think."

Participants stated 'cyberbullying and its consequences as the second among the subjects that they were affected by in training program. 26 of the participants wrote their opinions in the comments and suggestions section of the questionnaire. Table 11 shows the frequency and percentage values of these opinions and suggestions.

Table 11. Frequency and Percentage Values of the Opinions and Suggestions the Training Program

Opinions and Suggestions	f	%
Children should also be told.	8	30.7
The subjects were important, I was impressed by all of them, I found them useful.	6	23.07
Training should continue.	6	23.07
The subjects were clear enough, it was understandable.	5	19.23
Teachers should be trained too.	1	3.84

When the participants' opinions on education were examined, 8 participants (30.7%) suggested that education should be given to children and 1 participant (3.84%) to teachers. Six of the participants (23.07%) stated that the training should continue. Again, 6 of the participants (23.07%) stated that all the subjects covered in the training were important, they were impressed by the subjects covered in the training and they found them useful. The other 5 participants (19.23%) stated that the subjects covered in the training were explained clearly and understandably. Some of the participant opinions are as follows:

P73: "There were so many things I did not know that I learned a lot in these seminars, thank you."

P4: "The topics covered in the training were very useful as they were compatible with daily life.
The examples were used correctly. I want the training to be continuous."

P34: "I thank you, and I hope that the trainings will continue to raise awareness of other families."

P52: "*More people can be trained, and children can be taught with a presentation."*

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

In this study, firstly, one group pretest-posttest model, one of the weak experimental models, was used to determine the effect of the program developed for parents. Research findings on the effect of cyberbullying awareness training on parents' cyberbullying sensitivity levels show that cyberbullying awareness training is effective on parents participating in the research. At the end of the training, there was no difference in the cyberbullying sensitivity levels of the parents according to age, education level, and gender. These findings can be evaluated as the training program prepared for parents can be applied to parents with different characteristics such as men or women of different age groups and different education levels.

Secondly, parents' opinions about the training program were taken in the study. According to the research findings, the vast majority of parents stated that the educational program is very beneficial for them and that they are happy to participate in the training. Parents have expressed an opinion to repeat such training programs. In addition, some parents said that cyberbullying training should be given to their children and their teachers. According to these findings, it can be said that the training program they attended contributed to the awareness of parents about cyberbullying.

On the other hand, the majority of parents found the training period sufficient. Some of the parents stated that the training period should be even longer. It can be said that the parents' opinion that the duration of education should be longer coincides with their opinion that education should be repeated. These findings can also be expressed as supporting each other of the positive thoughts of parents regarding the educational program. These findings can also be interpreted as parents wanting to learn more about cyberbullying. In the literature, studies are examining the effect of the duration of such training programs. However, the target audience of these education programs is students. In the study of Roberto and his colleagues, the duration of the cyberbullying training given to parents is between 45-55 minutes (Roberto et al., 2017). However, the effect of the training period was not examined in this research. The training time in our study is 90 minutes.

Almost all of the parents found the content of the training interesting and said that the content described could be useful in their daily life. The many of parents stated that the teaching materials and teaching methods used during the training contributed positively to the understanding of the content.

Parents stated that the cyberbullying incident in the sample video they watched during the training was the first among the subjects they were most affected in the training. The subjects that parents say are affected in the second place are the case studies on cyberbullying in education. The fact that parents stated what they were told about cyberbullying incidents and their consequences during education among the subjects they were most affected by can be interpreted as that the training is suitable for them in terms of content. In addition, it can be said that parents receive the messages intended to be given in education. It can be said that presenting real-life sections to parents during education contributes to their perception of cyberbullying more easily. In the Family Support Education Guide (OBADER) Integrated with the Pre-School Education Program of the Ministry of National Education General Directorate of Basic Education, it is stated that techniques such as cases, demonstration, role-playing, question- answer should be used in family education. Roberto and his colleagues (2017) used videos containing case studies and news about cyberbullying from newspapers in the pieces of training they gave to both parents and students for the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying (Roberto et al., 2017).

Evidence-based empirical research is needed to determine the strengths and deficiencies of the programs to be implemented for the prevention and intervention of cyberbullying and to determine the strategies that will contribute to the effectiveness of such programs (Tanrikulu, 2017). Although there has been an increase in studies in the literature in recent years, the need for research continues. There is a greater need for research on this subject in Turkey. Current research is limited and its target audience is limited to students. Despite the increasing number of cyberbullies and cyber victims in Turkey (Erdur-Baker &Kavşut, 2007; Siyahhan et al., 2008), considering the limit of research (Topcu-Uzer &Tanrıkulu, 2017), cyberbullying prevention and intervention training programs and research examining their effectiveness are needed more. There are findings that it is more effective to conduct anti-bullying programs in the form of studies involving all stakeholders of the school (teachers, parents, etc.) rather than individual student interventions (Aboujaoude, Savage, Starcevic & Salame, 2015; Cantone et al., 2005; Hutson, Kelly & Militello, 2018). Cantone and his colleagues' (2005) systematic review of the effectiveness of school interventions on bullying and cyberbullying highlights the importance of involving parents in cyberbullying education (Cantone et al., 2005). Less than half (n = 7) of the programs Hutson and his colleagues reviewed also provided training to parents of children participating in the program. These programs are among the successful programs in reducing cyberbullying and victimization (Hutson, Kelly & Militello, 2018).

This research is limited to the parents of children in four schools in different districts of Bursa. The effectiveness of this program developed within the scope of the research can be examined in the future with an experimental study with a larger research sample. In addition, the effectiveness of the program can be examined by including students in the sample. School counselors can collaborate with field experts to organize cyberbullying awareness training that includes real-life sections that match students' age levels. Considering the importance of families' participation in the prevention of cyberbullying, the educational content developed in this research can be used in public education courses organized by municipalities. Thus, the probability of benefiting more parents from such training programs can be increased.

References

Aboujaoude, E., Savage, M. W., Starcevic, V., & Salame, W. O. (2015). Cyberbullying: Review of an old problem gone viral. *Journal of adolescent health*, *57*(1), 10-18.

Aizenkot, D., & Kashy-Rosenbaum, G. (2020). The effectiveness of safe surfing, an anti cyberbullying intervention program in reducing online and offline bullying and improving perceived popularity and self-esteem. Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace, 14(3), Article 6. https://doi.org/10.5817/CP2020-3-6.

Arıcak, T., Siyahhan, S., Uzunhasanoglu, A., Saribeyoglu, S., Ciplak, S., Yilmaz, N., & Memmedov, C. (2008). Cyberbullying among Turkish adolescents. *Cyberpsychology &behavior*, *11*(3), 253- 261.

Ay, F., & Şahan, G. (2015). Aile eğitimi kurslarının yetişkin eğitimi bağlamında etkililiğinin değerlendirilmesi. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *11*(1), 66-86.

Belsey, B. (2008). *Cyberbullying.* 20.07.2019 tarihinde http://www.cyber- bullying.org' dan alınmıştır.

Bradshaw, C. P. (2015). Translating research to practice in bullying prevention. *American Psychologist*, *70*(4),322.

Campbell, M. A. (2005). Cyber bullying: An old problem in a new guise?.*Journal of Psychologists and Counsellors in Schools*, *15*(1), 68-76.

Cantone, E., Piras, A. P., Vellante, M., Preti, A., Daníelsdóttir, S., D'Aloja, E., ... & Bhugra, D. (2015). Interventions on bullying and cyberbullying in schools: A systematic review. *Clinical practice and epidemiology in mental health: CP & EMH*, *11*(Suppl 1 M4), 58.

Cohen, J. (2013). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Routledge.

Connolly, P. (2007). *Quantitative data analysis in education: A critical introduction using SPSS*. Routledge.

Cresswell, J.W. (2017). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches [Araştırma Deseni Nitel, Nicel ve Karma Yöntem Yaklaşımları]*. (Çev. Ed.Demir, S.B.). Ankara: Eğiten Kitap.

Erdur-Baker, Ö., & Kavşut, F. (2007). Akran Zorbalığının Yeni Yüzü: Siber Zorbalık. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research (EJER*), (27),31-42.

Firat, M., Yurdakul, I. K., & Ersoy, A. (2014). Bir eğitim teknolojisi araştırmasına dayalı olarak karma yöntem araştırması deneyimi. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, *2*(1), 64-85.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS:(and sex and drugs and rock'n'roll)(2th Edition)*. Sage.

Gaffney, H., Farrington, D., Espelage, D., & Ttofi, M. (2019). Are cyberbullying intervention and prevention programs effective? A systematic and meta-analytical review. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 45,34-153. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.07.002.

Garaigordobil, M., & Mart´ınez-Valderrey, V. (2015). Effects of Cyberprogram 2.0 on 'face-to-face'bullying, cyberbullying, and empathy. Psicothema, 27(1), 45–51.

Gökkaya, Z. (2014). Yetişkin Eğitiminde Yeni Bir Yaklaşım: Oyunlaştırma. *HAYEF: Journal Education*, *11*(1), 1-84.

Heyeres, M., Carter, M. A., Lui, S. M., Low-Lim, Ä., Teo, S., & Tsey, K. (2020). Cyberbullying prevention and treatment interventions targeting young people: an umbrella review. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 1-27.

Hutson, E., Kelly, S., & Militello, L. K. (2018). Systematic review of cyberbullying interventions for youth and parents with implications for evidence-based practice. Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing, 15(1),72–79.

Jiménez-Barbero, J. A., Ruiz-Hernández, J. A., Llor-Zaragoza, L., Pérez-García, M., & Llor-Esteban,B.(2016).Effectiveness of anti-bullying school programs: A meta-analysis. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *61*,165-175.

Karagöz, Y. (2017). Spss ve Amos Uygulamalı Nitel-Nicel-Karma Bilimsel AraştırmaYöntemleri *ve Yayın Etiği*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

Kavuk, M. (2016). *Ortaokul ve liselerin siber zorbalık farkındalık profillerinin oluşturulması ve okul paydaşlarına yönelik siber zorbalık farkındalık eğitimi etkililiğinin değerlendirilmesi* (Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi).Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Keller, J. M. (2009). *Motivational design for learning and performance: The ARCS model approach.*Springer Science & Business Media.

Kocaşahan, N. (2012). *Lise ve üniversite öğrencilerinde akran zorbalığı ve sanal zorbalık* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Balıkesir.

Korkmaz, K. (2018). *Bilişsel Davranışçı Temelli Siber Zorbalık Önleme Programının Etkisi* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Gaziantep Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Gaziantep.

Kowalski, R. M., Limber, S. P., & McCord, A. (2019). A developmental approach to cyberbullying:Prevalenceand protective factors., Aggression and Violent Behavior, 45, 20–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.02.009.

Mason, K.L. (2008). Cyberbullying: A preliminary assessment for school personnel. Psychol.Sch., 45, 323–348.National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2016. Preventing Bullying Through Science, Policy, and Practice. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi:10.17226/23482. https://www.nap.edu/read/23482/chapter/7#229 31.12. 2020 tarihinde indirildi.

Nedim-Bal, P.& Kahraman, S., (2015). The effect of cyber bullying sensibility improvement group training program on gifted students. *Journal of Gifted Education Research, 3*(2),48-57.

Olweus, D. (1994). *Bullying at school (long-term outcomes for the victims and an effective school-based intervention program)*. Huesmann L. R. (Ed), Aggressive Behavior Current Perspectives. Boston: Springer.

Ortega-Barón, J., Buelga, S., Ayllón, E., Martínez-Ferrer, B., & Cava, M. J. (2019). Effects of intervention program Prev@ cib on traditional bullying and cyberbullying. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *16*(4), 527.

Otaran, N. (Ed.). (2008). *Yetişkin Eğitimi Kılavuzu.* Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Kadının Statüsü Genel Müdürlüğü.

Peker, A. (2013). *İnsani değerler yönelimli psiko-eğitim programının problemli internet kullanımı ve siber zorbalık üzerindeki etkisi* (Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sakarya, Türkiye.

Roberto, A. J., Eden, J., Deiss, D. M., Savage, M. W., & Ramos-Salazar, L. (2017). The short-term effects of a cyberbullying prevention intervention for parents of middle school students. International journal of environmental research and public health,14(9), 1038.

Robinson, E. (2012). *Parental involvement in preventing and responding to cyberbullying.* Australian Institute of Family Studies, 4, Child Family Community Australia (CFCA).

Saylor, J.G., Alexander, W.M., & Lewis, A.J. (1981). Curriculum planning for better teaching and learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Serin, H. (2012). *Ergenlerde siber zorbalık/siber mağduriyet yaşantıları ve bu davranışlara ilişkin öğretmen ve eğitim yöneticilerinin görüşleri* (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi).İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Schultze-Krumbholz, A., Jäkel, A., Schultze, M., & Scheithauer, H. (2012). Emotional and behavioural problems in the context of cyberbullying: A longitudinal study among German adolescents. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, *17*(3-4), 329-345.

Shariff, S. (2008). *Cyber-Bullying, İssues And Solutions For The School, The Classroom and The Home*. Routledge.

StopBullying (n.d.). *StopBullying*. 01.06.2019 tarihinde https://www.stopbullying.gov/about-us/index.html' dan erişildi.

Şeker, H.(Ed.).(2014). Eğitimde Program Geliştirme: Kavramlar Yaklaşımlar. Ankara:Anı Yayıncılık.

Tanrıkulu, T. (2013). *Siber zorbalıkla ilgili değişkenlerin incelenmesi ve gerçeklik terapisi yönelimli bir müdahale programının siber zorbaca davranışlar üzerindeki etkisi* (Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi).Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sakarya.

Tanrıkulu, T., Kınay, H., & Arıcak, O. T. (2013). Siber zorbalığa ilişkin duyarlılık ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 3*(1), 38-47.

Tanrikulu, I. (2017). Cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs in schools: A systematic review. School Psychology International, 39(1), 74–91. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034317745721.gaff.

Ttofi, M., & Farrington, D. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A systematic and meta-analytic review. Journal of Experimental Criminology, 7(1),27–56.

Topcu-Uzer, Ç., & Tanrıkulu, İ. (2017). Siber zorbalığı önleme ve müdahale programları: ulusal bir alanyazın taraması. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *30*(1), 1-17.

Varış, F. (1978). *Eğitimde Program Geliştirme Teori ve Teknikler*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.

Zych, I., Ortega-Ruiz, R., & Del Rey, R. (2015). Systematic review of theoretical studies on bullying and cyberbullying: Facts, knowledge, prevention, and intervention. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 23, 1–21.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.10.001.

Zych, I., Farrington, D., & Ttofi, M. M. (2019). Bullying and cyberbullying: Protective factors and effective interventions. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 45, 4–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.06.008.

Wang J, Iannotti R.J, Nansel T.R. (2009). School bullying among adolescents in the United States: physical, verbal, relational, and cyber, *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *45*(4),368-5.

Willard, N. E. (2007). *Cyberbullying and cyberthreats: Responding to the challenge of online social aggression, threats, and distress.* Research press.

Williford, A., Elledge, L. C., Boulton, A. J., DePaolis, K. J., Little, T. D., & Salmivalli, C. (2013). Effects of the KiVa Antibullying Program on Cyberbullying and Cybervictimization Frequency Among Finnish Youth. Journal of Clinical Child &Adolescent Psychology, 42(6), 820–833.https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2013.787623.

Wölfer, R., Schultze-Krumbholz, A., Zagorscak, P., Jäkel, A., Göbel, K., & Scheithauer, H. (2014).Prevention 2.0: Targeting cyberbullying@ school. Prevention Science, 15(6), 879-887.

http://anaokulu.cu.edu.tr/__/file/OBADER_2013.pdf 04.01.2021 tarihinde indirildi.