



T. C.
YEDITEPE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
MASTER'S PROGRAM IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES AND SOCIAL
MEDIA EDUCATION

EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HIGH SCHOOL
STUDENTS' STRATEGIES TO COPE WITH CYBERBULLYING AND THE
LEVELS OF NOMOPHOBIA

ÖZGÜL ŞEKER

İSTANBUL, 2022

EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HIGH SCHOOL
STUDENTS' STRATEGIES TO COPE WITH CYBERBULLYING AND THE
LEVELS OF NOMOPHOBIA

BY

ÖZGÜL ŞEKER



DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER
IN
MASTER'S PROGRAM IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES AND SOCIAL
MEDIA EDUCATION

YEDITEPE UNIVERSITY

İSTANBUL, 2022

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all materials and results that are not original to this work.



Name, Last name : Özgül ŞEKER

Signature :

ABSTRACT

This research was conducted with a view to determine the cyberbullying situation among high school students and also to determine the strategies of students to cope with cyberbullying. Within the scope of the research 311 high school students in Adana participated in the study on voluntary basis through an online questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of a student recognition form, a 23-question scale to determine the effects of cyberbullying on students and a 23-question survey to determine students' strategies for coping with cyberbullying. According to the results of the research, it has been determined that cyberbullying has many negative effects on students. Additionally, it was found that students who were exposed to cyberbullying mostly tried to avoid it by some coping strategies such as asking the bully to end their behaviour, blocking the messages from the bully, not answering the calls from unknown and private numbers, and changing the passwords of the internet accounts they use. On the other hand it was determined that stucyberbullying coping strategies such as telling the incident to the psychologist, resorting to legal procedures and reporting the situation to the teacher or the school principal were less used by students. Moreover, when the relationship between students' nomophobia levels and exposure to cyberbullying is examined, it was seen that there is a statistically significant, weak and positive relationship. When the relationship between students' nomophobia levels and their strategies to cope with cyberbullying is examined; it has been determined that there is a statistically significant, weak and negative relationship. When the relationship between students' strategies to cope with cyberbullying and their exposure to cyberbullying was examined, it was determined that there was a statistically significant, moderate and negative relationship.

Keywords: bully, bullying, cyberbullying

ÖZET

Bu araştırma lise öğrencilerinde siber zorbalık durumunu tespit etmek ve öğrencilerin siber zorbalıkla baş etme stratejilerini belirlemek amacıyla hazırlanmıştır. Araştırma kapsamında Adana ilinde 311 lise öğrencisi çevrimiçi anket yoluyla gönüllülük esasına göre çalışmaya katılmıştır. Anket, öğrenci tanıma formu, siber zorbalığın öğrenciler üzerindeki etkilerini belirlemeye yönelik 23 soruluk bir ölçek ve öğrencilerin siber zorbalıkla baş etme stratejilerini belirlemeye yönelik 23 soruluk bir anketten oluşmaktadır.

Araştırmada elde edilen sonuçlara göre siber zorbalığın öğrenciler üzerinde birçok negatif etki yarattığı tespit edilmiştir. Siber zorbalığa maruz kalan öğrencilerin siber zorbalıkla başa çıkma stratejilerine yönelik elde edilen sonuçlara göre öğrencilerin daha çok zorbalığı yapan kişiden davranışını sonlandırmasını istemek, zorbalığı yapan kişiden gelen mesajları bloke etmek, bilinmeyen ve özel numaralardan gelen aramaları cevaplamamak, kullandığı internet hesaplarının şifrelerini değiştirmek gibi teknik yönü ağır basan başa çıkma stratejileri kullanarak engellemeye çalıştığı tespit edilmiştir. Buna karşın yaşadıkları olayı psikoloğa anlatmak, adli yollara başvurmak ve öğretmene ya da okul müdürüne durumu bildirme gibi stratejilerini daha az kullandıkları belirlenmiştir.

Öğrencilerin nomofobi düzeyleri ile siber zorbalığa maruz kalma arasında ki ilişki incelendiğinde; istatistiki açıdan anlamlı, zayıf düzeyde ve pozitif yönlü ilişkinin var olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Öğrencilerin nomofobi düzeyleri ile siber zorbalık ile baş etme stratejileri arasında ki ilişki incelendiğinde; istatistiki açıdan anlamlı, zayıf düzeyde ve negatif yönlü ilişkinin var olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Öğrencilerin siber zorbalıkla baş etme stratejileri ile siber zorbalığa maruz kalma durumları arasında ki

ilişki incelendiğinde istatistiki açıdan anlamlı, orta düzeyde ve negatif yönlü ilişkinin var olduğu tespit edilmiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: zorba, zorbalık, siber zorbalık



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis has been completed with support of many. To begin, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor Doç.Dr.Gonca Kızılkaya Cumaoglu for adding to my academic development through the constant support, assistance and encouragement she gave me in every single step of the thesis. I am also very grateful to Doç. Dr. Yelkin Coşkun and Dr. Alper Beyazıt for being a part of committee members of the thesis. Their constructive feedback and suggestions helped me to finalise this thesis.

I also extend my heartfelt thanks to my dear friend Dr. Cihan Tekin and my best friend Computer Engineer Sevinç Uğraş for spending hours with me through each stage of the thesis with great support.

I also owe to my mother Selma Şeker for supporting me and sacrificing so much. I also wish to thank to my sisters, Özlem Şeker and Özge Şeker, for being an inspiration in my life.

Last but not least, I wish to dedicate this thesis to my beloved father Nebi Şeker; I love him and miss him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	İV
Özet.....	V
Acknowledgements.....	Vİİ
List Of Tables	Xİ
List Of Abbreviations	Xİİİ
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background to the Study	1
1.2. Aim of the Research	3
1.3. Assumptions of the Research	6
1.4. Limitations of the Research.....	6
1.5. Definitions of the Terms.....	6
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	8
2.1. Bullying and Its Types	8
2.1.1. Physical bullying.....	14
2.1.2. Verbal bullying	14
2.1.3. Emotional-psychological bullying.....	14
2.1.4. Cyber bullying	15
2.2. Differences Between Traditional and Cyber Bullying	17
2.3. Cyber Bullying	18
2.3.1. Distinguishing features of cyber bullying.....	21
2.3.1.1. Anonymity.....	21
2.3.1.2. Disinhibition.....	22
2.3.1.3. Deindividuation.....	22
2.3.1.4. Lack of supervision.....	23

2.3.1.5. Limitless victimization risk.....	23
2.3.1.6. Virality	24
2.3.2. Types of cyber bullying	24
2.3.2.1. Provocation/anger	24
2.3.2.2. Online harassment.....	25
2.3.2.3. Slander	25
2.3.2.4. Impersonating another person.....	25
2.3.2.5. Disclosing someone's personal information on the internet	26
2.3.2.6. The exclusion	26
2.3.2.7. Cyber harassment.....	26
2.3.3. Cyber bullying tools	27
2.3.4. Prevalence of cyber bullying	29
2.3.5. Causes of cyber bullying	35
2.3.6. The effects of cyber bullying on victims	38
2.4. Cyberbullying Coping Strategies.....	41
2.5. Related Research	45
2.5.1. Research on cyberbullying roles.....	45
2.5.2. Research on cyberbullying behavior	46
2.5.3. Research on online communication tools used in cyberbullying	49
2.5.4. Research on the prevalence of cyberbullying.....	50
2.5.5. Research on the consequences of cyberbullying	52
2.5.6. Research on cyberbullying sensitivity	55
3. METHODOLOGY	60
3.1. Purpose and Importance of the Research	60
3.2. Model of the Research.....	61

3.3. Universe and Sample of the Research	62
3.4. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants	62
3.5. Data Collection Tools.....	64
3.6. Research Questions	66
3.7. Data Analysis	66
4. FINDINGS	69
4.1. RQ1: What Is the Level of Nomophobia of High School Students? Do Students' Nomophobia Levels Change According to Their Demographic Characteristics?	69
4.2. RQ2: Do students' exposure to cyberbullying change according to their demographic characteristics? Is there a significant difference in the level of cyberbullying according to demographic characteristics?	79
4.3. RQ3: Do students' coping strategies with cyberbullying change according to their demographic characteristics? Is there a significant difference in the strategies of coping with cyberbullying used by students according to these demographic characteristics?	83
4.4. RQ4: Is there a relationship between students' nomophobia levels, the effects of cyberbullying, and coping strategies with cyberbullying?	87
5. DISCUSSION	89
SUGGESTIONS	94
REFERENCES	97
ATTACHMENTS.....	116

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Distribution of Participants' Socio-Demographical Characteristics	63
Table 2. Distribution of Participants' Ownership of Electronic Devices (Phone, Tablet, Computer)	63
Table 3. Distribution of Participants' Internet Usage Status.....	64
Table 4. Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Normality	67
Table 5. Mean and Standard Deviation Information of the Nomophobia Scale Sub- Dimension	70
Table 6. Mean and Standard Deviation Results of Students' Nomophobia Expressions.....	70
Table 7. According to Gender Variable.....	72
Table 8. By Class Variable	73
Table 9. According to Mother Education Level Variable	74
Table 10. According to Father Education Level Variable	75
Table 11. According to the Variable of Having a Computer at Home	76
Table 12. By Variable of Owning a Personal Mobile Phone.....	76
Table 13. By Variable of Owning a Personal Tablet.....	77
Table 14. According to the Variable of Daily Internet Usage Time.....	78
Table 15. Supervision of Internet Access Time by Family Members According to Status Variable	79
Table 16. According to Gender Variable.....	80
Table 17. By Class Variable	80
Table 18. According to Mother and Father Education Level Variable	81
Table 19. By Having Computer, Mobile Phone and Personal Tablet Variable.....	82

Table 20. According to the Variable of Daily Internet Usage Time.....	82
Table 21. Supervision of Internet Access Time by Family Members According to Status Variable	83
Table 22. According to Gender Variable.....	83
Table 23. By Class Variable	84
Table 24. According to Mother and Father Education Level Variable	85
Table 25. By Having Computer, Mobile Phone and Personal Tablet Variable.....	85
Table 26. According to the Variable of Daily Internet Usage Time.....	86
Table 27. Supervision of Internet Access Time by Family Members According to Status Variable	87
Table 28. Correlation Analysis Findings	88

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

NS	: Nomophobia Scale
ECS	: Effects of Cyberbullying Scale
SCCS	: Strategies for Coping with Cyberbullying Scale
SPSS	: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
E-MAIL	: Elektronik Posta



1.

INTRODUCTION

In this section, the problem, the purpose of the research, sub-problems, the importance of the research, assumptions, limitations and definitions are included.

1.1 Background to the Study

In the 21st century, with globalization internet technologies have undergone a rapid change and development. In parallel with the technological developments in the world, Turkey has started to develop some important technologies. According to the research conducted in the light of the data of Internet World Stats, while there were two million internet users in Turkey in 2000, the number of internet users exceeded thirty-six million in 2012. In addition, according to 2015 Internetworldstat data, 59.6% of Turkey's population (46,282,850 people) use the internet.

Similar results were obtained from the "household information technology usage survey" conducted by the Turkish Statistical Institute in April 2012. According to the research, 47.2% of the households in Turkey have access to the internet from home. With the increase in the use of the internet all over the world, the use of the internet has also increased in Turkey and the use of mobile phones or smart phones, which are communication tools, has also increased at a very rapid rate.

According to the records obtained from the Ministry of Transport, the number of short messages sent, which was 5.7 billion in 2004, reached 148 billion in 2010; Talk time with mobile phones, which was 20.3 billion minutes, increased to 121.9 billion minutes. Undoubtedly, accessing internet with high prices in its early stages and its

gradual decrease and the played an important role in reaching these records. These developments experienced in the field of mobile communication have made our lives easier. Yet, they have many negative effects as well.

With the widespread use of technological developments, especially mobile technologies, individuals become lonely. In fact, they become individuals who live together and act completely independently and unaware of each other. The use of electronic communication technologies is not only for adults, but it also attracts the attention of adolescents and children. Adolescent high school students also follow these changes and developments in electronic technologies and benefit from these technologies to make their lives easier, and in some cases, more than adults.

In a study conducted by Erdur-Baker and Kavşut (2007), it was found that approximately 80% of high school students have internet. This is an indication of the high level of interest in internet and telephone use among high school students. Internet usage purposes of students; communicating with their families, texting, doing their homework, having fun, watching movies, listening to music, playing games on the internet, sharing files, making new friends and keeping in touch with existing friends (Arıcak et al. 2012).

Some of the puberty problems seen in high school students show themselves in the virtual environment by keeping up with the changing conditions in the developing world conditions. The most basic feature seen in adolescents during adolescence is the alienation from the concept of family in this period and the orientation towards friends.

The separation of high school students from their parents during their adolescence shows itself as the loss of a very important element that existed in their lives until that period, and they form new friendships to fill this gap (Bakırcıoğlu,

2010). Accordingly, with the increase in internet use, adolescents are not only limited to the school environment and the environment they live in, but also make friends from other schools, cities and even countries in order to fill this gap in their life. The virtual environment and the internet, which rapidly increase the number of friends, bring along the problems of cyber bullying and victimization. While choosing his friends from the school environment in real life, the student (adolescent) trying to cope with bullying shifts his choice of friends to the internet (virtual) environment. With the increase in the use of the Internet and mobile technologies in our lives, we have to fight against cyberbullying more.

Cyberbullying has been defined in various ways by many researchers. In its most general definition, cyberbullying can be defined as “the whole of the technical or relational harming behaviours against an individual or group, a private or legal entity through the latest developing technologies” (Arıcak 2011: 10). Those who engage in such behaviours are called cyberbullies, and those who are exposed to these behaviours are called cyber victims. People who both engage in bullying behaviour and are exposed to bullying are also called bully-victims. However, there are those who are not bullies or victims, but who testify, who are also called witnesses (Patchin & Hinduja 2009).

1.2 Aim of the Research

The aim of this study is to measure the level of cyberbullying of high school students. In this context, through a questionnaire, 311 high school students’ cyber bullying levels were examined. Specifically this study sought to answer the following sub-problems:

1. What is the level of nomophobia of high school students?

Do students' nomophobia levels change according to their demographic characteristics given below?

- a) gender,
- b) grade level,
- c) mother's education level,
- d) father's education level,
- e) status of personal computer possession,
- f) status of personal mobile phone possession,
- g) status of personal tablet possession,
- h) daily internet use,
- i) the family's supervision of internet usage time)

Is there a significant difference of nomophobia levels of students according to these demographic characteristics?

2. Do students' exposure to cyberbullying change according to their demographic characteristics given below?

- a) gender,
- b) grade level
- c) mother's education level,
- d) father's education level,
- e) status of personal computer possession,
- f) status of personal mobile phone possession,
- g) status of personal tablet possession,
- h) daily internet use,
- i) the family's supervision of internet usage time

Is there a significant difference in the level of cyberbullying according to demographic characteristics?

3. Do students' coping strategies with cyberbullying change according to their demographic characteristics?

- a) gender,
- b) grade level
- c) mother's education level,
- d) father's education level,
- e) status of personal computer possession,
- f) status of personal mobile phone possession,
- g) status of personal tablet possession,
- h) daily internet use,
- i) the family's supervision of internet usage time

Is there a significant difference in the strategies of coping with cyberbullying used by students according to these demographic characteristics?

4. Is there a relationship between students' nomophobia levels, the effects of cyberbullying, and coping strategies with cyberbullying?

If there is a relationship:

- What is the relationship between students' nomophobia levels and the effects of cyberbullying?
- What is the relationship between students' nomophobia levels and their strategies to cope with cyberbullying?
- What is the relationship between the effects of cyberbullying and students' coping strategies?

1.3 Assumptions of the Research

It is assumed that high school students sincerely answered the items in the Cyberbullying Attitude Scale and Personal Information Form, which were used as data collection tools in the study.

1.4 Limitations of the Research

This research is limited to students who continue their education in high school, selected through appropriate sampling in the 2020-2021 academic year. Research findings are limited to the Cyberbullying Attitude Scale and Personal Information Form applied to the students. The research is limited to the measurement tools used and the dimensions that these tools measure.

1.5 Definitions of the Terms

Adolescence: Adolescence is the transition period from childhood to adulthood, where emotional formations, mental changes and physical maturation are experienced.

Bullying: “Bullying is a form of violence (verbal, psychological, physical, etc.) that is repeated or performed more than once by the person or persons in a certain process, has an imbalance of power, meets the needs of those who want to hold power, is exposed by those who are unable to prevent it, and is carried out in various ways (verbal, psychological, physical, etc.).) is the emerging behavior” (Bridge, 2010: 20).

Peer Bullying: It is the exposure of a student to disturbing behaviors by one or more students for a certain period of time and continuously (Özdemir & Akar 2011: 608).

Cyberbullying: Cyberbullying is defined as the malicious and repetitive use of information and communication technologies by an individual or group to harm other individuals (Eroğlu & Peker 2011:3).



2.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1. Bullying and Its Types

It is possible to observe that the destructive violence and conflicts experienced by individuals first within themselves and then between individuals, groups and societies change over time. These disagreements between individuals and societies may not be as directly constructive-destructive, right-wrong, positive-negative. On the other hand, it may be more appropriate to classify the ways used in solving these conflicts as true-false or constructive-destructive. Throughout the history of civilization, the development and civilization of human nature continue to undergo a learning process. Considering the living conditions and actions of today's people, it can be seen that there are great differences between them and people who lived in the past. These differences are due to the ability of people to learn and transfer the knowledge. Knowing how to resolve conflicts in the past and differentiation of solutions are among the indicators of civilization (Türnüklü, 2006: 11-12).

In order for an education system to achieve its purpose, schools, employees and students must also be able to achieve its purpose. In order for students and employees to reach their goals, the school must be a comfortable, organized and safe school. Considering the effects of environmental factors on students, it can be understood that this situation is not a necessity but an obligation. However, no matter how many regulations are made regarding school safety, undesirable behaviors can always be experienced within the school (Özer, 2018: 17). Bullying at school, and cyber environment are among these unwanted behaviors.

Although various studies have been carried out on bullying, Dan Olweus (1970), one of the oldest studies on bullying in schools, creates a study called *What do we know about bullying in schools and what can we do about it*. This study was reviewed and republished many times by educators and psychologists between 1993-2002. In the first part of his study, which consists of four parts, Olweus examined how often bullying behaviors are experienced at school, gender differences related to bullying behaviors, and the characteristics of traditional bully and victim. In the second part, he discussed what can be done to stop bullying, and in the third and fourth part, he included key concepts and applicable suggestions in the creation of an anti-bullying program (Craig, Pepler & Atlas, 2000).

When the literature on bullying is examined, the most frequently encountered concepts are violence and aggression (Haskaya, 2016). Although the concepts of violence and bullying, which are types of aggression in general, are used interchangeably, there are some differences between them. Violence usually refers to one-time injury and more physical harm. According to Anderson (2007), the conflict between peers should not be confused with bullying. Peer conflict is a conflict between students of equal strength, depending on the current circumstances and without serious consequences. This conflict does not involve the thought of gaining control over the other side, and usually regret at the end of the action. However, the power relations are coercive between the parties in the case of bullying. The bully has a desire to exert control over the victim and to this end, he constantly puts pressure on the victim. The bully does not regret his actions and the victim constantly blames himself (Yaman et al., 2011: 31).

The behavioral approach defines aggression as any behavior that hurts others. However, the intention of the person acting in the behaviorist approach is not taken into

account. For example, while the results of the doctor cutting his patient's hand because of gangrene and the procedure performed for the purpose of torture are the same, there are differences in terms of intentions. Bullying, on the other hand, is a deliberate and harmful behavior that is constantly seen between individuals or groups that do not have a balance of power. These behaviors can be physical, verbal, and psychological-emotional. If this bullying is carried out by a group, it is expressed as mobbing (Yaman, Eroğlu & Peker, 2011: 23).

Although violence and bullying in schools are a known phenomenon and problem, there are significant inconsistencies between the official statistics published on this subject and the statements of the students. The main reason for this is that school administrators, who do not want their school to be named, give incomplete information on this subject, the victims' fear of the bully and the difference in perceptions of bullying. Although there is a problem in official statistics about bullying, one of the indicators that bullying is an important problem for schools is the increase in studies and methods of struggle on bullying worldwide (Novikova & Rean, 2019: 10).

Although studies on combating bullying have increased, they have also begun to differentiate. A study conducted in Japan can be shown as an example to this differentiation. Increasing suicide rate among students due to school bullying is a major concern in Japan. For this reason, Japanese authorities have developed digital game software for educational purposes that will attract students' attention against bullying as part of a project. The purpose of the software is to develop positive attitudes and behaviors in students. During the game, the feelings and facial expressions of the virtual characters during the game were analyzed using various analysis techniques. Students were encouraged to show empathy by taking their opinions in discussion forums organized in their classrooms (Paracha, Clawson, Mitsche, Hall & Jehanzeb, 2019).

Depending on the interaction between individuals, anyone can be a party, a victim or a follower of a conflict at any time. Due to the fact that the students at the school come from different socio-economic and cultural backgrounds and have different values, experiences and perspectives, conflicts may arise from time to time. These conflicts, which are a natural part of life, can affect the cognitive, moral and psychosocial development of students (Serin, 2012).

According to Olweus (1994), bullying behaviors seen among peers in schools is a very old phenomenon and bullying is defined as the continuous and systematic assault, violence, injury or disturbance of a person or group to another person or group. These behaviors can be physical, verbal or emotional. In order for a behavior to be called bullying, the strengths of the person or group being bullied must not be equal to the person or group showing the bullying behavior.

After Olweus's research, many researchers focused on bullying behaviors seen in schools and made new definitions of bullying. Eliot (1992) stated that bullying can be in the form of negative behaviors of a person or a group to a single person. Besag (1995) defined bullying as the physical, verbal, social or psychological attacks of a person or people in a strong position to disturb those who do not have the power to resist them. Pişkin (2002) defined bullying as a type of aggression that one or more students deliberately and constantly disturbed students whom they deemed weaker than them, and the victim could not protect him (Ayas & Pişkin, 2015).

The problems caused by bullying in our schools are huge. Experiencing bullying incidents negatively affect the victims, those who are the agents, and the audience as well. Those exposed to bullying may experience various emotional and behavioral problems such as loneliness, fear, insomnia, nightmares, disappointment, helplessness,

stress, depression, anxiety, and anger. Students' academic development may also be negatively affected due to reasons related to bullying (Novikova & Rean, 2019; Lee, 2017: 77; Jantzer, Haffner, Parzer & Resch, 2011; Natvig, Albrektsen & Qvarnström, 2001: 366). In our schools, it has been found that students are afraid to go to recess and cannot meet their needs because they are exposed to peer bullying (Bakioğlu, 2014: 173). Some students are absent or even drop out of school due to bullying. Although the effects of anxiety and fear in students exposed to bullying negatively affect the social life of the student for a long time, some studies show that students who are exposed to bullying at an early age continue to experience victimization in the future or turn into bullies (Lee, 2017: 76).

Victims are concerned that adults they trust will experience similar victimization or will be more bullied if they tell someone else about their experiences. Victims do not always share their victimization with their environment or directly say that they are experiencing, for reasons such as exposure to bullying is a weakness (Yaman et al., 2011: 93). There are studies showing that students who are under close supervision of their families are exposed to bullying less and struggle with bullying more strongly. For this reason, especially families and teachers should be made aware of the symptoms of bullying. School-parent collaboration should be strengthened and parents should be informed about the problems experienced in schools (Serin, 2012; Gök, 2019; Topçu, 2014; Lee, 2017: 78; Pehlivan & Demirtaş, 2019: 45).

In the past, it was accepted that only physically weak students were exposed to bullying. Today, it is accepted that this view is wrong and anyone can be a victim. Although there are classifications such as innocent, passive, provocative, and bully in terms of victims, it is known that certain groups are targeted more in terms of bullies. Some students may be subject to racist bullying because of their ethnicity, because they

look different - talk and come from different cultures. Some students who are different from their peers in terms of their physical, psychological and intelligence level and who need special education can be the target of bullies. Some students experience victimization in terms of their sexual orientation and friend preferences (Yaman et al., 2011: 91-92).

It can be said that especially innocent and passive victims have a structure that avoids conflict. Trying to avoid conflict as much as possible, victims feel helpless and vulnerable as long as they experience victimization. Victims blame themselves in this process and question what they did to deserve the hatred of their friends. The stress level of the victim, who cannot find a reasonable answer at the end of his questioning, increases and loses self-confidence. Bullies who realize that the victim is vulnerable can be more ruthless, which can increase the degree of victimization and its destructive effect (Seçkin, 2017: 26).

The frequency and type of bullying events experienced among students also differ according to the environment in which the students are present. Students are exposed to different types and frequencies of bullying, including verbal, emotional and physical, depending on their presence in the classroom, laboratory, corridor, school washbasins, gym, school yard, and school environment. In classrooms where technological devices such as information technologies are used, they may be exposed to cyberbullying. Craig et al. (2000) stated that students were exposed to bullying twice as much in the playgrounds than in the classroom environment, students who were exposed to physical bullying more in the playgrounds were exposed to more verbal bullying in the classroom, Koç (2006) reported that students were most exposed to bullying in the corridors of the school.

In the literature, types of bullying are classified in different ways. These types of bullying are generally physical, verbal, psycho-emotional, social, relational, sexual, direct, indirect, vertical, horizontal, etc. It is called. However, rapid changes in current life and information technologies have led to the emergence of new types of bullying such as cyberbullying (Çakır, 2017; Gümüşler, 2014; Seçer, 2014). In this study, considering the developments in current life and information technologies, types of bullying are discussed under the headings of verbal, emotional-psychological, physical and cyber bullying.

2.1.1. Physical bullying

It refers to situations in which bullying occurs physically such as hitting, pushing, beating, hitting on purpose, pulling hair and ears, throwing something, injuring with sharp and piercing tools, damaging things, forcibly taking money or an item, breaking, tearing (Çakır, 2017; Ayas & Pişkin, 2015; Gümüşler, 2014; Seçer, 2014). In this type of bullying, the victim is often physically weak and unable to protect himself.

2.1.2. Verbal bullying

According to studies, verbal bullying behaviors in classrooms are observed more in classes with intense peer interaction (Atlas & Pepler, 1998). Behaviors of making unwanted words and verbal jokes, threatening, nicknames, trying to humiliate, physical characteristics, clothes, speaking style, friend preferences, and making discomfort with verbal expressions such as making fun of their ethnic origin are included in this group (Ayas & Pişkin, 2015; Çitemel, 2014; Seçer, 2014).

2.1.3. Emotional-psychological bullying

In this type of bullying, also known as social or relational bullying, trying to

distract other students by making gossip, ignoring a group of friends, not getting into a certain game and activity, ignoring, writing negative writing and drawing in some places, unfairly to the school administration and Psychological and emotional pressure behaviors such as complaining to the teacher and threatening to end his friendship if he does not do what is desired are included in this group (Çitemel, 2014; Gümüşler, 2014; Seçer, 2014).

2.1.4. Cyber bullying

Cyberbullying is a type of bullying that is frequently encountered in schools by moving the peer bullying to the cyber environment, differentiating in various aspects and expanding its scope (Baştürk Akca & Sayımer, 2017). Whether a bully is called cyberbullying depends on the environment in which the bullying or being bullied is exposed and the tools used. In the Annotated Disaster Management Dictionary (2018), the cyber environment is defined as the environment consisting of information systems spread all over the world and space and networks that connect them. Cyberbullying tools are electronic devices such as mobile phones, tablets and computers that can be connected to these networks.

Cyberbullying people or people using information technologies to intimidate or harm someone else, images, videos, messages, etc. It is a type of aggression where unwanted content (such as defamatory, obscene, etc.) is regularly sent. Behaviors such as writing negative comments under the content shared on social media, slander, gossip, threaten, capture information (passwords), re-share the shared content for the purpose of damaging it, or spread this content, threaten to spread it, blackmail cyberbullying (Bak & Eşidir, 2019; Hinduja & Patchin, 2015; Ybarra et al., 2006).

With the development of technology, electronic devices make their presence felt in all areas of our lives. These new communication technologies occupy an important place especially in the lives of young people. Communication technologies offer very important opportunities for sharing ideas and a culture of working together (Barlett & Coyne, 2014). Young people are increasingly spending time in cyber environments for reasons such as making new friends, expressing their thoughts they cannot express face to face with videos, pictures and interactive texts, gaining popularity by sharing their own pictures and videos, and playing games to have fun (Baykal, 2016). Cyber devices, which are initially used to have fun and have a good time, cause some negativities due to the increasing frequency of use. These negativities are sometimes the continuation of the negative encountered in daily life, and sometimes they can start in the cyber environment and cause negative effects and destruction in daily life.

Cyberbullying, which occurs due to the increase in the use of electronic devices, smart phones, social media and internet, is seen as an important and international problem in many parts of the world, especially among young people, and many studies are carried out in different countries to solve this problem (Machimbarrena, Alvarez-Bardon , Leon-Mejia, Gutierrez-Ortega, Casadiego-Cabrales & González-Cabrera, 2019; Parachave et al., 2009; Smith, Görzig & Robinson, 2018; Arıcak, Tanrikulu & Kınay, 2012). It imposes additional responsibilities on school staff in order to eliminate the victimization caused by cyber bullying (Aksaray, 2011: 405). Various laws on cyberbullying are enacted in many countries around the world. Some countries have many different sanctions against cyberbullies, including imprisonment (Hinduja & Patchin, 2015: 1).

Many variables can be listed that affect students' cyberbully and victim status. The education level of the parents of the students, the environment in which the student

lives, the level of the student's participation in sports activities, the ease of access to technological devices and the internet, the place to connect to the internet, whether the students have smart phones, social media, etc. Variables such as the frequency of use of the platforms, whether filters or anti-virus programs are used against negative content on the internet can affect students' cyberbully and victim status (Süslü, 2016; Eroğlu, 2014).

2.2. Differences Between Traditional and Cyber Bullying

There are some differences between traditional bullying and cyberbullying, although they are interrelated. These differences can be listed as follows;

In traditional bullying, the bully is generally physically stronger, while cyber bullies have a higher ability to use technological tools, equipment and software.

In traditional bullying, the bully tries to gain respect around him with physical power, while the bully tries to gain respect with his ability to use information technologies in cyberbullying.

Traditional bullying can only be witnessed by those in the environment where it is experienced, while cyberbullying can be witnessed from all over the world in a very short time (Togunaga, 2010).

Cyberbullying related materials can be easily copied, then blackmail, etc. can be stored for use (Hinduja & Patchin, 2015).

Since cyberbullies often hide their identity with fake accounts and know that it is more difficult to identify than traditional bullying, they can display their repressed feelings, grudges and hatred uncontrollably (Yaman et al., 2011).

Cyber bullies generally lack the ability to empathize, since they cannot directly observe what effect the effect they initiate has on the victim (Baştürk Akca & Sayımer, 2017).

The effort of individuals with high empathic tendencies to establish close relationships with those around them and to understand them decreases their possibility of being cyberbully and cyber victim (Peker, Eroğlu, & Ada, 2012). It is very difficult to prevent the dissemination of damaging posts about the victim in cyberbullying, and those who try to take legal precautions are often left helpless against this speed. However, if the person exposed to cyberbullying is sufficient to use information technologies, they can prevent attacks or be harmed less by this process (Seçkin, 2017: 91).

2.3.Cyber Bullying

Cyberbullying is the repetitive and deliberate occurrence of aggressive behaviors to harm someone else in the digital environment with digital tools (Tokunaga, 2010). Cyberbullying, which describes any bullying activity using technology, is a general term that can harm our individual or social well-being. The most common types of cyberbullying are; anonymous comments and pseudonyms, provocation, browsing public internet sites, chat, sexually explicit images and articles, personal information or pictures, recording and exclusion of messages or conversations (Harmon, 2004).

Virtual network is an environment where adolescents meet and communicate with their peers. Cyberbullying during this communication is a growing phenomenon in virtual communication environments and it is observed that there is not much that families and schools can do legally and technologically to stop it. Bamford (2004) stated in the same study that cyberbullying behavior is exhibited in students until the

age of eight.

According to Belsey (2006) cyberbullying; It is the bullying done more than once with hostile feelings, repeated by one person or by the use of technology by more than one person.

It is to act deliberately and repeating in hostile feelings by using communication tools (e-mail, mobile phone, sms, etc.) by one or more people in order to harm other people (Arıcak, 2009).

The use of information technologies derived from all comments on cyberbullying is deliberate, in a certain repetition state. In this case, there is an imbalance between implementing and applied forces (Li, Smith & Cross, 2012).

Harmful behaviors in cyberbullying differ from other bullying behaviors in terms of the speed of reaching and spreading from other bullying behaviors. It is capable of reaching millions of people in a matter of minutes, making it easy to repeat the damage once it happens (Dooley, Pyzalski & Cross, 2009; Patchin & Hinduja, 2012; Shariff, 2008).

Internet usage behavior is similar to people's social environment outside. In other words, if there is a power imbalance in environments other than the internet environment, there is the same power imbalance in the internet environment. A person who uses communication media very well establishes an advantage in virtual environment (Li, Smith & Cross, 2012; Smith, 2011).

Cyberbullying, abusive speech, slang accusations, mocking people, attacks carried out by means of communication (Kiesler & Sproull, 1992: 101; Thompsen, 1996: 300).

Examples of cyberbullying behavior are as follows (Topçu & Erdur, 2007: 256):

- Saying unfounded words about a person,

- Saying humiliating and threatening words in the social media accounts of the bullied person,
- Sending derogatory, sexually harassing and violent messages via e-mail or using your mobile phone,
- Taking inappropriate pictures of a person without their knowledge,
- Excluding the person from social media and away from chat sites without any reason,
- Preparing minimizing sites about the person and sharing images.

The situation of bullying by using technological tools is a general definition of cyberbullying behavior that will affect and affect our country both personally and massively. The most common types of cyberbullying are as follows (Harmon, 2004);

- Making anonymous comments,
- Pictures, videos and articles, which are sexual subjects in terms of their content, ridiculing people,
- Sharing provocative articles, browsing sites where anyone who does not want a special membership is free to enter,
- Sharing personal information (Disclosure),
- Exclude.

As a result of the research conducted by Nocentini et al. (2010), the definition of cyber bullying in Germany, Italy and Spain was examined and the following results were found in the countries.

Psychological assault in Germany, moral bullying in Italy, cyber bullying in Italy has been found to be defined as internet abuse in Spain. According to the research, in order for a situation to be cyberbullying, that behavior must be done deliberately and in order to harm (Nocentini et al. 2010).

2.3.1. Distinguishing features of cyber bullying

Cyberbullying using technological tools such as mobile phones, websites, blogs, and online chat rooms (Shariff & Gouin, 2005); It differs from peer bullying (Olweus, 1999: 10), which is carried out by different methods such as physical contact, words, deliberate exclusion from the group, or using sarcastic facial expressions. These distinctive features of cyberbullying, which are discussed in different studies (Hines, 2011; Mishna, Cook, Gadalla, Daciuk & Solomon, 2010; Patchin & Hinduja, 2006; Slonje & Smith, 2008; Strom & Strom, 2006) Hinduja and Patchin (2015: 46-52); The ambiguity of identity is grouped under six general headings: freedom from obstacles, loss of self-awareness, lack of control, reaching countless victims, and countless audiences.

2.3.1.1. Anonymity

Unlike school bullying, where the bullying is done directly and who is known to do so, the cyberbully has the ability to hide his identity in cyberbullying behaviors performed in virtual environments. The use of pseudonyms in social media accounts, online gaming sites, e-mail, instant messaging and other internet applications makes it difficult to find out who is perpetrating cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2015: 46). Although cyber bullies hiding behind the keyboard (Mishna et al., 2010) perform behaviors that harm the victim in a virtual environment, bullying starts to negatively affect the learning process of the victim in school over time. Not knowing the identity of the bully; It causes the victim to be suspicious of their classmates, causes the victim to feel fear and anxiety, and causes the destructive consequences of bullying that begins in the virtual environment to continue in the school environment (Shariff & Gouin, 2005). Because the victim is in constant curiosity and doubt about who the person

harmed himself; This situation can be frightening for cyber victims and they may feel more helpless in the face of bullying they are subjected to (Hines, 2011).

2.3.1.2. Disinhibition

Hinduja and Patchin (2015: 48) define the concept of freedom, which is associated with the ambiguity of the identity of the bully, as the freedom of individuals from all limits or obstacles on their behavior. Eliminating the factors that limit behaviors and not seeing the consequences of inappropriate behaviors make it difficult to control impulsive behaviors. Since cyber bullying takes place in the virtual environment, the bully cannot know how his behavior affects the victim emotionally, psychologically and physically. When talking about bullying behavior with cyberbullies, many of them; It is seen that the behavior is not to harm the victim, but to joke (Hinduja & Patchin, 2015: 49).

Cyberbullies' ability to hide their identity and not communicate face-to-face with the bully leads them to go further in mocking or hurting victims. Cyber bullies can do and say things they would not or would not do in real life with the ease of not being recognized by others (Hines, 2011). In addition, the fact that the messages transmitted in virtual environments do not contain verbal and visual cues that reflect emotions such as facial expressions and body language can lead to misunderstanding and cyberbullying among individuals (Hinduja & Patchin, 2015: 49).

2.3.1.3. Deindividuation

The loss of self-awareness (deindividuation) means that the individual is not aware of his own behavior. Establishing relationships with individuals over the internet

reduces the individual's awareness of their own behaviors and their ability to regulate their behaviors and relieves them from traditional pressures (Hinduja & Patchin, 2015: 49). When the bully cannot see the effects of his behavior on the victim, the bully does not activate the mechanism to regulate and control his behavior; This causes the bully to exhibit more damaging behaviors in the virtual environment than he can when confronted with the victim (Hines, 2011).

2.3.1.4. Lack of supervision

The contents of messages and e-mails sent from mobile phones or the internet are not controlled by anyone or those who have harmful content are not blocked (Patchin & Hinduja, 2006). Increasingly widespread use of the internet at home and becoming indispensable for children, the fact that internet access can be easily provided at school and other environments, parents do not show much interest in how children use the internet, young people who use computers and the internet more than adults have more information on the subject (National Telecommunications and Information Administration [NTIA], 2002) make it difficult to control the virtual environment; makes it difficult for families to realize that their children are exposed to cyberbullying.

2.3.1.5. Limitless victimization risk

Unlike traditional bullying that takes place in a specific place at a specific time, cyberbullying can occur anytime, anywhere. Those who are bullied in traditional bullying areas such as school cafeteria, bus stop or bus can escape from bullying when the school day is over and may experience a temporary comfort when they return home. However, in cyberbullying, when the victim returns home, they can continue to receive messages or e-mails from the cyberbully (Hinduja & Patchin, 2015: 51; Slonje & Smith, 2008). Mishna et al. (2010), one of the participants exposed to this situation defines

cyberbullying as continuous bullying.

2.3.1.6. Virality

Another aspect that distinguishes cyberbullying from traditional bullying is that cyberbullying can spread faster and more widely than traditional bullying (Solonje & Smith, 2008). Hurtful and humiliating content related to the victim in cyberbullying can be delivered to many people in a short time, and a message can be sent to countless people within seconds (Hinduja & Patchin, 2015: 50; Strom & Strom, 2006). It can be argued that this situation makes it difficult to control cyberbullying and fight against cyberbullying.

2.3.2. Types of cyber bullying

Mith, Mahdavi and Tippett (2008) stated that in terms of information and communication tools, cyberbullying can be handled in seven categories: mobile phone, text messages, photo and video viewing bullying, e-mails, dating sites, instant messaging and web sites. Willard (2007), on the other hand, specified common cyberbullying behaviors in seven different categories according to the content of the actions. These categories are: provocation / anger, online / online harassment, slander, impersonation, disclosure, exclusion and cyber harassment.

2.3.2.1. Provocation/anger

It is a type of short-term cyberbullying in which two or more individuals use aggressive, vulgar, humiliating and sometimes threatening language against each other to annoy each other in the online environment. Anger generally occurs in public environments such as chat rooms, discussion pages, e-games. There is no difference between individuals in terms of various characteristics such as social status and

technological competence in anger that occurs between two or more individuals (Willard, 2007).

2.3.2.2. Online harassment

It is the continuous and ongoing sending of derogatory messages to an individual target. Online harassment can usually occur through personal communication channels such as e-mail, instant messaging and text messages, as well as in public places. There are some differences between online harassment and agitation. First, online harassment lasts longer than anger. Secondly, while it is the case that individuals send insulting messages to each other in anger; In online harassment, it is the case that a cyberbully constantly sends offensive messages to someone who is inferior to him in various characteristics. Third, the online harassed person is constantly exposed to harmful messages when online or looking at their phone (Willard, 2007).

2.3.2.3. Slander

Slander is posting inaccurate, brutal and damaging information in places like websites to defame someone online. Generally, gossip and rumors predominate in slander. The purpose of slander is to damage the target's reputation and to interfere with their friendships. Also, the direct recipient of the inaccurate and damaging material is not the target but others (Willard, 2007).

2.3.2.4. Impersonating another person

Impersonating another identity can be defined as logging into an individual's account by breaking their password, or sending them as if they were sculpting messages that would distress others by learning their password and password, cause them to lose their reputation among their friends and make the other person feel bad. This can be

done through the victim's personal web page, profile, blog, social media accounts or any of the information and communication tools. The reason why this type of cyberbullying is common is that among adolescents, especially young girls, telling each other their passwords and passwords is seen as a symbol of friendship. As an example of this type of cyberbullying, learning the password and password of a friend and sending harmful messages to his boyfriend from his account can be given (Willard, 2007).

2.3.2.5. Disclosing someone's personal information on the internet

It can be defined as sending pictures, photos, videos, personal secrets belonging to the victim or the content of a personal conversation made by the individual to other people or sharing them online. An example of this is treating someone as a friend and sharing personal information and secrets about them online with others (Willard, 2007).

2.3.2.6. The exclusion

It involves the individual not being included in the online group or being ruthlessly expelled by someone from the online group they are in. As an example of this, being removed from friendships in social media accounts or after defeating someone in the online game, the friends of the person who is defeated as a union restricts the activities of the person who beats the game and prevents him from participating in the game (Willard, 2007).

2.3.2.7. Cyber harassment

Repetitive online harassment is the constant sending of harmful messages to the victim, including extortion, excessively offensive, excessive intimidation and threats. While there is no clear distinction between online harassment and cyber harassment, the

victim's fear for their own safety is one of the factors that distinguishes cyber harassment from online harassment (Willard, 2007).

It is seen that the scope of cyber bullying types classified into seven categories by Willard (2007) has expanded in recent years and four new concepts have been added. These; Sexting is happy slapping, online trolling and online gambling, which involves the recording and sharing of attacks on mobile phones or other electronic devices.

Sexting is the sharing of sexually explicit photos of the victim online via mobile phones and the internet without their consent. Griefing is defined as intentional harassment of someone online and in online games. Trolling is defined as making continuous swearing comments from websites and social media accounts (Slonje, Smith, Frisen, 2013). Happy slapping involves a group attacking anyone while recording the attack footage of someone from the group with a mobile phone camera or other electronic devices, and then sending these images to other people or sharing them online (Kowalski, Limber, Agastson, 2008).

2.3.3. Cyber bullying tools

The most common tools used for cyberbullying are behaviors such as chat rooms, sending photos, video clips, creating websites, instant messaging, calling or sending messages on a mobile phone (Ybarra, Mitchell & Finkelhor, 2006).

Instant Messaging: It is a conversation between familiar people in the form of a simultaneous conversation with two or more people (Willard, 2007).

Phone: It can be used to disturb the person by calling or to wear them by sending messages, pictures, videos.

Chat Rooms: These conversations, which are made as written conversations at the same time, are open only to the people in the room. The person in the chat room can invite others to chat, exclude people they do not want or hide their identities (Bauman, 2007).

E-mail: It is a type of messaging that allows people of all ages to send messages simultaneously or asynchronously. It can be used as a bullying tool by sharing messages that have a negative impact on people (Bauman, 2007). E-mails can remain between the sender and the people sent. However, if the information sent is received by the third party, it causes it to be evaluated as a cyber bullying tool as an intervention in the private life of the person.

Social Network Sites: These are applications that allow individuals to share different profiles by creating their personal profiles. The fields and persons that the person wants to be seen on his page, depending on his permission; They maintain their social ties through applications in social networks such as facebook, myspace, orkut contact.

These applications used, sharing private life and personal information brought along the security problem. The reliability of individuals and institutions that can take part in social networks in online situations also adds a different dimension to the emerging problem (Durmuş, Kılıç, Yurtkoru & Ulus, 2010).

Blogs: These are web pages that their authors share by creating a title and content on the topics they want. An interactive environment can be created with comments through the articles written and the topics opened, and pictures, videos and various questionnaires can be added to blogs. This variety of use can whet the appetite

of the cyberbully and create an environment where individuals and groups can embarrass, mock or attack (Odabaşı, Kabakçı & Çoklar, 2007).

Forums: Forums are built on special topics and are asynchronous environments that enable people to talk and discuss these topics. Forums contain certain membership rules. While the usage environment is wider in the membership made by using nicknames and passwords, the usage without membership is more limited (Odabaşı, Kabakçı & Çoklar, 2007).

Web sites: Web sites are created by people or institutions bringing together content such as photographs, texts, pictures. In order to be published, it is necessary to get a hosting service (hosting), which includes the storage of the site and data such as pictures and music on the site on advanced computers called servers. Unauthorized use of photographs, videos and texts belonging to individuals and sharing any documents that are harmful to the person in an inappropriate manner and using this situation as an advertising material by turning this situation into corrosive contents can be defined as cyberbullying (Odabaşı, Kabakçı & Çoklar, 2007).

2.3.4. Prevalence of cyber bullying

Today, about half of the world's population (43%) uses the internet for various purposes (Internet World Stats, 2014). More than two billion internet users interact socially with others using the internet. This interaction is provided through famous websites, especially young people are also members. To that end, the majority of young people in North America today are My Space.com, Xanga.com, and Facebook. He uses websites such as com extensively (Arıcak, 2011). In Turkey, which actively use social networking sites, half of the population (WDS 2015); It is observed that three quarters (78%) of internet users use the internet to join social groups (Facebook, Twitter)

(TURKSTAT, 2014). The widespread use of the internet and the fact that the internet has become an important part of the communication and interaction process brings with it the risk of facing a cyber-attack at any time. Findings obtained from researches on the subject in many countries show that this risk can reach a level that cannot be ignored.

In a study conducted by Ybarra and Mitchell (2004) on children and adolescents between the ages of 10 and 17 who regularly use the internet in the United States of America, approximately one-fifth of the participants were involved in cyberbullying in some way; It has been revealed that 4% are cyber victims, 12% are cyberbullies and 3% are bullies / victims. In another study conducted on a total of 3767 students studying in the 6th, 7th and 8th grade in order to determine the prevalence of cyberbullying among middle school students, it was found that 11% of the students were exposed to cyberbullying at least once in the last few months; 4% was bullied; 7% of them were found to be both bullies and victims (Kowalski & Limber, 2007).

According to the answers given to the questionnaire prepared to determine the prevalence and nature of cyber bullying by 384 young people aged 18 and under in a research conducted over the Internet; One tenth of the participants (11%) did cyberbullying; It has been revealed that more than a quarter (30%) of them suffered acts of cyberbullying such as being ignored, threatened, made fun of, or making up false news about them, and almost half (47%) of them witnessed cyberbullying (Patchin & Hinduja, 2006). Considering the average of the results of the research conducted by Hinduja and Patchin between 2007 and 2014 on the level of cyberbullying of middle school students, one fourth of the participants were cyberbullied at some point in their lives; It is seen that approximately one fifth of them are involved in cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2015: 74, 75).

In Canada, Mishna et al. (2010), according to the results of a study conducted on 2186 students studying at various levels of secondary and high schools, while approximately half of the students experienced cyber victimization; One third of them have been in cyberbullying on the internet. In another study examining the cyberbullying / victimization situations of 264 students studying at secondary school in the same country, it was found that one out of four students was cyberbullied, approximately one-fifth (17%) of the participants were cyberbullied using electronic tools, and more than half knew someone who was cyberbullied. (Li, 2006).

Zhou et al. According to the results of the study conducted by (2013) to determine the prevalence and risk factors of cyberbullying among 1438 students studying at secondary education institutions in China, one third (35%) of the students have been cyberbullying on the internet and more than half have been exposed to cyberbullying in the last five months. It remained. In addition, one fourth of the participants have both been cyberbullying and being bullied. Approximately two-fifths (37%) of the students said that one of their classes was cyberbullying; Four out of ten (40%) stated that one of their classmates was cyberbullied. Based on the results of this research, Zhou et al. (2013) states that cyberbullying is a common problem among high school students in China.

According to the results of the research conducted by Huang and Chou (2010) on students attending secondary school in Taiwan, more than half of the participants witnessed cyber bullying, one third (35%) were cyberbullied and one fifth demonstrated online bullying acts.

In a study conducted in Belgium, it is stated that the majority of the participants described cyberbullying as a big problem. According to the results of the research, one

tenth (11%) of the participants are cyber victims; one-fifth (18%) cyberbully; More than a quarter (28%) is the audience (Vandebosh & Van Cleemput, 2009). In the study conducted by Walvare and Heirman (2011) on 1318 students between the ages of 12 and 18 in the same country, it was revealed that one third (34%) of the students were cyber victims, and one fifth (21%) were cyberbullies.

In the study conducted by Williams and Guerra (2007) on 5632 students studying in 5th, 8th and 11th grades in Colorado, it was found that cyberbullying incidents are 9%. When the distribution by classes is examined, it is seen that bullying incidents are 5% in 5th graders, this rate rises to 13% in 8th graders and decreases to 10% in 11th graders. In parallel with the results of this research, Kowalski and Limber (2007) found in their study on secondary school students that 7th and 8th grade students participated in cyberbullying twice more than 6th grade students. Tokunaga (2010) states that the students who are most exposed to cyberbullying are the students studying in the 7th and 8th grades.

Kraft (2006); In his study, which summarizes the findings of the studies conducted to examine the prevalence and effects of cyberbullying in England, America, Canada and Austria, it reveals that the average of those who have experienced cyberbullying varies between 10% and 42%.

In Turkey, the prevalence of cyber-bullying, causes, and its relationship with different variables in order to explain the results of the day the number of investigations initiated since 2007 seems to be increased since then.

In a study conducted with the participation of 227 students between the ages of 14-19 in order to examine the prevalence of cyberbullying among high school students and whether the frequency of internet use is a determinant, it was revealed that more

than a quarter (30%) of the students were exposed to cyberbullying (Erdur-Baker & Kavşut, 2007).

Arıcak et al. (2008), in the study conducted to determine the prevalence of cyberbullying among adolescents, one third (35.7%) of 269 middle school students participating in the study did cyberbullying others; Close to a quarter (23.8%) are both bullies and victims; Less than one tenth (5.9%) was found to be just a victim.

In Arıcak's (2009) study to explain the relationship between cyberbullying and psychiatric symptoms and to find out which symptoms are the determinants of cyberbullying, approximately two-fifths (36.7%) of the 695 university students who participated in the study were exposed to cyberbullying, and one-fifth (17.7%) were both bullies. that he was both a victim; It was revealed that very few of them (2%) did cyberbullying.

In a study conducted by Burnukara (2009) to examine the relationship between traditional bullying and cyberbullying, it was found that one tenth (10%) of 608 students attending secondary and high school were exposed to cyberbullying in various environments, and very few (5.8%) were cyberbullying. In another study conducted on the same subject, one tenth (12.6%) of 276 students between the ages of 14-19 were cyberbullies; one-fifth (19.5%) cyber victim; and one fifth (21.1%) was revealed to be both a bully and a victim (Erdur-Baker, 2010).

In a study conducted to reveal the relationship between the individual's psychological needs and cyberbullying experiences, it was found that one fifth (22.5%) of the university students participating in the study were cyberbullied, and more than half (55.3%) were cyberbullied (Dilmaç, 2009).

Yılmaz (2011), in his study to examine the cyberbullying experiences of students, found that approximately one fifth (16.9%) of the 756 students studying in the 7th grade were cyberbullied, and very few (6.4%) were cyberbullying.

In the study conducted by Özdemir and Akar (2011) to examine the views of high school students on cyberbullying according to some variables, approximately one seventh (14%) of the 336 students participating in the study had been cyberbullied in the last month, and one tenth (10%) had been cyberbullying.

In a study conducted by Ayaş and Horzum (2012) to determine the prevalence of cyberbullying and cyber victimization among middle school students, approximately one fifth (18.6%) of the 413 students participating in the study were exposed to cyberbullying; One tenth (11.6%) was found to be cyberbullying.

In a study conducted by Serin (2012) to examine the cyberbullying and victimization experiences of adolescents and the level of awareness of teachers and administrators regarding these behaviors, it was found that one tenth (11.7%) of 4291 students studying at secondary school experienced cyberbullying; It was revealed that approximately one tenth (9.4%) did cyber bullying.

In the study conducted by Baştürk-Akça, Sayımer, and Ergül (2015) to examine adolescents' social media use and cyberbullying experiences, one tenth (9.5%) of 200 students studying in the 7th and 8th grade were cyberbullied, and very few were only cyberbullies. It turned out to be a bully (7%) and a cyber victim / bully (7.5%).

When the various countries and the findings of research on cyber-bullying cases examined in Turkey; It can be argued that cyberbullying and victimization are experienced at various levels of educational institutions at a level that cannot be ignored and is an important problem. This situation reveals that various measures should be

taken by families, teachers, school administrators and other authorities in order to solve the problem.

2.3.5. Causes of cyber bullying

There are many reasons for cyberbullying. It has been determined that the most important reason for cyberbullying of young people is gaining high social status. Gaining more likes by making cyber bullying actions to others can provoke more people. This can be in a way of making fun of other people's visual features or writing. Some individuals exhibit cyberbullying in order to attract attention to them in the internet environment (Berne et al., 2014: 529; Navarro & Serna, 2016: 205; Faucher et al., 2014: 3-6). In this case, social status is obtained by gaining followers and likes in the virtual world. Another reason for cyberbullying is to attack people on the internet with the feeling of revenge. The purpose of the attack can be completely dependent on the psychological state of the person, or it can be caused by any previous experience.

The reasons for cyberbullying include entertaining oneself and others, taking revenge, blackmail, having a bad personality, feeling superior to others, being jealous, experiencing disharmony at school, and experiencing psychological maladjustment (Navarro & Serna, 2016: 205).

Students get angry with the feeling of rejection due to their romantic breakups and retaliate with cyberbullying. When two students who are interested in each other first enter into a romantic relationship and one of the parties quit or no longer continue the relationship, the feeling of harming the other person can be motivated on the internet. Another reason for cyberbullying is due to hostility. A student or person is attracted to the opposite sex and expresses his feelings to him. If the opposite sex person does not want to, he may feel hostile to the other party due to the feeling of rejection or

neglect. In order to get rid of the feeling of rejection or being ignored, they can make damaging and hostile attacks on the other party via internet or phone (Hoff & Mitchell, 2009: 655; Selkie et al., 2018). Since the researches are generally carried out on schools, cyberbullying situations are transferred to students privately. The same situations are not only valid for students, but also for other age groups.

Another reason is the feeling that begins with envy and turns into jealousy. Especially students have a feeling of envy towards their friends who are popular in their class or at the event. This feeling of envy can turn into jealousy over time when you are ignored within the group or class. In this case, cyberbullying can be done against the popular person (Felmlee & Faris, 2016: 249; Navarro & Serna, 2016: 205; Hoff & Mitchell, 2009: 655). This is not just the case at school or at an event. It is very likely to be in the ordinary course of life. Cyberbullying is done through anonymous accounts, especially in such cases of jealousy.

Another reason for cyberbullying is intolerance. Cyberbullies often engage in such behaviors about victims in order to make themselves happier towards them, to show themselves superior to others, to emphasize that victims are retarded, or to induce feelings of pain, fear, sadness, social isolation, incapacitation. It has also been observed in some studies that cyberbullying is done with deeper prejudices. A study has shown that cyber bullying is also exhibited based on sexual preference, religion-based prejudices and disability (Hoff & Mitchell, 2009: 656; Jenaro, 2018: 269; Navarro & Serna, 2016: 205).

Another question to ask about cyberbullying is why do people display negative behaviors that they do not or cannot do in the real world while using the internet or

other technologies? When the reasons for this are examined, some of them are (Arıcak, 2015; Joinson, 1998; Willard, 2007;);

While using the internet or technology, people feel that “you cannot see me”. People experience the perception that they are invisible while using the internet. This perception is further enhanced by using anonymous accounts or fake accounts. People are not invisible, all their activities and movements on the internet can be monitored. However, when people think that they are invisible on the internet, concerns about perception, approval and punishment disappear (Willard, 2007: 7). As a result of all these, people engage in many wrong and problematic behaviors in the virtual world.

Another reason why behaviors that are not done in the real world are performed on the internet or on the phone is that the feeling that “I cannot see you is dominant”. People do not receive concrete feedback on the consequences of these behaviors while using the internet, including actions that hurt someone. The lack or absence of feedback hinders empathy. This creates the perception that bad behavior does not harm (Willard, 2007: 8).

Another reason why some wrong behaviors are displayed in the internet environment instead of being done in the real world is the approach that “everyone does”. “Everyone is doing” approach, perception of invisibility and lack of concrete feedback support and increase risky and problem-free social norms on the internet (Willard, 2007: 8).

In addition, the following approaches cause behaviors that are not done in the real world to be done on the internet;

“Life and behavior on the Internet is just a game.”

"Look at me, I'm a star."

"I am the one who exists on the Internet."

"Things done on the internet stay on the internet."

"I have the right to act freely to write or publish anything I want regardless of the damage that may be done to someone else on the Internet" (Willard, 2007: 8).

Studies show that many young people who commit cyberbullying cannot adequately think about the negative consequences that will arise. To find the underlying causes of cyberbullying, it is necessary to look at more impulsive reasons. The main motives for cyberbullying are the desire to hurry, impatience, and seek excitement. A person who wants to commit cyberbullying impulsively feels light, imaginary or really revenge on the other side (victim, victim) in a hurry.

When looking at the reasons for cyberbullying, the literature generally goes through students. In some sources, student expressions are given without any intervention. However, the mentioned reasons for cyberbullying are thought to cover all age groups. There are few studies in the literature that support this prediction.

2.3.6. The effects of cyber bullying on victims

In the studies (Kowalski et al., 2008; Lenhart, 2007; Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007; Varjas, Talley, Meyers, Parris & Cutts, 2010) the causes of cyberbullying; entertainment, revenge, feeling bad, aiming to gain control over others, striving to gain respect among friends, enjoying acting aggressively, low probability of being caught, having the opportunity to hide their identity in the virtual environment and not having to communicate face-to-face with the victim, the chance to avoid taking responsibility for their actions boredom, jealousy, desire to try something new, want to behave aggressive

phantasies that cannot be expressed in real life, and directing anger towards other individuals to the victim.

Uncontrolled behaviors such as cyberbullying can cause serious problems in individuals' normal lives and impair their quality of life (Seçkin, 2017: 82). On the one hand, it is stated that cyberbullying does not cause physical harm to the victim, so it is not as harmful as traditional bullying (Anderson & Sturm, 2007), on the other hand, it is stated that the harmful consequences caused by cyberbullying are more than traditional bullying (Willard, 2007). The reasons for this are:

- Online communication can be extremely immoral.
- Cyberbullies can be bullied anywhere online.
- The material used in cyberbullying can be distributed around the world and is often irreversible.
- Cyber bullies can be anonymous, and by asking other friends to become bullies, they can also cause others to be bullies (Willard, 2007).

When the family relationships of cyber victims were examined, it was seen that 44% of them had weak family relationships and insufficient emotional ties. The formation of self-protection motives in the victims triggers the behavior of carrying guns or the desire to be absent at school. Alcohol use or withdrawal starts in the victims. Cyber bullies, on the other hand, have been found to be able to perform actions such as substance use and damaging the personal belongings of others. While those who frequently display cyberbullying behavior are more irregular, those who occasionally bully follow the rules more. People who display aggressive behaviors in daily life are also more likely to commit cyberbullying (Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004).

It is observed that cyber bullying and victimization are in close relationship with people who do not have strong relationships with family members and internet usage where parental control is inadequate. It is observed that cyberbully and victims use the internet for at least 3 hours, 12% of regular internet users are cyberbullies, 4% are cyber victims and 3% are cyberbullies and victims. The actions taken by breaking users' passwords and entering their accounts can have a much more destructive effect on the victim. The fact that the actions reach large masses paves the way for a series of degrading events such as the individual's attempt to self-laundering after making false statements as if they were spoken (Vandebosch & Van Cleemput, 2009).

The time spent on the internet in online spaces increases the likelihood of being a cyber victim. Victims may experience emotional stress in interpersonal relationships. The fact that the cyberbully is an adult, making requests from the victim (asking for a photo, asking for private information about the victim, etc.) are factors that increase the stress level of the victim (Ybarra, Mitchell, Wolak & Finkelher, 2006).

These situations, which cyber victims are exposed to, have been observed to cause clinical problems such as depression, panic attack anxiety disorders, as well as panic fear, sadness, and general anxiety. Not knowing who the cyberbully is also drives the victim to skepticism (Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007).

Studies show that cyberbullying increases the anxiety level of victims, causes students to deteriorate their classes and to be absent. If the cyberbully has gained the upper hand, the victim feels even more helpless.

Traditional bullying also increases the chances of a person becoming a cyberbully. Likewise, the fact that traditional victimization increases the possibility of

being a cyber victim 2.5 times has led to studies that certain personality traits show certain behaviors in different environments.

Students' positive perception of the school climate and high school attendance will also reduce their involvement in cyberbullying. It was observed that the family relationships of cyber victims were weakened, their communication skills were interrupted, and their introversion increased (Wolak, Mitchell & Finkelhor, 2007). Li (2007) concluded in his study that the academic success of cyber victims is higher than cyber bullies.

2.4. Cyberbullying Coping Strategies

Studies show that they are exposed to cyberbullying; It shows that victims who are affected emotionally, psychologically, socially, academically and physically at various levels use various methods to avoid being bullied or to end the behaviors of the cyber bully.

In the research conducted by Patchin and Hinduja (2006), the strategies most frequently used by students experiencing cyberbullying are; telling the cyberbully to stop their bullying behavior (36.3%), running away from the environment where they were bullied (31.9%), telling their friends (25.7%); The least preferred methods are staying offline (19.5%) and informing the parents about being bullied (19.5%). In Li's (2010) study, nearly half of the victims (42.5%) preferred not to do anything; the other half of Patchin and Hinduja (2006) seem to use the coping methods revealed as a result of the research at different rates. In the study in question, it was revealed that the most used coping strategy is to escape from the cyberbully, and the least preferred method is to share the experience of cyberbullying with an adult. The findings of different studies conducted by the same researcher also show that the vast majority of students who are

subjected to cyberbullying do not tell anyone that they are bullied, and very few of them inform an adult (mother, father, teacher, school principal, etc.) of the situation (Li, 2007a; Li, 2007b; Li, 2008).

Agatston, Kowalski and Limber (2007) state that cyber victims follow ways such as preventing the bully or ignoring the messages they send, rather than responding to the behavior of bullies with a sense of revenge. In addition, this research; It shows that the students are not very aware of how to help the victim when they witness cyberbullying behavior. Similar to the results of the study conducted by Huang and Chou (2010), although the number of witnesses of cyber bullying is higher than cyber bullies and victims; It appears that very few of them use any coping strategy to end cyberbullying. Among the reasons for this situation, the person who witnessed the bullying fears that he will be bullied when he reports the situation to someone, it is not right to intervene in the private lives of others, they do not have any friendship ties with the people involved in the bullying incidents, and they think that it is not their responsibility to intervene in such events. In addition, in this study, it is seen that cyber victims shared their cyber bullying mostly with their classmates, then with their siblings, parents, friends on the internet, and at least with their teachers.

Research findings of Slonje and Smith (2008); Half of the students (50%) did not tell anyone about their cyberbullying, one third (35.7%) told their friends about the situation, very little of them told their parents or caregivers (8.9%) and someone else (5.4%); It shows that none of the students participating in the study reported to any teacher that they were bullied. Students in the research; Cyberbullying by adults via text messages, e-mail and telephone is not as noticed as peer bullying; He states that the probability of detecting cyber bullying by sending pictures and videos is higher than through text message, e-mail and telephone.

According to the research conducted by Price and Dangleish (2010); Approximately one-fifth (71.4%) of the students exposed to cyberbullying prevent the bully, close to half of them remove the bully from their friends list (45.9%) or face the bully in real life (44.2%), one third tell the situation to their friend (39.4%) or stay offline (32.3%); one in four tells their parents or caregivers (29.4%), share the situation with their teacher / school principal (24.6%), change their phone number (23.2%) or do nothing (24.6%). The results of the aforementioned research revealed that approximately one tenth (9%) of the cyber victims reported their cyber bullying to the child helpline.

Arıcak et al. (2008) in his research on middle school students; Adolescents stated that if they encounter cyberbullying, they will use methods such as blocking messages from the bully, asking them to end their bullying behavior, telling their friends that they are being bullied, sharing the situation with their parents, and changing their usernames. Students' least preferred methods of dealing with cyberbullying are, respectively, ignoring the cyberbully, not sharing the bullying with anyone and not telling the situation to their teachers. In another study on the subject, the least preferred method to prevent cyber victimization is to notify the parents of being bullied, then close the account they were bullied and respond to the cyber bully by bullying, and the most preferred method is to the administrator of the site where they are bullied. It was revealed that there was a complaint (Sezer et al., 2013).

The research findings of Ayaş and Horzum (2012) show that most of the students who are victims of cyber bullying do not tell anyone about their cyber bullying (33.6%), a quarter of them tell their close friends (23.4%), and then to their parents (16.3%), boys or girls, respectively. It shows what they said to their siblings (13.2%), to the class or counselor (8.2%), to someone else (3%) and to the principal or vice

principals (2%). In parallel with the findings of this research, Topçu et al. (2008), the victims generally told their friends, then their families, school counselors and other teachers, and at least to the principal; It was revealed that close to one fourth of the participants in the study did not mention anyone about their being bullied.

Research results show that the various strategies used by victims to cope with cyberbullying are classified by researchers in different ways.

Riebel, Jager and Fischer (2009), in their research, the strategies used by victims to cope with cyberbullying; Seeking help from family, friends and teachers in the face of cyberbullying is social; Responding to bullying behavior in the same way, physical assault and threats are aggressive; passive reactions such as despair and keeping away from the bully are helpless; He stated that why use, analyzing the behavior of the bully and the incident of bullying are cognitive coping strategies.

Parris, Varjas, Meyers and Cutts (2012) categorize cyberbullying strategies under three headings: reactive strategies, preventive strategies, and doing nothing. Reactive coping methods; Preventive coping methods include avoiding the environment where bullying occurs, accepting that bullying is a part of life, finding reasons for bullying not to disturb him and asking someone for help, while preventive coping methods include preferring face-to-face communication and increasing security measures in the virtual environment.

According to Sleglova and Cerna (2011), coping strategies with cyberbullying; It consists of technical coping, activities targeting cyberbullying, avoidance, defensive strategies and social support. Technical coping, blocking the bully or complaining the cyberbully to the admin of the page; activities targeting the cyberbully, their reactions to the bully, threatening the victim to tell the bully the incident to the authorities; stay out,

not responding to messages or calls from the bully, deleting or temporarily neutralizing risky sources of online danger; defensive strategies, diverting attention to different activities such as sports instead of cyberbullying; social support includes the victim sharing his / her cyberbullying with his / her parents, friends, teachers or someone else.

2.5. Related Research

In this part of the study, studies on cyberbullying roles, cyberbullying behaviors, online communication tools used in cyberbullying behavior, the prevalence and consequences of cyberbullying and cyberbullying sensitivity are included. Finally, studies examining the relationship between cyber victimization and sensitivity together have been tried to be conveyed.

2.5.1. Research on cyberbullying roles

Considering the studies examining the roles of students in the cyberbullying process, a study conducted on 3767 middle school students found that 22% of the students were involved in online bullying, 4% were bullies, 11% were victims, and 7% were bullies / victims (Kowalski & Limber, 2007). In another study conducted with 2186 secondary and high school students, 24% of the students stated that they were victimized, 8% bullied others, and 26% stated that they were both bullies and victims (Mishna, Khoury-Kassabri, Gadalla & Daciuk, 2012). In another study conducted on 1501 people between the ages of 10-17 who regularly use the internet, it was concluded that 19% of the participants were involved in online aggression (Smith et al., 2012). 12% of them were bullies, 4% were victims, and the remaining 3% were both victims and victims of bullying. In a study conducted by Arıcak (2009) with 695 university students, 20% of the students stated that they had cyberbullied at least once in their life, and 54% stated that they were victims of cyber at least once. While the rate of pure

cyber bullies calculated from these rates is 2%, 37% are reported as pure cyber victims and 17% as cyberbully-victims. In another study conducted with university students, 14% of the participants were cyberbully, 11% cyber victim, 33% cyberbully / victim category, while 42% did not fall into any category (Kokkinos, Antoniadou & Markos, 2014). As can be seen in the researches, there is a risk of encountering certain dangers as a result of being online.

2.5.2. Research on cyberbullying behavior

Finkelhor, Mitchell, and Wolak (2001) conducted a study with 10-17-year-old teenagers who regularly use the internet when examining the types of behavior that cyberbullies harm the victim. In the study, 19% of the youth reported that they received unwanted sexual harassment requests, 25% received online sexual materials, 3% received aggressive messages, 6% reported that they received threats, gossip or other aggressive messages and were exposed to bullying. Hinduja and Patchin (2010) stated in a study they conducted with 2000 middle school students that 23% of the students posted posts about someone else to make others laugh, and 12% sent someone else's picture without permission. In the same study, 18% of students stated that they received upsetting e-mails from someone they knew, 10% from people they did not know, 16% received instant messages that upset them, 10% were teased in chat rooms, 9% were about themselves on their web pages. 9% stated that there were bad posts about themselves, and they did not want others to see (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010). In a study of 1431 adolescents aged 12-17, the most common behaviors people encountered were excluding their classmate from an online group (20%), spreading jokes, rumors, gossip, embarrassing messages about their classmate (20%), sending links to such comments to others (17%). In addition, hijacking the victim's account (18%) in order to send

messages that would cause the victim to be in a difficult situation was another behavior that the victims encountered (Calvete et al., 2010). In a study conducted with middle school students, these behaviors of students who were bullied, exposed to bullying, and witnessed bullying were threatened or harassed, joking, having fun, and spreading gossip (Huang & Chou, 2010).

In a study conducted with university students, victimized students were treated like friends (31%), poems, praises, greetings, etc. in order to obtain personal information. messages (33%), exaggerated messages (28%), sexually explicit messages (23%), and insulting messages (13%), such as having a close relationship with the victim (Walker, Sockman & Koehn, 2011). In another study conducted with university students, the most common examples of victimization are; abusive e-mails or messages (81.1%), receiving religious or political messages (63.9%), being invited to chat applications with gossip or inappropriate content (63.5%), encountering swearing or slang while using instant messaging programs (61.8%)), receiving obscene e-mails (61.8%), encountering people who hide their identity while communicating (61.7%) and receiving unwanted messages (61.4%) (Akbulut & Erişti, 2011). In the same study, the most common behaviors of cyberbullying participants; Blocking people from instant messaging programs (42.8%), inviting them to chat applications with gossip or inappropriate content (34.7%), sending religious or political messages (25.6%), using swearing or slang language when using instant messaging programs (25.8%), It was reported that there were exclusion from online groups (25%) and anonymity (21.6%).

A study conducted with 430 university students showed that the most common bullying was gossip and malicious comments via SMS, and the least frequent bullying was masking oneself using someone else's computer or cell phone. In terms of victims, the most frequently reported behavior was writing about themselves on the internet that

others would not want to see, while the least frequently reported behavior was mocking by transmitting videos or pictures of the person online (Kokkinos, Antoniadou & Markos, 2014). In another study conducted with university students, it was found that the most common behaviors of bullies were sending bad messages to upset the other person with 23%, talking about the person to make them funny and ridiculous with 12%, and sending threatening messages with 9%. In the same study, behaviors such as pretending to learn someone else's secret, sharing other people's secrets on Facebook, acting like someone else on Facebook to obtain personal and sensitive information of others were reported as the least common (less than 10% of the participants) (Kokkinos, Baltzidis & Xynogala, 2016).

In a study conducted with 249 university students, 10.8% of the students were bullied while 24.5% experienced victimization. While the majority of bullying behavior was capturing social media accounts and posting on behalf of that person, the behavior most frequently encountered by victims was exposure to obscene messages (Selkie, Kota & Moreno, 2016). In another study conducted with university students, most of the students faced electronic harassment and insults on social networks. 15.7% of them received constant frightening e-mails for a week, 14% received frightening calls from people who knew them on social networks, 15.3% were harassed. In the same study, however, in the one month before the survey, 14.2% of the participants stated that they sometimes or often published annoying information about others, 23.6% sent e-mails to others with content that was harmful to that person, 6% - reported that he sent mails (Kamali, 2015). In another study, 38.73% of 386 university students were disturbed by missed calls, 36.97% were humiliated, humiliated, humiliated and exposed to verbal attacks, 14.45% were exposed to threats and intimidation, 12.23% were distributed their photographs. These behaviors were followed by identity theft along with cyberbullying

(6.30%), blackmail (5.71%), distributing their videos (2.49%), and distributing their voices (1.97%) (Kopecky, 2014). Looking at the behaviors performed and exposed to in the online environment, it is possible to see that all kinds of behaviors that can cause psychological harm to the individual, independent of the physical environment, can be seen.

2.5.3. Research on online communication tools used in cyberbullying

Looking at the studies on cyberbullying tools preferred by bullies after bullying behaviors and cyberbullying environments where victims are exposed to bullying behavior, online bullying is more common in some online environments. In Kopecky's (2014) study, SMS (49.3%), social networks (39.35%), chat room (18.06%), e-mail (11.61%), blogs and websites (3.23%) were the most common platforms for verbal attacks. It has been identified. The environments and behaviors of victimization in a study conducted with university students; verbal attack during online play (10%), sending gossip or abusive content via email or text message (23.5%), exclusion from a social network or chat room (19.4%), verbal attack via text message or email or threat (18.6%) and finally taking the person's account (8.3%) (Gianesini & Brighi, 2015). In a study about the tools used in cyberbullying, internet users; 66% of recent events on a social networking site or application, 22% in the comments section of a website, 16% in online gaming, 16% in personal e-mail accounts, 10% in discussion sites, 6% of them stated that it took place on a dating site (Pew Research Center, 2014).

471 university students participated in the study carried out by Kraft and Wang (2010) to determine the prevalence and types of cyberbullying experienced by university students. The victim students most often; text message (43%), mobile phones (39%), instant messaging (37%), e-mail (35%), Facebook (22%), chat rooms (11%),

web pages (9%) and other They were bullied through social networking sites (7%). In a study conducted with female university students, 73% of the bullied students were instant messaging, 31.8% text message, 30.4% e-mail, 26% chat rooms, 26% social networks, 17.4% They stated that they faced bullying through online games (Kowalski et al., 2015). In a study involving adults over the age of 18, 70% of the victims stated that they were victims through social networking sites, 50% via instant messaging, 49% via e-mail, and 44% via mobile phones (Kowalski, Toth & Morgan, 2018). As can be seen, actively used technological communication tools have also been preferred tools in bullying.

2.5.4. Research on the prevalence of cyberbullying

When the prevalence of bullying incidents was examined by gender, some researchers found that women (Campfield, 2008; Marcum, Higgins, Freiburger, & Ricketts, 2012), others more cyber bullying (Arıcak, 2009; Dilmaç, 2009; Erdur-Baker & Kavşut, 2007, Antoniadou & Markos, 2014), while others state that the incident of bullying does not differ according to gender (Beran & Li, 2005; Calvete et al., 2010; Kamali, 2015). Hinduja and Patchin (2008) stated that 18% of men and 16% of women harm others online. It was reported that 32% of the students who experienced cyber victimization were male and 36% were female (Hinduja & Patchin, 2008). Bauman, Toomey, and Walker (2013) reported that men are three times more likely to be cyberbullies. In the study, it was reported that men are more engaged in bullying than women (Bauman, Toomey, & Walker, 2013). In another study report, it was stated that while men are more bullied than women, women are more victims (Mishna et al., 2012). Campfield (2008) and Marcum et al. (2012) reported that women do more cyberbullying than men. The reason for this was stated as the ability of women to prefer

indirect aggression such as continuous rejection of peers and social exclusion rather than physical aggression in expressing their emotions (Campfield, 2008; Crick, 1996; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995).

Calvete et al. (2010) conducted a study with 1431 adolescents between the ages of 12-17 and observed differences between boys and girls in bullying behaviors according to gender. 0.4% of the girls recorded the humiliating images of their classmates versus 2% of the boys, 0.4% of the girls compared the 2.14% of the boys distributed the images of the attacks (Calvete et al., 2010). In another study conducted with middle school students, it was concluded that male students have a higher average of cyber bullying and victimization experiences than female students (Huang & Chou, 2010). In another study with a similar result, it was concluded that girls have more experience, excitement, thoughtless, irresponsible and emotionless behaviors compared to girls, while girls have more cognitive empathy, emotional response, and interpersonal sensitivity (Kokkinos, Antoniadou & Markos, 2014).

In another study conducted with university students, boys had a higher average than girls in terms of narcissism, computer and internet use skills, and Facebook bullying (Kokkinos, Baltzidis & Xynogala, 2016). At the point of Facebook bullying, boys have more negative behaviors than girls. 48% of males and 30% of females have bullied on Facebook. The most common behavior in both boys and girls was sending unsightly messages to others (male: 28.8%, female: 19.7%). However, another type of behavior that men do most frequently in Facebook bullying is talking about people in order to make others funny, while for women, it is the deliberate exclusion of the individual from any Facebook group (Kokkinos, Baltzidis & Xynogala, 2016). In another study conducted with university students, 57% of cyber bullying students were girls, while 43% were boys. 58% of the cyberbully / victim students were girls and 42%

were boys (Schenk, Fremouw, & Keelan, 2013). In a study conducted by Chapell et al. (2006) in which 119 university students participated, 72% of 25 students who were exposed to bullying at the university were also exposed to bullying in middle school and high school. It is also stated that 54% of 26 bully students are bullied in middle school and high school. 42% of the 12 students who were both bullies and victims were both bullies and victims in secondary school and high school. In the study, it was observed that students who are cyberbully, cyber-victim or both cyberbully and cyber victim tend to repeat their situation from early school years to university (Chapell et al., 2006; Guan et al., 2016).

2.5.5. Research on the consequences of cyberbullying

Cyberbullying causes many problems in psychological, behavioral and social, academic fields. Beran and Li (2005) stated in their study that more than half of the victims of cyberbullying (57%) felt angry in response, and approximately one third (36%) felt sadness and pain. Ybarra and Mitchell (2004) found that there is a significant relationship between being a cyber victim and being a cyberbully and psychological and social problems such as problematic behavior, low school engagement, alcohol use, smoking, and depressive symptoms. In addition, Ybarra and Mitchell (2007) reported in another study that prolonged bullying leads to an increase in behavioral problems such as aggression, breaking rules, and introverted depression. Patchin and Hinduja (2006) stated in their study that young victims felt angry (42.5%), angry (39.8%), sad (27.4%) after being bullied. Kraft and Wang (2010) show that the emotional situations experienced by cyber victims; reported that anger (72%), frustration (63%), sadness (52%), pain (48%), shame (39%), anxiety (37%), depression (15%) and suicidal ideation (2%). .

In a study conducted by Beran et al. (2012) with university students, university students who were cyberbullied; They stated that they experienced problems such as anger, sadness, hurt, embarrassment, worry, fear, crying, self-blame, attention problems, low academic achievement and school absenteeism. In the studies of Schenk and Fremouw (2012), cyberbullying behaviors showed some negative effects on victims such as frustration (46.2%), stress (40.9%), sadness and hurt (37.9%), anger (33.8%), attention problems (23.4%). It has been found to cause effects. In Arıcak's (2009) study to examine the relationship between cyberbullying and psychological symptoms, those who did not commit and were not bullied showed significantly lower hostile feelings, depression and anxiety symptoms than naive victims and bully / victims.

In a study conducted by Faucher, Jackson, and Cassidy (2014) with university students, they concluded that bullying has some negative effects on students. Emotional or physical security threats (39%), productivity, confidence anxiety, attention problems (41%), thought of leaving the university (14%), inability to attend classes (17%), friendships affected at university (27%), individual relationships outside the university situations such as being affected (41%) showed itself. In addition, mental health problems such as anxiety, depression, emotional explosions (42%); physical health problems such as headache, stomach problems, nausea, heart palpitations, chest pain, sweating (26%); This has led to problems up to thoughts of self-harm or suicidal thoughts (14%) (Faucher, Jackson & Cassidy, 2014). In a study conducted with adults aged 18 and over, it was found that individuals exposed to cyber bullying tend to be depressed, have high social anxiety levels, have low self-esteem, and feel more lonely than those who do not experience bullying (Kowalski, Toth & Morgan, 2018).

In a survey conducted by the Cyber Civil Rights Initiative, 22.5% of 1606 people stated that they experienced sexual victimization online. There have been some problems experienced by victims after suffering victimization (Franks, 2015). These:

93% of them suffer serious emotional sadness,

82% of them experience deterioration in social, professional and other living areas,

42% received psychological support,

34% of them that family relationships are in danger,

38% of them that their relations with their friends are in danger,

13% of them lost an important friend / relative,

54% of them had difficulty focusing on school,

54% of them are afraid that the materials shared online about them will be discovered by their family and children,

51% thought of committing suicide,

55% of those who have started their professional life are afraid that their professional reputation may be damaged,

25% of them had to get a new e-mail account because of harassing, abusive, obscene messages,

26% opened a new account online,

26% of them had to take a break from school,

6% stated that they were expelled from school.

As seen in the studies, cyberbullying can cause serious harm in many areas from daily and academic life to business life.

2.5.6. Research on cyberbullying sensitivity

When looking at the studies on sensitivity to cyberbullying; Aktürk (2015) concluded in his study with high school students that the participants have high cyberbullying sensitivity. In the study, it was determined that female students ($\bar{x}=34.95$) have more cyberbullying sensitivity than male students ($\bar{x}=31.98$). In addition, a positive relationship was found between academic achievement and cyberbullying sensitivity in the study. In a study conducted with secondary school students, it was aimed to measure the relationship between students' human values and their sensitivity to cyberbullying and cyberbullying. Human values model in the research that 173 middle school students participated; It includes tolerance, honesty, respect, being peaceful, friendship and responsibility sub-variables. As a result of the research, while the most effective variable on cyberbullying sensitivity was respect, this variable was followed by the variables of being peaceful, friendship and responsibility. The researchers stated that the increase in respect, being peaceful, friendship and responsibility values can positively contribute to cyberbullying sensitivity. In addition, it was seen in the study that the increase in the values of being peaceful, honest and cyberbullying sensitivity negatively affected cyberbullying (Dilmaç, Yurt, Aydın & Kaşarcı, 2016). In another study conducted with secondary school students, the sensitivity level of 311 students participating in the study was determined to be $\bar{x}=20.24$ out of 42, and it was observed that students did not have sufficient knowledge and awareness about cyberbullying (Şentürk & Bayat, 2016). In the study, it was stated that

although the average sensitivity of female students was higher than that of male students, gender factor was not effective on cyberbullying sensitivity. In a thesis study conducted with high school students, it was found that female students ($\bar{x}=36.33$) had higher cyberbullying sensitivity scores than male students ($\bar{x}=33.86$) (Kınay, 2012).

Gezgin and Çuhadar (2012) conducted a research to examine cyberbullying sensitivities with students studying in the Department of Computer and Instructional Technologies Education (BÖTE) of the Faculty of Education. In the research conducted with the participation of 162 students, 30% of the students stated that they had been cyberbullied before, and 52% of them stated that they witnessed cyber bullying in their environment. However, it was concluded that the students have a high level of sensitivity ($\bar{x}=35.06$). In addition, the fact that female students ($\bar{x}=35.97$) have higher sensitivity towards cyberbullying than males ($\bar{x}=34.51$) is another result of the study.

In a similar study conducted with 217 pre-service teachers studying in the ICT department, pre-service teachers' cyberbullying sensitivities were examined in terms of various variables. The average cyberbullying sensitivity level of teacher candidates was calculated as $\bar{x}=36.227$ and this value showed that the sensitivity of the candidates towards cyberbullying is high. In the study, the sensitivity of teacher candidates to cyberbullying was not found to be statistically significant according to the variables of daily average internet use duration, frequency of using social networks, cyber victim / bully, and hiding their identity in the internet environment (Dikmen & Çağlar, 2017).

Uysal, Duman, Yazıcı and Şahin (2014) participated in a study conducted by teacher candidates to investigate their level of sensitivity towards cyberbullying, from a state university in the West Black Sea region. In the study, it was concluded that the sensitivity levels ($\bar{x} = 32.37$) of pre-service teachers towards cyberbullying were high.

In another study on sensitivity, the awareness of students in their first year of university on cyberbullying was examined. In the study in which 172 university students participated, the cyberbullying sensitivity mean ($\bar{x} = 33.98$) of the students was found to be quite high from the sensitivity scale regarding cyberbullying with a maximum score of 39 (Ata & Adnan, 2016). In another study, which tried to measure the cyberbullying awareness of the students of the Department of Management Information Systems according to gender, age and internet use, 174 people participated in the study, and there was no significant difference between cyberbullying awareness according to age and internet usage frequency. In the study, it was concluded that male students have more awareness than female students (Elçi & Seçkin, 2016).

In a study conducted by Lawler and Molluzzo (2015) with university students, students were asked whether they were aware of cyberbullying through an online questionnaire. While 91% of the participants stated that they were just aware, 52% stated that they believed that bullying on the internet is a serious problem for them. 92% of the students believe that cyberbullying is a simple mistake, while 72% of them think it is a violation of privacy. In addition, in the questionnaire about whether cyberbullying should be discussed in the Computer Technologies course, 76% of the students stated that they believe that it should be discussed (Lawler & Molluzzo, 2015). In another study, the relationship between the purposes of using Facebook and the level of sensitivity towards cyberbullying was examined. Research in Turkey in 1590 individuals who play online games social networking participated. The purposes of individuals to use Facebook were examined in three sub-dimensions. These; social relationships are in the form of work and daily work. As a result of the study, it was observed that individuals who use Facebook for working purposes have a high level of sensitivity towards cyberbullying and that individuals who use Facebook for daily work

have a low sensitivity to cyberbullying. In the sub-dimension of social relations, no significant difference was found according to the level of sensitivity towards cyber bullying (Doğan, Çaka & Şahin, 2016). Another study was conducted to examine the relationship between Anatolian High School students' cyberbullying sensitivity and cyber victimization levels (Nartgun, Uylas & Yerlikaya, 2016). In the study, in which 439 student data was valid, sensitivity scale for cyberbullying and cyber victimization scale were used to collect the data. A very weak negative correlation ($r = -.079$) was found between cyberbullying sensitivity and cyber victimization. However, this relationship was not significant. This situation showed that there is no relationship between students' cyberbullying sensitivity and their cyber victim status.

When looking at the studies on cyberbullying, it is possible to see bullying from primary school to university and even adults (Sevcikovâ & Smahel, 2009). The rate of these behaviors varies according to the sample selected and the definition of cyberbullying and the duration of the behavior (Kokkinos, Baltzidis & Xynogala, 2016; Lindsay & Krysik, 2012). However, it has been reported that students who experienced victimization or bullying before university also experienced victimization or bullied at university (Kraft & Wang, 2010). In a study by Chapell et al. (2006), it was concluded that students who are cyberbully, cyber-victim or both cyberbully and cyber-victim tend to repeat their situation from early school years to university. Similarly, 19% of individuals who faced bullying in high school also encountered this situation at university (Zalaquett & Chatters, 2014). Online environments present some problems and shortcomings for users, these are; These are harmful content from pages attacking the account of the person, such as encountering inappropriate content, lack of information about privacy settings online, sharing too much and false information about themselves, third party ad groups (Chadwick, 2014: 25). An effective way to prevent

this and many negative cyber behaviors should be to raise awareness of internet and mobile phone users about these behaviors and how to avoid these behaviors (Taiwo, 2015). Individuals who gain awareness and exhibit sensitive behavior in the way of taking precautions against external stimuli will suffer as little as possible from the harmful effects of the internet.



3.

METHODOLOGY

In this section, information about the purpose and importance of the study, its model, universe and sample, data collection tools, research questions and applied analyzes are given.

3.1. Purpose and Importance of the Research

In this study, the level of cyberbullying seen among high school students was determined by the students' gender, age, school, class, mother's education level, father's education level, monthly income of the family, own room at home, computer ownership at home, internet use environment, etc. It is aimed to examine how it changes according to various variables such as the time to start using the internet, the daily internet use time, the purpose of using the internet, the friend with whom he spends the most time, friendship relations and how he evaluates his spare time.

In addition, depending on the findings obtained as a result of the examination, it is aimed to offer suggestions to students, families, educators and administrators about the prevention, intervention and solution of cyberbullying behavior.

Today, information and communication technologies have become an indispensable element of human life. Acquiring new information, communicating with friends, making new friends and forming social relations and norms are realized with these technological tools (Dilmaç 2009; Eroğlu et al. 2011). Information communication technology brings many problems along with its positive contributions to human life. One of these problems is cyberbullying. Hinduja and Patchin (2009) defined cyberbullying as the persistent and repetitive use of computers, mobile phones

and other electronic devices to harm others. Adolescents who are exposed to cyberbullying can be adversely affected by this situation. Adolescents exposed to cyberbullying behaviors have serious problems such as deterioration in social relations, truancy, sadness, anger, anxiety, academic failure, school absenteeism, bringing a gun to school, loneliness, depression and suicide (Agatston et al. 2007; Arıcak 2011; Hinduja & Patchin 2009; Leaf et al. 2007; Raskauskas & Stoltz 2007; Willard 2007b).

Adolescents use social networks and social networking sites intensively in virtual environments, away from the control of their parents. In this context, it is necessary to determine the level of cyberbullying of high school students in adolescence and to carry out necessary preventive studies in this regard. It is thought that this study will make an important contribution to the literature in terms of drawing attention to the wrong behaviors of high school students in cyber (virtual) environments, raising awareness on this issue and carrying out preventive studies. In addition, depending on the findings obtained as a result of the research, it is expected to guide and be useful to students, teachers and researchers on how to prevent, intervene and deal with cyberbullying behavior.

3.2. Model of the Research

The aim of this study is to examine the nomophobia levels of 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th grade students studying in high school institutions according to some variables, and to determine the effects of cyberbullying on students and the strategies of students to cope with cyberbullying. For this reason, the survey model is based on the research.

The survey model is a research model used to determine the types of knowledge such as people's attitudes, beliefs, values, habits and thoughts (Mcmillan & Schumacher, 2001).

3.3. Universe and Sample of the Research

The universe of this research consisted of 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th grade high school students studying in Turkey. The sample of the study consists of 311 high school students who accepted the research and whose questionnaire was considered valid.

3.4. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

The demographic distribution characteristics of a total of 311 high school students who constitute the sample group of the study are given in Table 3.1.

When Table 3.1 is examined, 62.1% of the participant students are girls and 37.9% are boys. Considering the grade levels of the students, 33.1% are 9th grade, 19.9% are 10th grade, 23.8% are 11th grade and 23.2% are 12th grade.

When the education levels of the mothers of the students were examined, it was determined that the majority (37.9%) were primary school graduates. On the other hand, when the education level of their fathers is examined, it was determined that the majority (32.8%) were primary school graduates.

Table 1

Distribution of Participants' Socio-Demographical Characteristics

Variable	Group	n	%
Gender	Female	193	62.1
	Male	118	37.9
	Total	311	100.0
Class	9th grade	103	33.1
	10th grade	62	19.9
	11th grade	74	23.8
	12th grade	72	23.2
Mother Education Level	Illiterate	38	12.2
	Primary school graduate	118	37.9
	Secondary school graduate	86	27.7
	High school graduate	59	19.0
	Graduated from a University	10	3.2
Father Education Level	Illiterate	4	1.3
	Primary school graduate	102	32.8
	Secondary school graduate	94	30.2
	High school graduate	91	29.3
	Graduated from a University	20	6.4

The distribution of 311 participating high school students whether they have an electronic device or not is presented in Table 3.2. According to the table, 78.5% of the students have their own mobile phones, while 21.5% do not. While 22.2% of the students have their own tablet, 77.8% do not. Finally, 57.9% of the students have a computer at home, while 42.1% do not (Table 3.2).

Table 2

Distribution of Participants' Ownership of Electronic Devices (Phone, Tablet, Computer)

Variable	Group	n	%
Do you have your own cell phone?	Yes	244	78.5
	No	67	21.5
Do you have your own tablet?	Yes	69	22.2
	No	242	77.8
Do you have a computer at home?	Yes	180	57.9
	No	131	42.1

The daily internet usage times of the participant high school group students, their parental supervision and their forms are summarized in Table 3.3. According to Table 3.3, the majority of students (31.2%) spend 3-5 hours on the Internet, except for their

mobile phones. On the other hand, 22.5% spend 5-7 hours, 10.9% spend 7-9 hours and 17.0% spend more than 9 hours on the internet daily.

While 62.7% of the students are not supervised by their family members in terms of internet access time, 37.3% are supervised. On the other hand, 25.9% of the students who were under the supervision of their family members stated that they imposed a time limit on the games their family played. In addition, 16.4% stated that there is an internet entry-exit tracking schedule, 6.9% stated that a quota was applied to their internet, and 1.7% stated that the parental control window was activated. 49.1% of the students stated that they were kept under control by their families in other ways.

Table 3

Distribution of Participants' Internet Usage Status

Variable	Group	n	%
What is your daily internet usage time apart from your mobile phone?	1-3 hours	57	18.3
	3-5 hours	97	31.2
	5-7 hours	70	22.5
	7-9 hours	34	10.9
	more than 9 hours	53	17.0
Do your parents or any of your family elders control your internet access time? If your answer is yes;	Yes	116	37.3
	No	195	62.7
	Time is set for the games I play	30	25.9
	Internet entry and exit tracking schedule is applied	19	16.4
	quoting the internet	8	6.9
	Parental control window activated	2	1.7
	Other	57	49.1
	Total	116	100

3.5. Data Collection Tools

In the study, a four-step questionnaire was applied to the participants by using the personal information form created by the researcher, Nomophobia Scale (NS), Effects of Cyberbullying Scale (ECS) and Strategies for Coping with Cyberbullying Scale (SCCS).

In the personal information form, which was created to determine the general socio-demographic distribution profile of the students who constitute the research group in the first part of the questionnaire, the questions regarding the gender of the participants, their grade level, education levels of their parents, their possession of a personal mobile phone, tablet and computer, and their daily internet usage times.

In the second part of the questionnaire, there are expressions such as "Nomophobia Scale", "Effects of Cyberbullying Scale" and "Strategies for Coping with Cyberbullying Scale".

Nomophobia Scale (NS); Developed by Yıldırım and Correia (2015) to measure individuals' nomophobia scores, Yıldırım et al. (2015) adapted to Turkish. The said scale consists of 20 statements and four sub-dimensions. Sub dimensions; Inability to Access Information, Waiver of Comfort, Inability to Communicate, Loss of Online Connection. The scale consists of a 7-point Likert format (1.Strongly Disagree, 7.Strongly Agree). The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of NS was .94 in this study.

Effects of Cyberbullying Scale (ECS); In the research, a questionnaire developed by Özer (2016) was applied in order to determine the effects of cyberbullying on students who experienced victimization. The said scale consists of 23 statements. Scale scoring is 1: No; 2: partially; 3: Yes. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of ECS was found as .94 in this study.

Strategies for Coping with Cyberbullying Scale (SCCS); In the research, a questionnaire developed by Özer (2016) was applied in order to determine the strategies of students who were exposed to cyberbullying to cope with cyberbullying. The said scale consists of 23 statements. Scale scoring is 1: No; 2: Yes. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of SCCS was determined as .90 in this study.

3.6. Research Questions

In line with the purpose determined in the research, the following research questions were formed;

1. What is the level of nomophobia of high school students? Do students' nomophobia levels change according to their demographic characteristics?
2. Do students' exposure to cyberbullying change according to their demographic characteristics? Is there a significant difference in the level of cyberbullying according to demographic characteristics?
3. Do students' coping strategies with cyberbullying change according to their demographic characteristics? Is there a significant difference in the strategies of coping with cyberbullying used by students according to these demographic characteristics?
4. Is there a relationship between students' nomophobia levels, the effects of cyberbullying, and coping strategies with cyberbullying?

3.7. Data Analysis

While analyzing the data in the research, the SPSS 25.0 statistical package program was used. Frequency and percentage analyzes were used to determine the general profile of the students participating in the study, such as their gender, grade level, mother and father education levels, personal mobile phones, tablets and computers, their daily internet usage times and the status of being supervised by their family members. Moreover, using descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation) according to the data obtained from the NS, ECS and SCCS used in the study, It was aimed to determine the general profile of the participants.

As a result of the normality analysis, it was determined that the scores obtained from the scales differed significantly from the normal distribution. Therefore, the analysis was continued with non-parametric tests. Table 3.4 shows the normality test results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov.

Table 4

Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Normality

		NS	ECS	SCCS
Gender	Female	.047	.000	.000
	Male	.049	.000	.000
Class	9th grade	.200	.000	.000
	10th grade	.062	.054	.059
	11th grade	.052	.001	.029
	12th grade	.007	.004	.004
Mother Education Level	Not literate	.200	.001	.006
	Primary school graduate	.099	.000	.003
	Secondary education graduate	.014	.002	.182
	High school graduate	.200	.004	.081
	University graduate	.073	.200	.200
Father Education Level	Not literate	.403	.007	.574
	Primary school graduate	.200	.000	.068
	Secondary education graduate	.012	.000	.027
	High school graduate	.026	.000	.014
	University graduate	.043	.098	.200
Having a Computer at Home	Yes	.200	.000	.005
	No	.017	.000	.001
Having a Personal Mobile Phone	Yes	.000	.000	.000
	No	.039	.000	.001
Having a Personal Tablet	Yes	.009	.010	.094
	No	.069	.000	.000
Daily Internet Usage Time	Between 1-3 hours	.200	.000	.004
	Between 3-5 hours	.109	.000	.138
	Between 5-7 hours	.001	.021	.200
	Between 7-9 hours	.200	.001	.200
	More than 9 hours	.200	.002	.200
Supervision of Internet Access Time	Yes	.099	.000	.029
	No	.012	.000	.000

In the study, Mann Whitney U test was used for pairwise comparison and Kruskal Wallis H test was used for comparison of more than two groups. In these tests, the level of significance was tested based on .05.

Finally, correlation analysis was used to reveal the relationship between students' nomophobia levels, the effects of cyberbullying, and coping strategies with cyberbullying, which is the main theme of the study.



4.

FINDINGS

In this part of the study, the findings and hypothesis results obtained as a result of the analysis of the data belonging to the relevant research subject are given.

4.1. RQ1: What Is the Level of Nomophobia of High School Students? Do Students' Nomophobia Levels Change According to Their Demographic Characteristics?

The interpretation of the evaluation of high school students' nomophobia levels is summarized in Table 4.1. When the range of the average total score of the answers given by the students to the scale expressions in 7-point likert format is examined; if the total average score from the scale is 20, it indicates that there is no nomophobia level. On the other hand, between 21-60 is mild; between 60-100 indicates moderate and 100-140 indicates extreme nomophobia level.

When the nomophobia level of 311 high school students is examined; the average total score was found to be 76.88 ± 29.683 . Therefore, it was determined that the nomophobia level of 311 high school students, who constituted the study group of the research, was at a moderate level. In addition, while the minimum total score of my students is 20, the maximum total score is 140.

According to Table 4.1, the total mean value of the sub-dimension of inability to access information is 17.25 ± 6.852 , while the minimum total score of the sub-dimension is 4; the maximum is 28. While the total mean value of the sub-dimension of waiver of comfort was 18.51 ± 8.402 , the minimum total score of the sub-dimension was 5; the maximum is 35. The total mean value of the inability to communicate sub-

dimension is 25.29 ± 10.707 and the minimum total score of the sub-dimension is 6; the maximum is 42. Finally, the total mean value of the sub-dimension of losing online connection is 15.83 ± 9.034 , the minimum total score of the sub-dimension is 5; the maximum is 35.

Table 5

Mean and Standard Deviation Information of the Nomophobia Scale Sub-Dimension

Variables	n	$\bar{X}$	S.s	Min.	Max.
Sub-dimension 1. Inability to Access Information	311	17.25	6.85	4	28
Sub-dimension 2. Waiver of Comfort	311	18.51	8.40	5	35
Sub-dimension 3. Inability to Communicate	311	25.29	10.70	6	42
Sub-dimension 4. Losing Online Connection	311	15.83	9.03	5	35
Total	311	76.88	26.68	20	140

In Table 4.2 below, the descriptive analysis findings of the answers given by 311 high school students to the nomophobia scale statements are given. According to Table 4.2, the highest mean ($\bar{x} = 4.47 \pm 2.063$) of the answers given by high school students to the nomophobia scale statements is "11. If I don't have my smartphone with me, I would worry about my family and/or friends not being able to reach me", while the lowest mean ($\bar{x} = 2.95 \pm 2.025$) was 19. If I don't have my smartphone with me, I feel uneasy because I can't check my e-mails.

Table 6

Mean and Standard Deviation Results of Students' Nomophobia Expressions

Expressions	$\bar{X}$	S.s.	Min	Max
1. I feel uncomfortable when I am constantly unable to access information on my smartphone.	4.34	1.92	1	7
2. I get bored when I can't look up information on my smartphone whenever I want.	4.53	1.97	1	7
3. Not being able to access the news (for example, what's going on. weather and other news) on my smartphone makes me uneasy.	4.09	2.16	1	7
4. I get annoyed when I cannot use my smartphone and its features whenever I want.	4.29	2.13	1	7
5. I am afraid that my smartphone will run out of charge.	3.90	2.21	1	7
6. I panic when my credit (TL) runs out or when I exceed my monthly quota limit.	3.12	2.18	1	7
7. When my phone isn't picking up or I can't access the wireless	4.35	2.09	1	7

Internet connection, I constantly check for a signal or if I can find a wireless access connection.				
8. When I can't use my smartphone, I'm afraid I'll be stuck somewhere.	3.35	2.16	1	7
9. If I haven't been able to look at my smartphone for a while, I feel a strong urge to look at it.	3.79	2.16	1	7
10. If I don't have my smartphone with me, I worry about not being able to contact my family and/or friends right away.	3.99	2.06	1	7
11. If I don't have my smartphone with me, I worry that my family and/or friends cannot reach me.	4.47	2.06	1	7
12. If I don't have my smartphone with me, I feel uneasy because I won't be able to receive incoming calls and messages.	4.20	2.11	1	7
13. If I don't have my smartphone with me, I worry about not being in touch with my family and/or friends.	4.31	2.08	1	7
14. If I don't have my smartphone with me, I get nervous because I don't know if someone is trying to reach me.	4.22	2.06	1	7
15. If I don't have my smartphone with me, I feel uneasy because I will be disconnected from my family and friends.	4.09	2.10	1	7
16. If I don't have my smartphone with me, I'd be nervous about disconnecting from my online identity.	3.07	2.04	1	7
17. If I don't have my smartphone with me, I feel uncomfortable because I can't stay up to date on social media and other online networks.	3.17	2.05	1	7
18. If I don't have my smartphone with me, I feel awkward because I can't keep up with update notifications from my connections and online networks.	3.19	2.05	1	7
19. If I don't have my smartphone with me, I feel uneasy because I can't check my emails.	2.95	2.02	1	7
20. If I don't have my smartphone with me, I feel awkward because I won't know what to do.	3.45	2.16	1	7

In this section, it is aimed to examine the nomophobia levels of high school students in terms of their demographic characteristics.

The Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determine whether there was a significant difference in the nomophobia levels of high school students according to their gender. The analysis findings applied are presented in Table 4.3. According to Table 4.3, there was no statistically significant difference at the .05 significance level in terms of the mean total score and sub-dimensions of the gender variable on the nomophobia scale ($p > .05$).

Table 7

According to Gender Variable

Sub-dimension	Group	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Inability to Access Information	Female	193	157.68	30432.00	11063	.673
	Male	118	153.25	18084.00		
Waiver of Comfort	Female	193	159.16	30717.50	10777.5	.428
	Male	118	150.83	17798.50		
Inability to Communicate	Female	193	162.62	31386.00	10109.5	.096
	Male	118	145.17	17130.00		
Losing Online Connection	Female	193	156.91	30284.50	11210.5	.818
	Male	118	154.50	18231.50		
Total	Female	193	160.08	30896.00	10599	.306
	Male	118	149.32	17620.00		

The Kruskal Wallis H test was applied to determine whether the grade levels of the participating 311 high school students showed significant differences in terms of the total score of the nomophobia scale and its sub-dimensions. According to Table 4.4, at a significance level of .05, it was determined that the grade levels of the students caused a significant difference in terms of the nomophobia scale sub-dimension "inability to access information, waiver of comfort, and inability to communicate" and the total score of the scale ($p < .05$).

As a result of the analysis applied to determine from which grade level the significant difference originated, it was determined that the 11th and 12th grade students' inability to access information, waiver of comfort sub-dimension score and the average total score of the nomophobia scale were higher than the 9th grade students. Therefore, it can be said that the 11th and 12th grade students' inability to access information, renunciation of comfort and nomophobia levels are higher than 9th grade students. In addition, it was determined that 12th grade students' inability to access information sub-dimension score was higher than 10th grade students. Finally, it was determined that the 12th grade students' inability to communicate sub-dimension score was higher than the 9th grade students.

It can be said that as the grade levels of the students increase, the level of nomophobia also increases.

Table 8

By Class Variable

Sub-dimension	Group	n	Mean Rank	df	χ^2	p	Difference
Inability to Access Information	9th grade	103	127.30	3	26.047	.000	3,4>1 4>2
	10th grade	62	145.58				
	11th grade	74	166.62				
	12th grade	72	195.11				
Waiver of Comfort	9th grade	103	135.28	3	10.998	.012	3,4>1
	10th grade	62	151.29				
	11th grade	74	176.97				
	12th grade	72	168.15				
Inability to Communicate	9th grade	103	137.03	3	8.907	.031	4>1
	10th grade	62	152.18				
	11th grade	74	168.38				
	12th grade	72	173.70				
Losing Online Connection	9th grade	103	144.52	3	3.145	.370	-
	10th grade	62	154.71				
	11th grade	74	162.42				
	12th grade	72	166.93				
Total	9th grade	103	133.57	3	11.923	.008	3,4>1
	10th grade	62	153.15				
	11th grade	74	169.70				
	12th grade	72	176.47				

The Kruskal Wallis H test, which was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference in the nomophobia levels of 311 high school students according to their mother's education levels, was used (Table 4.5). As a result of the analysis applied, there was no significant difference between the students' maternal education levels in terms of the total score of the nomophobia scale and its sub-dimensions ($p>.05$).

Table 9

According to Mother Education Level Variable

Sub-dimension	Group	n	Mean Rank	df	X ²	p
Inability to Access Information	Not literate	38	136.17	4	7.230	.124
	Primary school graduate	118	147.23			
	Secondary education graduate	86	175.76			
	High school graduate	59	156.08			
	University graduate	10	164.40			
Waiver of Comfort	Not literate	38	154.66	4	8.059	.089
	Primary school graduate	118	142.69			
	Secondary education graduate	86	154.92			
	High school graduate	59	178.95			
	University graduate	10	191.95			
Inability to Communicate	Not literate	38	140.62	4	8.947	.062
	Primary school graduate	118	141.12			
	Secondary education graduate	86	168.80			
	High school graduate	59	172.66			
	University graduate	10	181.65			
Losing Online Connection	Not literate	38	151.97	4	3.795	.434
	Primary school graduate	118	145.59			
	Secondary education graduate	86	159.90			
	High school graduate	59	171.08			
	University graduate	10	171.60			
Total	Not literate	38	147.00	4	7.446	.114
	Primary school graduate	118	141.03			
	Secondary education graduate	86	167.00			
	High school graduate	59	171.56			
	University graduate	10	180.45			

The Kruskal Wallis H test was applied to determine whether the students' father education levels showed significant differences in terms of the total score and sub-dimensions of the nomophobia scale. According to Table 4.6, at a significance level of .05, it was determined that the education level of the fathers of the students caused a significant difference in terms of the sub-dimension of the nomophobia scale, waiver of comfort ($p < .05$).

When examining which education level the significant difference originates from; it has been determined that students who have university graduate fathers are more likely to renounce comfort compared to students who have fathers who are primary, secondary and high school graduates.

Table 10

According to Father Education Level Variable

Sub-dimension	Group	n	Mean Rank	df	X^2	p	Difference
Inability to Access Information	Not literate	4	127.13	4	6.645	0.156	-
	Primary school graduate	102	144.95				
	Secondary education graduate	94	165.36				
	High school graduate	91	151.78				
	University graduate	20	193.38				
Waiver of Comfort	Not literate	4	171.13	4	13.991	0.007	5>2,3,4
	Primary school graduate	102	151.90				
	Secondary education graduate	94	151.02				
	High school graduate	91	149.24				
	University graduate	20	228.05				
Inability to Communicate	Not literate	4	119.25	4	7.071	0.132	-
	Primary school graduate	102	165.56				
	Secondary education graduate	94	151.97				
	High school graduate	91	143.17				
	University graduate	20	191.93				
Losing Online Connection	Not literate	4	158.75	4	8.512	0.075	-
	Primary school graduate	102	151.57				
	Secondary education graduate	94	148.38				
	High school graduate	91	156.58				
	University graduate	20	211.23				
Total	Not literate	4	130.50	4	8.550	0.073	-
	Primary school graduate	102	155.20				
	Secondary education graduate	94	155.50				
	High school graduate	91	146.65				
	University graduate	20	210.08				

The Mann-Whitney U test, which was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference between students' nomophobia levels compared to having a computer at home, was applied. The analysis findings applied are given in Table 4.7. According to Table 4.7, there is no significant difference between students' having computers at home in terms of the average total score of the nomophobia scale and its sub-dimensions ($p>.05$).

Table 11

According to the Variable of Having a Computer at Home

Sub-dimension	Group	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Inability to Access Information	Yes	180	163.99	29518.50	10351.50	.066
	No	131	145.02	18997.50		
Waiver of Comfort	Yes	180	157.99	28438.00	11432.00	.647
	No	131	153.27	20078.00		
Inability to Communicate	Yes	180	162.47	29244.50	10625.50	.136
	No	131	147.11	19271.50		
Losing Online Connection	Yes	180	157.18	28293.00	11577.00	.785
	No	131	154.37	20223.00		
Total	Yes	180	160.84	28950.50	10919.50	.266
	No	131	149.35	19565.50		

The Mann-Whitney U test, which was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference between the nomophobia levels of the students according to the status of having a personal phone, was applied.

When Table 4.8 was examined, it was determined that the students' possession of a personal phone caused a significant difference in terms of the average total score of the nomophobia scale and its sub-dimensions ($p < .05$). It has been determined that the students who have a personal phone have higher nomophobia levels compared to the students who do not.

Table 12

By Variable of Owning a Personal Mobile Phone

Sub-dimension	Group	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Inability to Access Information	Yes	244	169.70	41408.00	4830.00	.000
	No	67	106.09	7108.00		
Waiver of Comfort	Yes	244	167.10	40772.00	5466.00	.000
	No	67	115.58	7744.00		
Inability to Communicate	Yes	244	164.85	40224.50	6013.50	.001
	No	67	123.75	8291.50		
Losing Online Connection	Yes	244	163.36	39859.50	6378.50	.006
	No	67	129.20	8656.50		
Total	Yes	244	167.80	40943.50	5294.50	.000
	No	67	113.02	7572.50		

The Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determine whether there was a

significant difference between the students' nomophobia levels according to their personal tablet possessions. As a result of the analysis findings, there was no significant difference between the students' possession of a personal tablet in terms of the average total score of the nomophobia scale and its sub-dimensions ($p>.05$).

Table 13

By Variable of Owning a Personal Tablet

Sub-dimension	Group	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Inability to Access Information	Yes	69	150.57	10389.50	7974.50	.569
	No	242	157.55	38126.50		
Waiver of Comfort	Yes	69	153.67	10603.00	8188.00	.807
	No	242	156.67	37913.00		
Inability to Communicate	Yes	69	160.20	11054.00	8059.00	.659
	No	242	154.80	37462.00		
Losing Online Connection	Yes	69	168.59	11632.50	7480.50	.186
	No	242	152.41	36883.50		
Total	Yes	69	160.05	11043.50	8069.50	.671
	No	242	154.85	37472.50		

The Kruskal Wallis H test was applied to determine whether the daily internet usage duration of the high school students who constitute the research group showed significant differences in terms of the total score and sub-dimensions of the nomophobia scale. According to Table 4.10, it was determined that at the .05 significance level, the daily internet usage duration of the students caused a significant difference in terms of the sub-dimensions of the nomophobia scale and the total score of the scale ($p<.05$).

When examining from which group the significant difference originates; it has been determined that students who use the internet for 5-7 hours a day and more than 9 hours are more likely to be unable to access information and lose their online connection compared to students who use the internet for 1-3 hours. On the other hand, it has been determined that students who use the internet for 5-7 hours and more than 9 hours a day are more likely to renounce comfort compared to students who use the

Internet for 1-3 hours. In addition, it was determined that students who use the Internet for more than 9 hours a day are more likely to renounce comfort than students who use the Internet for 1-3 hours and 3-5 hours daily. It is also among the findings that the students who use the internet for more than 9 hours daily are more likely to be unable to communicate than the students who use the internet for 1-3 hours and 3-5 hours daily.

Finally, it was determined that the students who use the internet for 5-7 hours a day have higher nomophobia levels than the students who use the internet for 1-3 hours. In addition, it has been determined that the students who use the Internet for more than 9 hours daily have higher nomophobia levels than the students who use the Internet for 1-3 hours and 3-5 hours daily.

Therefore, it can be said that as students' internet use increases, their level of nomophobia also increases.

Table 14

According to the Variable of Daily Internet Usage Time

Sub-dimension	Group	n	Mean Rank	df	X^2	p	Difference
Inability to Access Information	Between 1-3 hours	57	115.12	4	19.409	.001	3>1 5>1
	Between 3-5 hours	97	151.85				
	Between 5-7 hours	70	176.49				
	Between 7-9 hours	34	157.00				
	More than 9 hours	53	179.87				
Waiver of Comfort	Between 1-3 hours	57	118.84	4	24.216	.000	3>1 5>1,2
	Between 3-5 hours	97	143.43				
	Between 5-7 hours	70	173.16				
	Between 7-9 hours	34	158.00				
	More than 9 hours	53	195.02				
Inability to Communicate	Between 1-3 hours	57	129.55	4	19.059	.001	5>1,2
	Between 3-5 hours	97	138.63				
	Between 5-7 hours	70	168.63				
	Between 7-9 hours	34	167.75				
	More than 9 hours	53	192.02				
Losing Online Connection	Between 1-3 hours	57	129.71	4	16.771	.002	3>1 5>1
	Between 3-5 hours	97	140.35				
	Between 5-7 hours	70	176.71				
	Between 7-9 hours	34	158.40				
	More than 9 hours	53	184.03				
Total	Between 1-3 hours	57	117.78	4	28.580	.000	3>1

Between 3-5 hours	97	139.21	5>1,2
Between 5-7 hours	70	178.84	
Between 7-9 hours	34	159.03	
More than 9 hours	53	195.72	

The Mann-Whitney U test, which was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference between the students' nomophobia levels and the time they used the Internet to be supervised by their family members, was used (Table 4.11). As a result of the analysis, there is no significant difference between the status of being supervised by family members of the students in terms of the average total score of the nomophobia scale and its sub-dimensions ($p>.05$).

Table 15

Supervision of Internet Access Time by Family Members According to Status Variable

Sub-dimension	Group	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Inability to Access Information	Yes	116	147.43	17102.00	10316.00	.194
	No	195	161.10	31414.00		
Waiver of Comfort	Yes	116	146.81	17029.50	10243.50	.164
	No	195	161.47	31486.50		
Inability to Communicate	Yes	116	163.42	18957.00	10449.00	.261
	No	195	151.58	29559.00		
Losing Online Connection	Yes	116	156.50	18154.50	11251.50	.939
	No	195	155.70	30361.50		
Total	Yes	116	153.06	17755.00	10969.00	.657
	No	195	157.75	30761.00		

4.2. RQ2: Do students' exposure to cyberbullying change according to their demographic characteristics? Is there a significant difference in the level of cyberbullying according to demographic characteristics?

In this section, it is aimed to examine high school students' exposure to cyberbullying in terms of demographic characteristics.

The Mann-Whitney U test, which was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference according to the gender of high school students' exposure to cyberbullying, was applied.

According to the Table 4.12, it was determined that the gender variable caused a statistically significant difference between cyberbullying and students ($p < .05$). It can be said that female students are exposed to cyberbullying more than male students ($\bar{x} = 174.76 > 125.31$).

Table 16

According to Gender Variable

	Group	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Impact of Cyberbullying on Students	Female	193	174.76	33729.50	7765.50	.000
	Male	118	125.31	14786.50		

The Kruskal Wallis H test was applied to determine whether students' exposure to cyberbullying causes a significant difference in terms of grade levels.

According to Table 4.13, it was determined that the grade level variable caused a statistically significant difference between cyberbullying and students ($p < .05$).

As a result of the analysis applied to determine from which grade level the significant difference originated, it was determined that the 9th grade students were exposed to cyberbullying higher than the 10th, 11th and 12th grade students. Therefore, it can be said that the effect of cyberbullying decreases as the grade levels of the students increase.

Table 17

By Class Variable

	Group	n	Mean Rank	df	χ^2	p	Difference
Impact of Cyberbullying on Students	9th grade	103	121.27	3	25.01	0.000	2,3,4>1
	10th grade	62	169.36				
	11th grade	74	165.41				
	12th grade	72	184.51				

The Kruskal Wallis H test, which was conducted to determine whether students' exposure to cyberbullying causes a significant difference in terms of education level of mother and father, was applied.

When Table 4.14 was examined, it was determined that the education levels of the students' parents did not cause a statistically significant difference in terms of their exposure to cyberbullying ($p>.05$).

Table 18

According to Mother and Father Education Level Variable

Variables	Group	n	Mean Rank	df	X^2	p
Mother Education Level	Not literate	38	153.29	4	1.511	.825
	Primary school graduate	118	154.32			
	Secondary education graduate	86	164.31			
	High school graduate	59	147.25			
	University graduate	10	166.20			
Father Education Level	Not literate	4	211.63	4	3.998	.406
	Primary school graduate	102	156.51			
	Secondary education graduate	94	150.97			
	High school graduate	91	152.00			
	University graduate	20	184.10			

The Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determine whether the participant students' exposure to cyberbullying caused a significant difference according to their computer, mobile phone and personal tablet status.

When Table 4.15 was examined, it was determined that the students' possession of personal computers and tablets did not cause a statistically significant difference in terms of their exposure to cyberbullying ($p>.05$). On the other hand, it was determined that the students' having a personal mobile phone caused a statistically significant difference in terms of their exposure to cyberbullying ($p<.05$). It can be said that students with personal mobile phones are exposed to cyberbullying more than male students without ($\bar{x}=162.96>130.64$).

Table 19

By Having Computer, Mobile Phone and Personal Tablet Variable

Variables	Group	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Computer	Yes	180	161.14	29005.50	10864.50	.235
	No	131	148.94	19510.50		
Mobile phone	Yes	244	162.96	39763.00	6475.00	.009
	No	67	130.64	8753.00		
Personal Tablet	Yes	69	160.33	11063.00	8050.00	.648
	No	242	154.76	37453.00		

The Kruskal Wallis H test was applied to determine whether students' exposure to cyberbullying causes a significant difference in terms of their daily internet use.

When Table 4.16 was examined, it was determined that the daily internet usage duration of the students caused a statistically significant difference in terms of their exposure to cyberbullying ($p < .05$).

When examining which group the significant difference originates from; It has been determined that students who use the internet for 3-5, 5-7, 7-9 and more than 9 hours a day are more exposed to cyberbullying than students who use the internet for 1-3 hours.

Table 20

According to the Variable of Daily Internet Usage Time

Group	n	Mean Rank	df	X^2	p	Difference
Between 1-3 hours	57	123.10	4	10.486	.033	2,3,4,5>1
Between 3-5 hours	97	158.04				
Between 5-7 hours	70	172.24				
Between 7-9 hours	34	163.46				
More than 9 hours	53	161.43				

The Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determine whether high school students' exposure to cyberbullying caused a significant difference in terms of their internet access time compared to their being supervised by their family members.

When Table 4.17 was examined, it was determined that the supervision of

students' internet use by their family members did not cause a statistically significant difference in terms of their exposure to cyberbullying ($p > .05$).

Table 21

Supervision of Internet Access Time by Family Members According to Status Variable

Group	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Yes	116	148.83	17264,00	10478.00	.276
No	195	160.27	31252,00		

4.3. RQ3: Do students' coping strategies with cyberbullying change according to their demographic characteristics? Is there a significant difference in the strategies of coping with cyberbullying used by students according to these demographic characteristics?

In this section, it is aimed to examine high school students' strategies for coping with cyberbullying in terms of demographic characteristics.

The Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determine whether the high school students' coping with cyberbullying caused a significant difference according to their gender.

According to Table 4.18, it is observed that the gender variable does not cause a statistically significant difference on the students' coping strategies with cyberbullying ($p > .05$).

Table 22

According to Gender Variable

			Group	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Coping Strategies with Cyberbullying			Female	193	149.22	28799.50	10078.50	0.088
			Male	118	167.09	19716.50		

The Kruskal Wallis H test, which was conducted to determine whether students'

coping strategies with cyberbullying cause a significant difference in terms of grade levels, was applied.

According to Table 4.19, it was determined that the grade level variable caused a significant difference in the coping strategies of students with cyberbullying ($p < .05$). When the class level of the significant difference is examined; It was determined that the strategies of coping with cyberbullying of 9th grade students were higher than 10th, 11th and 12th grade students. Therefore, as the grade levels of the students increase, the strategies for coping with cyberbullying decrease. It can be said that as the grade level of the students' increases, the situation of being caught and struggling with cyberbullying decreases.

Table 23

By Class Variable

	Group	n	Mean Rank	df	X^2	p	Difference
Coping Strategies with Cyberbullying	9th grade	103	179.82	3	11.195	0.011	1>2,3,4
	10th grade	62	142.76				
	11th grade	74	148.74				
	12th grade	72	140.80				

The Kruskal Wallis H test, which was conducted to determine whether the strategies of coping with cyberbullying caused a significant difference in terms of mother and father education levels, was applied.

When Table 4.20 was examined, it was determined that the education levels of the students' parents did not cause a statistically significant difference in terms of coping strategies with cyberbullying ($p > .05$).

Table 24

According to Mother and Father Education Level Variable

Variables	Group	n	Mean Rank	df	X^2	p
Mother Level	Education					
	Not literate	38	179.08			
	Primary school graduate	118	155.01			
	Secondary education graduate	86	159.61	4	4.774	0.311
	High school graduate	59	139.75			
Father Education Level	University graduate	10	144.75			
	Not literate	4	140.75			
	Primary school graduate	102	158.92			
	Secondary education graduate	94	153.64	4	3.346	0.987
	High school graduate	91	154.92			
	University graduate	20	160.15			

Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determine whether students' coping strategies with cyberbullying cause a significant difference according to their computer, mobile phone and personal tablet.

When Table 4.21 was examined, it was determined that the students' possession of personal computers and tablets did not cause a statistically significant difference in terms of coping strategies with cyberbullying ($p > .05$). On the other hand, it was determined that the students' having a personal mobile phone caused a statistically significant difference in terms of coping strategies with cyberbullying ($p < .05$). It can be said that high school students who do not have a personal mobile phone have more strategies to cope with cyberbullying ($\bar{x} = 177.58 > 150.07$).

Table 25

By Having Computer, Mobile Phone and Personal Tablet Variable

Variables	Group	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Computer	Yes	180	154.10	27738.00	11448.00	.661
	No	131	158.61	20778.00		
Mobile phone	Yes	244	150.07	36618.00	6728.00	.026
	No	67	177.58	11898.00		
Personal Tablet	Yes	69	155.84	10753.00	8338.00	.987
	No	242	156.05	37763.00		

The Kruskal Wallis H test was applied to determine whether students' coping strategies with cyberbullying cause a significant difference in terms of their daily internet use.

When Table 4.22 was examined, it was determined that students' daily internet use caused a statistically significant difference in terms of coping strategies with cyberbullying ($p < .05$).

When examining which group the significant difference originates from; It was determined that the students who use the internet for 1-3 hours a day have higher coping strategies with cyberbullying compared to the students who use the internet for 3-5 and 5-7 hours. In addition, it was determined that the students who use the internet for 3-5 hours a day have higher coping strategies with cyberbullying compared to the students who use the internet for 5-7 hours. Therefore, it can be said that the decrease in daily internet use also reduces the strategies to cope with cyberbullying.

Table 26

According to the Variable of Daily Internet Usage Time

Group	n	Mean Rank	df	X^2	p	Difference
Between 1-3 hours	57	194.77	4	18.211	0.001	1>2,3 2>3
Between 3-5 hours	97	149.36				
Between 5-7 hours	70	128.61				
Between 7-9 hours	34	153.74				
More than 9 hours	53	164.09				

The Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determine whether students' strategies for coping with cyberbullying caused a significant difference in terms of their internet access time and being supervised by their family members.

When Table 4.23 was examined, it was determined that the supervision of students' internet use by their family members did not cause a statistically significant difference in terms of coping strategies with cyberbullying ($p > .05$).

Table 27

Supervision of Internet Access Time by Family Members According to Status Variable

Group	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Yes	116	153.89	17851.00	11065.00	.276
No	195	157.26	30665.00		

4.4. RQ4: Is there a relationship between students' nomophobia levels, the effects of cyberbullying, and coping strategies with cyberbullying?

In this section, it is aimed to examine the relationship between high school students' nomophobia levels, the effects of cyberbullying, and coping strategies with cyberbullying by correlation analysis.

Correlation analysis is a coefficient that shows the direction and magnitude of the linear relationship between two variables. The correlation coefficient takes a value between -1 and +1 and is denoted by "r". The correlation coefficient between each variable and itself is 1. The interpretation of the correlation coefficient according to the values it receives is as follows (Ünlü, 2019, pp. 147);

- $-0.5 < r < 0$ = Weak
- $-0.9 < r < -0.5$ = Medium
- $-1 < r < -0.9$ = Strong
- $0 < r < 0.5$ = Poor
- $0.5 < r < 0.9$ = Medium
- $0.9 < r < 1$ = Strong

First, when the relationship between students' nomophobia levels and exposure to cyberbullying was examined; It was determined that there was a statistically significant, weak and positive relationship ($r = .427; .369; .378; .322; .373$). Therefore, it can be said that as students' nomophobia levels increase, their exposure to cyberbullying will also increase.

When the relationship between students' nomophobia levels and their strategies to cope with cyberbullying is examined; It was determined that there was a statistically significant, weak and negative relationship ($r = -.343$; $-.245$; $-.280$; $-.257$; $-.312$). Thus, it can be said that as students' strategies to cope with cyberbullying increase, their nomophobia levels will decrease.

Finally, when the relationship between students' strategies to cope with cyberbullying and their exposure to cyberbullying was examined, it was determined that there was a statistically significant, moderate and negative relationship ($r = -0.573$). For this reason, it can be said that as students' coping strategies increase, their exposure to cyberbullying will decrease.

Table 28

Correlation Analysis Findings

		The Impact of Cyberbullying	Coping Strategies with Cyberbullying
Total Nomophobia Scale Score	r	.427**	-.343**
	p	.000	.000
Inability to Access Information	r	.369**	-.245**
	p	.000	.000
Waiving Comfort	r	.378**	-.280**
	p	.000	.000
Inability to Communicate	r	.322**	-.257**
	p	.000	.000
Losing Online Connection	r	.373**	-.312**
	p	.000	.000
The Impact of Cyberbullying	r	1	-.573**
	p		.000

**, Correlation Significant at the .01 Level

5.

DISCUSSION

Bullying is one of the types of violence that exists from the beginning of human history, depending on the balance of power. Bullying is the physical, verbal and psychological aggression caused by a person due to intentional harm. This can take form of peer bullying. Bullying is divided into five categories: physical, verbal, behavioral/emotional, sexual and cyber.

Cyberbullying is the act of bullying through an electronic communication tool. There are various ways of cyberbullying such as anger-provoking, harassment, defamation/slander, imitation, disclosure, exclusion, disturbing and repetitive messages and calls. Electronic mail (E-mail), instant messaging, chat rooms, text messaging, online games, blogs and video blogs, discussion walls and mailing lists, one-to-one networking, websites, social networking sites are tools of cyberbullying.

There are differences between cyberbullying and traditional bullying. In cyberbullying, the identity of the person doing the act of bullying is unknown. However, in traditional bullying, the identity of the person doing the act the bullying is clear. Another difference is the environment in which the bullying takes place. Traditional bullying takes place in school building unlike cyberbullying.

Cyberbullying happens everywhere. While the balance of power comes to the fore while defining bullying, the difference between cyberbullying and traditional bullying is due to the balance of power. While there may not always be a power inequality between the bully and the victim in cyberbullying, there is an asymmetrical power balance between the bully and the victim in traditional bullying.

Being exposed to cyberbullying has social, emotional and academic effects. Social problems such as loneliness and exclusion from the group may occur as a result of being exposed to cyberbullying. It has been observed that the victims have problems in adapting to the social environment and have difficulties in establishing friendships.

Those who are exposed to cyberbullying also suffer psychologically. Victims experience problems such as anger, sadness, depression, anxiety and helplessness. When looking at the academic effects, the first thing that can be seen is absenteeism and a decrease in course success. Students exposed to cyberbullying show behaviors such as truancy, dropout, and disciplinary punishment.

The aim of this study is to examine the nomophobia levels of high school students according to some variables, and to determine the effects of cyberbullying on students and the strategies of students to cope with cyberbullying. The sample group of the study consisted of a total of 311 high school students. 62.1% of the students are girls and 33.1% are 9th grade students. In addition, it was determined that 37.9% of the mothers and 32.8% of the students' fathers were primary school graduates. 78.5% of the students have their own mobile phone, 22.2% have their own tablet and 57.9% have a computer at home. The majority of students (31.2%) spend 3-5 hours on the Internet, except for their mobile phones. In addition, 62.7% of the students are not supervised by their family members in terms of the time they use the internet.

41.5% of 311 participating high school students experienced cyberbullying. Therefore, when we look at the effect of cyberbullying on students, it can be said that it affects students badly in general, that is it causes anger, sadness, doubt, stress, fear and restlessness. It can be argued that students are generally affected by cyberbullying emotionally and psychologically, and students who are exposed to bullying have fewer

academic and social problems (Özer, 2016). When the strategies of students to cope with cyberbullying are observed, it can be noticed that the vast majority (69.1%) asked the person who did the bullying to end their behavior. On the other hand, when the nomophobia level of 311 high school students was examined, it was determined that it was at a moderate level.

The comparison of students' cyber victimization, coping strategies and nomophobia scores with sociodemographic characteristics was examined. As a result of the analysis;

There was no significant difference between the gender variable in terms of nomophobia scale and coping strategies with cyberbullying. On the other hand, it was determined that the gender variable caused a statistically significant difference in cyberbullying on students. It can be said that female students are exposed to cyberbullying more than male students. Contrary to this finding, Manap (2012) found that male students had a higher cyberbullying level than female students.

When the grade levels of the students showed significant differences in terms of the total score and sub-dimensions of the nomophobia scale, it was determined that there was a significant difference in terms of "inability to access information, renounce comfort and communication" and the total score of the scale. As a result of the analysis applied, it was determined that the 11th and 12th grade students' inability to access information, renunciation of comfort sub-dimension score and the average total score of the nomophobia scale were higher than the 9th grade students. Therefore, it can be said that the 11th and 12th grade students' inability to access information, renunciation of comfort, and nomophobia levels are higher than 9th grade students. In addition, it was determined that 12th grade students' inability to access information sub-dimension score

was higher than 10th grade students. Finally, it was determined that the 12th grade students' inability to communicate sub-dimension score was higher than the 9th grade students. In addition, it was determined that 9th grade students' strategies for being exposed to cyberbullying and coping with cyberbullying were higher than 10th, 11th and 12th grade students. Manap (2012) concluded in his research that the level of cyberbullying increases as the grade level of the student increases.

When it was examined whether the students' mother and father education levels showed significant differences in terms of the total score and sub-dimensions of the nomophobia scale, it was determined that there was no significant difference in terms of mother's education level. On the other hand, it has been determined that students who have university graduate fathers are more likely to renounce comfort than students who have fathers who are primary, secondary and high school graduates. In his study, Sarak (2012) found that as the education level of the mother increases, the status of being a cyber bully and a cyber victim decreases. Türkoğlu (2013) found in his study that as the education level of the father increases, the cyberbullying tendency of the students increases.

There is a significant difference between students' having a personal phone, their nomophobia levels, their exposure to cyberbullying, and their strategies to cope with cyberbullying. In addition, it was determined that students who use the internet for 3-5, 5-7, 7-9 and more than 9 hours a day are more exposed to cyberbullying than students who use the internet for 1-3 hours. In addition, it was determined that the students who use the internet for 1-3 hours a day have higher coping strategies with cyberbullying compared to the students who use the internet between 3-5 and 5-7 hours. Those who have a high level of cyberbullying cannot do cyberbullying on someone else's computer because they want to hide their identities, which supports the finding obtained in the

study. Kavuk (2011) found in his study that as the years of computer use increase, cyberbullying behavior increases. Özdemir and Akar (2011) found that students whose daily internet usage time exceeds 5 hours tend to be more cyberbullying than others. The reason for this situation can be explained meaningfully.

A correlation analysis was applied to examine the relationship between high school students' nomophobia levels, the effects of cyberbullying, and coping strategies with cyberbullying. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that as the nomophobia levels of the students increase, their exposure to cyberbullying will also increase. On the other hand, it has been determined that as students' coping strategies with cyberbullying increase, their nomophobia levels will decrease. Finally, it was found that as students' coping strategies increase, their exposure to cyberbullying will decrease.

SUGGESTIONS

As a result of the study, we can list the priority suggestions to be made as follows:

1. In order to prevent and reduce cyberbullying among high school students in Adana, new studies can be conducted by using the cyberbullying attitude scale with different variables.

2. In Adana, seminars and conferences should be given to high school students to raise awareness about cyberbullying.

3. In Adana, cultural and sports activities and activities should be organized to distance high school students from the virtual environment and attract students' attention.

4. In Adana, parents of high school students should be informed about the development and needs of adolescents. It is seen that children in adolescence are estranged from their families due to the characteristics of this period. Studies should be carried out to establish a sincere and positive communication environment and a relationship based on trust between parents and children.

5. Studies should be conducted to inform the families of high school students about cyberbullying in Adana. Thus, families can minimize the risk of their children being exposed to cyberbullying or being exposed to it.

6. Parents of high school students in Adana should install software tools with parental control on their computers so that they can find out if their children are bullies or victims. In addition, the computer used at home should be in an environment where all family members use it together.

7. Students, teachers and school administrators (Principal and assistant principals) in high schools in Adana should be given information and training about safe internet use, what to do when faced with cyberbullying behavior and what to do.

8. The most important task in cyber (virtual) bullying falls on counselors. In order for the guidance teachers working in high schools in Adana to be experts in this subject, necessary domestic and international training should be provided.

9. School guidance teachers working in high schools in Adana should train students on how to use communication tools more accurately and within a moral framework.

10. In Adana, high school guidance teachers should give seminars to students, parents, teachers and school administrators to raise awareness about cyber crimes and the penalties for these crimes.

11. Necessary sensitivity should be shown to listen to the student who is understood to be a bully or victim by the guidance teachers at the school without being judged, and to resolve the situation by collaborating with the school and the family, and getting help from experts if necessary.

12. The extent of cyberbullying at school, the attitudes of bully and victim students towards this situation should be determined, and policies should be produced to solve this problem.

13. A new draft law should be prepared by raising awareness about cyberbullying.

14. Considering the examples of combating cyberbullying abroad, research should be conducted on whether these measures can be implemented in Turkey.

15. Universities and national education should act together in the fight against cyberbullying.

16. Internet cafes, which are frequently used by students who do not have internet at home, should be rearranged in relation to cyber bullying and these cafes should be controlled with various computer software.

17. Police departments, families, school administrators and teachers should cooperate and work together on cyberbullying.

18. Within the scope of school social work, social work practices in schools should be increased and its field of activity should be developed in the fight against cyberbullying. It is thought that the employment of social workers in schools will contribute significantly to the fight against cyberbullying.

As a result of the findings obtained as a result of the research, the above suggestions were put forward. In this direction, cyber bullying should be prevented within the framework of the above suggestions in order to raise individuals with high self-esteem, developed sense of belonging, at peace with the value judgments of the society they live in, with high awareness and hope for the future.

REFERENCES

- Akbulut, Y., & Erişti, B. (2011). Cyberbullying and victimisation among Turkish university students. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 27(7), 1155– 1170. doi:10.14742/ajet.910
- Akca, E. B., & Sayimer, İ. (2017). Siber zorbalık kavramı, türleri ve ilişkili olduğu faktörler: Mevcut araştırmalar üzerinden bir değerlendirme. *AJIT-e: Bilişim Teknolojileri Online Dergisi*, 8(30), 7-19
- Aktürk, A. O. (2015). Analysis of cyberbullying sensitivity levels of high school students and their perceived social support levels. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, 12(1), 44–61. doi:10.1108/ITSE-07-2014-0016
- Anderson, T., & Sturm, B. (2007). Cyberbullying from playground to computer. *Young Adult Library Services*, 5(2), 24–27
- Antoniadou, N., Kokkinos, C. M., & Markos, A. (2016). Possible common correlates between bullying and cyber-bullying among adolescents. *Psicología Educativa*, 22(1), 27–38. doi:10.1016/j.pse.2016.01.003
- Arıcak, O. T. (2009). Psychiatric symptomatology as a predictor of cyberbullying among university students. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 34, 167–184. doi:10.1016/j.neuropharm.2005.02.010
- Arıcak, O. T. (2011). Siber Zorbalık: Gençlerimizi Bekleyen Yeni Tehlike. *Kariyer Penceresi*, 2(6), 10-12.
- Arıcak, O. T., Kınay, H., & Tanrıkulu, T. (2012). Siber zorbalık ölçeğinin ilk psikometrik bulguları. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(1), 101–114

- Arıcak, O. T., Siyahhan, S., Uzunhasanoglu, A., Sarıbeyoglu, S., Çıplak, S., Yılmaz, N., & Memmedov, C. (2008). Cyberbullying among *Turkish adolescents*. *Cyberpsychology & Behaviour*, 11(3), 253–261. doi:10.1089/cpb.2007.0016
- Ayas, T., & Pişkin, M. (2015). AKran Zorbalığı Belirleme Ölçeği Ergen Formu. *Akademik Bakış Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (50), 316-324
- Ayas, T., & Horzum, M. B. (2010). Sanal zorba/kurban ölçek geliştirme çalışması. *Akademik Bakış*, 19(1), 1–17. doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004
- Bak, G., & Eşidir, O. V. (2019). Yerel bir gazetenin bir aylık eğitim haberlerinin analizi: Şafak Gazetesi örneği.
- Bakioglu, B. (2014). Bull in a china shop: Alternate reality games and transgressive fan play in social media franchises. *Bull in a China Shop: Alternate Reality Games and Transgressive Fan Play in Social Media Franchises (February 1, 2014)*. *Transformative Works and Cultures*, 17
- Bakırcıoğlu, R. (2010). *Çocuk ve Ergende Ruh Sağlığı*. Ankara, Anı Yayıncılık
- Bamford, A. (2004). Adolescent identity, cyber bullying and ethics in information communication technologies. *International Journal of the Humanities*, 2(3), 2411-2420
- Barlett, C., & Coyne, S. M. (2014). A meta- analysis of sex differences in cyber- bullying behavior: The moderating role of age. *Aggressive behavior*, 40(5), 474-488

- Baştürk Akca, E., Sayımer, İ., & Ergül, S. (2015). Ortaokul Öğrencilerinin Sosyal Medya Kullanımları ve Siber Zorbalık Deneyimleri: Ankara Örneği. *Global Media Journal: Turkish Edition*, 5(10).
- Bauman, S. (2007). Cyberbullying: A virtual menace. National Coalition Against Bullying National Conference içinde . Melbourne, Australia
- Bauman, S., Toomey, R. B. and Walker, J. L. (2013). Associations among bullying, cyberbullying, and suicide in high school students. *Journal of Adolescence*, 36(2), 341–350. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.12.001
- Baykal, F. (2016). *Lise öğrencilerinde siber zorbalık ve mağduriyetin ailedeki koruyucu etmenlerle ilişkisi: Afyonkarahisar ili örneği* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Afyonkarahisar.
- Belsey, B. (2006). Cyberbullying an Emerging Threat to the “Always on” Generation.
- Beran, T. and Li, Q. (2005). Cyber-Harassment: A study of a new method for an old behavior. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 32(3), 265–277. doi:10.2190/8yqm-b04h-pg4d-bllh
- Beran, T., Rinaldi, C., Bickham, D. S., & Rich, M. (2012). Evidence for the need to support adolescents dealing with harassment and cyber-harassment: Prevalence, progression and impact. *School Psychology International*, 33(5), 562–576. doi:10.1177/0143034312446976
- Berne, S., Frisén, A., & Kling, J. (2014). Appearance-related cyberbullying: A qualitative investigation of characteristics, content, reasons, and effects. *Body image*, 11(4), 527-533

- Bridge, B. (2010). *Zorbalık- Mobbing: Bilinmeyen Çeşitleri ve Çözümleri*. 2. Baskı, İstanbul: Beyaz Yayınları
- Burnukara, P. (2009). *İlk ve orta ergenlikte geleneksel ve sanal akran zorbalığına ilişkin betimsel bir inceleme*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Çakır, Ç. (2017). Siber Zorbalık ve Siber Mağduriyet Ekseninde Özsaygı ve İş Tatmini İlişkisi. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 15(5)
- Calvete, E., Orue, I., Estévez, A., Villardón, L., & Padilla, P. (2010). Cyberbullying in adolescents: Modalities and aggressors' profile. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(5), 1128–1135
- Campfield, D. C. (2008). *Cyber bullying and victimization: Psychosocial characteristics of bullies, victims and bully/victims*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Missoula, MT: Montana Üniversitesi, Klinik Psikoloji
- Chadwick, S. (2014). *Impacts of cyberbullying, building social and emotional resilience 78 in schools*. SpringerBriefs in Education. Cham: Springer
- Chapell, M., Hasselman, S. L., Kitchin, T., Lomon, S. N., MacIver, K. W., & Sarullo, P. L. (2006). Bullying in elementary school, high school and college. *Adolescence*, 41(164), 633–648
- Çitemel, N. (2014). *Çözüm odaklı kısa süreli grupla psikolojik danışmanın lise öğrencilerinin akran zorbalığına etkisi*. Doktora tezi. Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Sakarya.

- Craig, W. M., Pepler, D., & Atlas, R. (2000). Observations of bullying in the playground and in the classroom. *School psychology international*, 21(1), 22-36
- Crick, N. R. (1996). The role of overt aggression, relational aggression and prosocial behavior in the prediction of children's future social adjustment. *Child Development*, 67(5), 2317-2327
- Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development*, 66(3), 710-722
- Dikmen, M., & Çağlar, A. (2017). Öğretmen adaylarının siber zorbalığa yönelik duyarlılıklarının farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 27(2), 101-111
- Dilmaç, B. (2009). Sanal zorbalığı yordayan psikolojik ihtiyaçlar: Lisans öğrencileri için 79 bir ön çalışma. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 9(3), 1291-1325
- Dilmaç, B., Yurt, E., Aydın, M., & Kaşarcı, I. (2016). Predictive relationship between humane values of adolescents cyberbullying and cyberbullying sensibility. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 14(1), 3-22
- Doğan, E., Çaka, C., & Şahin, Y. L. (2016). Çevrimiçi sosyal ağ oyunu oynayan bireylerin siber zorbalığa duyarlılık düzeyleri ile facebook kullanım amaçları üzerine bir çalışma. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 12(3), 501-520
- Dooley, J. J., Pyżalski, J., & Cross, D. (2009). Cyberbullying versus face-to-face bullying: A theoretical and conceptual review. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie/Journal of Psychology*, 217(4), 182-188

- Durmuş, B., Yurtkoru, S., Ulusu, Y., & Kılıç, B. (2010). *Facebook'tayız: sosyal paylaşım ağlarının bireylere ve işletmelere yönelik incelemesi: Facebook üzerine bir araştırma*. Beta Basım Yayım
- Elçi, A., & Seçkin, Z. (2016). Cyberbullying awareness for mitigating consequences in higher education. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1–15
- Erdur-Baker, Ö., & Kavrut, F. (2010). Cyberbullying and its correlation to traditional bullying, gender and frequent and risky usage of internet-mediated communication tools. *New Media & Society*, 12(1), 109–125
- Erdur-Baker, Ö., & Kavrut, F. (2007). Akran Zorbalığının Yeni Yüzü: Siber Zorbalık. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research (EJER)*, 27, 31-42
- Eroğlu, Y. (2014). *Ergenlerde siber zorbalık ve mağduriyeti yordayan risk etmenlerini belirlemeye yönelik bütüncül bir model önerisi*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Bursa: Uludağ Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Eroğlu, Y., & Peker, A. (2011). Aileden ve Arkadaştan Algılanan Sosyal Destek ve Siber Mağduriyet: Yapısal Eşitlik Modeliyle Bir İnceleme. *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 27
- Faucher, C., Jackson, M., & Cassidy, W. (2014). Cyberbullying among university students: Gendered experiences, impacts and perspectives. *Education Research International*, 2014, 1–10.
- Felmlee, D., & Faris, R. (2016). Toxic ties: Networks of friendship, dating, and cyber victimization. *Social psychology quarterly*, 79(3), 243-262

- Finkelhor, D., Mitchell, K., & Wolak, J. (2001). *Highlights of the youth internet safety survey*. Crimes Against Children Research Center. Washington, DC.
- Franks, M. A. (2015). Drafting an effective'revenge porn'law: A guide for legislators. *Available at SSRN 2468823*.
- Gezgin, D. M., & Çuhadar, C. (2012). Bilgisayar ve öğretim teknolojileri eğitimi bölümü öğrencilerinin siber zorbalığa ilişkin duyarlılık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(2), 93–104
- Gianesini, G., & Brighi, A. (2015). Cyberbullying in the era of digital relationships: The unique role of resilience and emotion regulation on adolescents' adjustment. *Technology and Youth: Growing Up in a Digital World içinde* (ss. 1–46).
- Gök, S. (2019). *Ergenlerde siber zorbalığın yordanmasında değerlerin rolü* . Master's thesis, Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Guan, N. C., Kanagasundram, S., Ann, Y. H., Hui, T. L., & Mun, T. K. (2016). Cyber bullying - a new social menace. *ASEAN Journal of Psychiatry*, 17(1), 104–115.
- Gümüşler-Başaran, A. (2014). *Rize ili lise öğrencilerinde akran zorbalığı ve zorbalığı önleme eğitiminin etkisinin değerlendirilmesi*. Doktora Tezi, Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Halk Sağlığı Anabilim Dalı, Sivas.
- Harmon, A. (2004). Cyberbullies: Cell phones, instant messaging, and the Internet are giving bullies new ways to harass their classmates, even they're not at school [Electronic version]. *New York Times Upfront*, 137 (5), 20-22.

- Haskaya, S. (2016). *Ortaokul öğrencilerinde akran zorbalığı ile okula yabancılaşma arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Master's thesis, Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2008). Cyberbullying: An exploratory analysis of factors related to offending and victimization. *Deviant Behavior*, 29(2), 129–156
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2010). Bullying, cyberbullying and suicide. *International Academy for Suicide Research*, 14, 206–221
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2015). Cyberbullying glossary brief overview of common terms. Cyberbullying Research Center.
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2012). Cyberbullying: Neither an epidemic nor a rarity. *European journal of developmental psychology*, 9(5), 539-543.
- Hines, M. (2011). Gender development and the human brain. *Annual review of neuroscience*, 34, 69-88.
- Hoff, D. L., & Mitchell, S. N. (2009). Cyberbullying: Causes, effects, and remedies. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47(5), 652-665.
- Huang, Y., & Chou, C. (2010). An analysis of multiple factors of cyberbullying among junior high school students in Taiwan. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(6), 1581– 1590
- Jantzer, V., Haffner, J., Parzer, P., & Resch, F. (2011). Opfer von Bullying in der Schule. *Kindheit und Entwicklung*.

- Jenaro, C., Flores, N., & Frías, C. P. (2018). Systematic review of empirical studies on cyberbullying in adults: What we know and what we should investigate. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 38, 113-122.
- Kamali, A. (2015). Assessing cyberbullying in higher education. *Information Systems Education Journal*, 13(6), 43–53.
- Kavuk, M. (2011). *İlköğretim Öğrencilerinin Sanal Zorba ve Sanal Kurban Olma Durumlarının İncelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara
- Kiesler, S., & Sproull, L. (1992). Group decision making and communication technology. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 52(1), 96-123.
- Kınay, H. (2012). *Lise öğrencilerinin siber zorbalık duyarlılığının riskli davranış, korumacı davranış, suça maruziyet ve tehlike algısı ile ilişkisi ve çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Sakarya: Sakarya Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Koc, Z. (2006). *Lise öğrencilerinin zorbalık düzeylerinin yordanması. [The Prediction of High School Students Bullying Levels.]* Unpublished thesis. Ankara: Gazi University
- Kokkinos, C. M., Antoniadou, N., & Markos, A. (2014). Cyber-bullying: An investigation of the psychological profile of university student participants. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 35(3), 204–214

- Kokkinos, C. M., Baltzidis, E., & Xynogala, D. (2016). Prevalence and personality correlates of Facebook bullying among university undergraduates. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 55, 840–850
- Kopecký, K. (2014). Cyberbullying and other risks of internet communication focused on university students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 112, 260–269
- Kowalski, R. M., & Limber, S. P. (2007). Electronic bullying among middle school students. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41(6), 22–30.
- Kowalski, R. M., Giumetti, G. W., Schroeder, A. N., & Reese, H. H. (2015). Cyber bullying among college students: Evidence from multiple domains of college life. L. A. Wankel and C. Wankel (Ed.), *Misbehavior Online in Higher Education içinde* (C. 5, ss. 293–321). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Kowalski, R. M., Limber, S. P., & Agatston, P. W. (2012). *Cyberbullying: Bullying the digital age* (2. bs.). Oxford, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated
- Kowalski, R. M., Toth, A., & Morgan, M. (2018). Bullying and cyberbullying in adulthood and the workplace. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 158(1), 64–81.
- Kraft, E. (2006). Cyberbullying: A worldwide trend of misusing technology to harass others. *WIT Transactions on Information and Communication Technologies*, 36, 155-166.
- Kraft, E., & Wang, J. (2010). An exploratory study of the cyberbullying and 84 cyberstalking experiences and factors related to victimization of students at a public liberal arts college. *International Journal of Technoethics*, 1(4), 74–91

- Lawler, J., & Molluzzo, J. C. (2015). A comprehensive survey on cyberbullying perceptions at a major metropolitan university. *Contemporary Issues In Education Research*, 8(3), 159–170
- Lee, E. B. (2017). Cyberbullying: Prevalence and predictors among African American young adults. *Journal of Black Studies*, 48(1), 57-73.
- Lenhart, A. (2007). *Cyberbullying and online teens*. Pew Internet & American Life Project.
- Li, Q. (2007). Bullying in the new playground: Research into cyberbullying and cyber victimisation. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 23(4), 435–454.
- Li, Q. (2007). New bottle but old wine: A research of cyberbullying in schools. *Computers in human behavior*, 23(4), 1777-1791.
- Li, Q., Smith, P. K., & Cross, D. (2012). Research into cyberbullying. *Cyberbullying in the global playground: Research from international perspectives*, 1.
- Lindsay, M., & Krysik, J. (2012). Online harassment among college students. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 703–719
- Machimbarrena, J. M., Álvarez-Bardón, A., León-Mejía, A., Gutiérrez-Ortega, M., Casadiego-Cabrales, A., & González-Cabrera, J. (2019). Loneliness and personality profiles involved in bullying victimization and aggressive behavior. *School mental health*, 11(4), 807-818.
- Manap, A. (2012). *İlköğretim İkinci Kademe Öğrencileri ve Siber Zorbalık: Samsun İli Örneği*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Samsun

- Marcum, C. D., Higgins, G. E., Freiburger, T. L., & Ricketts, M. L. (2012). Battle of the sexes: An examination of male and female cyber bullying. *International Journal of Cyber Criminology*, 6(1), 904–911
- Mcmillan, J.H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education. A conceptual introduction (5th ed.)*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Inc.
- Mishna, F., Cook, C., Gadalla, T., Daciuk, J., & Solomon, S. (2010). Cyber bullying behaviors among middle and high school students. *American journal of orthopsychiatry*, 80(3), 362-374.
- Mishna, F., Khoury-Kassabri, M., Gadalla, T., & Daciuk, J. (2012). Risk factors for involvement in cyber bullying: Victims, bullies and bully-victims. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34(1), 63–70
- Natvig, G. K., Albrektsen, G., & Qvarnström, U. (2001). School-related stress experience as a risk factor for bullying behavior. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 30(5), 561-575.
- Navarro, R., & Serna, C. (2016). Spanish youth perceptions about cyberbullying: Qualitative research into understanding cyberbullying and the role that parents play in its solution. In *Cyberbullying across the Globe* (pp. 193-218). Springer, Cham.
- Nocentini, A., Calmaestra, J., Schultze-Krumbholz, A., Scheithauer, H., Ortega, R., & Menesini, E. (2010). Cyberbullying: Labels, behaviours and definition in three European countries. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 20(2), 129– 142.

- Novikova, M., & Rean, A. (2019). Influence of School Climate on Bullying Prevalence: Russian and International Research Experience. *Вопросы образования*, (2 (eng)).
- Odabaşı, H. F., Kabakçı, I., & Çoklar, A. N. (2007). *İnternet, çocuk ve aile*. Nobel yayınları, Ankara.
- Olweus, D. (1994). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Maide, MA: Blackwell
- Özdemir, M., & Akar, F. (2011). Lise Öğrencilerinin Siber Zorbalığa İlişkin Görüşlerinin Bazı Değişkenler Bakımından İncelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 17(4), 605-626
- Özer, G. (2016). *Ortaokul Öğrencilerinin Siber Zorbalık Yaşama Düzeyleri ile Siber Zorbalığın Öğrenciler Üzerindeki Etkileri ve Siber Zorbalıkla Baş Etme Stratejileri*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara
- Paracha, S., Hall, L., Clawson, K., Mitsche, N., & Jamil, F. (2019). Co-design with children: using participatory design for design thinking and social and emotional learning. *Open Education Studies*, 1(1), 267-280.
- Parris, L., Varjas, K., Meyers, J., & Cutts, H. (2012). High school students' perceptions of coping with cyberbullying. *Youth & society*, 44(2), 284-306.
- Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2006). Bullies move beyond the schoolyard: A preliminary look at cyberbullying. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 4(2), 148– 169.

- Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2015). Measuring cyberbullying: Implications for research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 23, 69-74.
- Patchin, J., & Hinduja, S. (2009). *Bullying Beyond the Schoolyard: Preventing and Responding to Cyberbullying*. Thousand Oaks CA: CorwinPub
- Pehlivan, F., & Demirtaş, H. (2019). Ortaokul ve Liselerde Yaşanan Disiplin Problemlerinin Çözümüne Yönelik Yönetmelik Uygulamalar. *e-Uluslararası Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 10(2), 31-50.
- Peker, A., Eroğlu, Y., & Ada, Ş. (2012). Ergenlerde siber zorbalığın ve mağduriyetin yordayıcılarının incelenmesi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12(2), 185-206
- Pekşen Süslü, D. (2016). *Lise öğrencilerinde siber zorbalık ve siber mağduriyetin benlik saygısı, anne, baba ve akran ilişkileri açısından incelenmesi*. Doktora tezi. Maltepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Price, M., & Dalgleish, J. (2010). Cyberbullying: Experiences, impacts and coping strategies as described by Australian young people. *Youth Studies Australia*, 29(2), 51-59.
- Raskauskas, J., & Stoltz, A. D. (2007). Involvement in traditional and electronic bullying among adolescents. *Developmental psychology*, 43(3), 564–575
- Riebel, J. R. S. J., Jäger, R. S., & Fischer, U. C. (2009). Cyberbullying in Germany—an exploration of prevalence, overlapping with real life bullying and coping strategies. *Psychology science quarterly*, 51(3), 298-314.

- Schenk, A. M., & Fremouw, W. J. (2012). Prevalence, psychological impact and coping of cyberbully victims among college students. *Journal of School Violence, 11*(1), 88 21–37
- Schenk, A. M., Fremouw, W. J., & Keelan, C. M. (2013). Characteristics of college cyberbullies. *Computers in Human Behavior, 29*, 2320–2327
- Seçer, İ. (2014). *The effect of group counseling on the victimhood perceptions of adolescents who are the subject of peer victimization and on their coping strategies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Atatürk University, Erzurum.
- Seçkin, Z. (2017). *Örgütlerde mobbing ve siber zorbalık*. Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi.
- Selkie, E. M., Kota, R., & Moreno, M. (2016). Cyberbullying behaviors among female college students: Witnessing, perpetration and victimization. *College Student Journal, 50*(2), 278–287.
- Şentürk, Ş., & Bayat, S. (2016). Internet usage habits and cyberbullying related opinions of secondary school students. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 4*(5), 1103–1110
- 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.
- Ševčíková, A., & Šmahel, D. (2009). Online harassment and cyberbullying in the Czech Republic. *Journal of Psychology, 217*(4), 227–229

- Shariff, S. (2008). Cyber-dilemmas in the new millennium: School obligations to provide student safety in a virtual school environment. *McGill Journal of Education*, 40(3), 467–487
- Shariff, S., & Gouin, R. (2005, September). Cyber-dilemmas: Gendered hierarchies, free expression and cyber-safety in schools. In *Safety and Security in a Networked World: Balancing Cyber-Rights and Responsibilities*,” Oxford Internet Institute conference, Oxford, UK.
- Šléglová, V., & Cerna, A. (2011). Cyberbullying in adolescent victims: Perception and coping. *Cyberpsychology: journal of psychosocial research on cyberspace*, 5(2).
- Slonje, R., & Smith, P. K. (2008). Cyberbullying: Another main type of bullying? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 49, 147–154.
- Slonje, R., Smith, P. K., & Frisé, A. (2013). The nature of cyberbullying and strategies for prevention. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(1), 26–32
- Smith, A., & Anderson, M. (2018). *Social media use in 2018*. Pew Research Center
- Smith, B. W., Dempsey, A. G., Jackson, S. E., Olenchak, R. F., & Gaa, J. (2012). Cyberbullying among gifted children. *Gifted Education International*, 28(1), 112–126.
- Smith, P. K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., & Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry*, 49(4), 376-385.

- Strom, P. S., & Strom, R. D. (2006, March). Cyberbullying by adolescents: A preliminary assessment. In *The Educational Forum* (Vol. 70, No. 1, pp. 21-36). Taylor & Francis Group.
- Taiwo, R. (2015). Cyber behavior. M. Khosrow-Pour (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology* içinde (3. bs., ss. 2972–2980). Hershey, PA: IGI Global
- Thompsen, P. A., & Foulger, D. A. (1996). Effects of pictographs and quoting on flaming in electronic mail. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 12(2), 225-243.
- Tokunaga, R. S. (2010). Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of research on cyberbullying victimization. *Computers in human behavior*, 26(3), 277-287.
- Topçu, Ç., & Erdur-Baker, Ö. (2012). Affective and cognitive empathy as mediators of gender differences in cyber and traditional bullying. *School Psychology International*, 33(5), 550–561.
- Türkoğlu, S. (2013). *Ergenlerin Problemlı İnternet Kullanımları ile Siber Zorbalık Eğilimleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul
- Türnüklü, A., & İllez, M. (2006). Öğretmenlerin, Öğrenci Çatışmalarını Çözüm Strateji ve Taktiklerinin Sosyal Oluşturmacılık Perspektifinden İncelenmesi. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research (EJER)*, (22)
- Ünlü, Ü. Ş. (2019). *Örgütsel Öğrenme ve İnovasyonun Firma Performansı Üzerine Etkisi: Taşımacılık Sektörü Örneği*. Doktora Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.

- Uysal, İ., Duman, G., Yazıcı, E., & Şahin, M. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının siber zorbalık duyarlılıkları ve siber zorbalık duyarlılık ölçeğinin bazı psikometrik özellikleri. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 15(1), 191–210
- Vandebosch, H., & Van Cleemput, K. (2008). Defining cyberbullying: A qualitative research into the perceptions of youngsters. *CyberPsychology & behavior*, 11(4), 499–503
- Varjas, K., Talley, J., Meyers, J., Parris, L., & Cutts, H. (2010). High school students' perceptions of motivations for cyberbullying: An exploratory study. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 11(3), 269.
- Willard, N. (2007). Cyberbullying and cyberthreats: *Responding to the challenge of online social aggression, threats and distress* (3. bs.). Champaign: Research Press
- Williams, K. R., & Guerra, N. G. (2007). Prevalence and predictors of internet bullying. *Journal of adolescent health*, 41(6), S14-S21.
- Yaman, E., Eroğlu, Y., & Peker, A. (2011). *Başa çıkma stratejileri ile okul zorbalığı ve siber zorbalık*. İstanbul: Kaknüs yayınları
- Ybarra, M. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2004). Online aggressor/targets, aggressors and targets: A comparison of associated youth characteristics. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 45(7), 1308–1316.
- Ybarra, M. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2007). Prevalence and frequency of internet harassment instigation: Implications for adolescent health. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41(2), 189–195

- Ybarra, M. L., Mitchell, K. J., Wolak, J., & Finkelhor, D. (2006). Examining characteristics and associated distress related to Internet harassment: findings from the Second Youth Internet Safety Survey. *Pediatrics*, 118(4), e1169-e1177.
- Yılmaz, E. (2011). Üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyal destek ve yalnızlık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Genel Tıp Dergisi*. 18, 71-79
- Zalaquett, C. P., & Chatters, S. J. (2014). Cyberbullying in college. *SAGE Open*, 4(1), 1-8
- Zhou, Z., Tang, H., Tian, Y., Wei, H., Zhang, F., & Morrison, C. M. (2013). Cyberbullying and its risk factors among Chinese high school students. *School psychology international*, 34(6), 630-647.

ATTACHMENTS

ÖĞRENCİ TANIMA FORMU

Sevgili öğrenciler;

Aşağıda size yöneltilen sorular eğitim bilimleri enstitüsü yüksek lisans tezi çalışması amacı ile sorulmaktadır. İsminizi yazmanıza gerek yoktur. Tüm bilgileriniz saklı tutulacaktır. Size uygun yanıtları doldurarak ve kutucuklara çarpı (x) işareti koyarak yanıtlayabilirsiniz.

Katılımınız için teşekkür ederim.

1) Sınıfınız.....

2) Cinsiyetiniz K () E ()

3) Yaşınız yıl

4) Siz dahil kaç kardeşsiniz?

5) Siz kaçınıcı çocuksunuz?.....

6) Ebeveynlerinizin eğitim durumunu lütfen aşağıda belirtiniz.

Anneniz: Okuryazar değil () İlköğretim () Ortaöğretim () Yüksek öğrenim ()

Babanız: Okuryazar değil () İlköğretim () Ortaöğretim () Yüksek öğrenim ()

7) Kiminle oturuyorsunuz?

Aile () Anne() Baba () Akraba () Yurt ()

8) Kendi odan var mı ?

Evet () Hayır ()

9) Anne sağ mı?

Hayatta () Hayatta Değil ()

10)Baba sağ mı?

Hayatta () Hayatta Değil ()

11) Anne ve Baba birlikte mi ayrı mı?

Birlikte () Ayrı ()

12) Evinizde bilgisayar var mı?

Evet () Hayır ()

13) Evinizde sadece sizin kullandığınız bilgisayar var mı?

Evet () Hayır ()

14) Kendinize ait cep telefonunuz var mı?

Evet () Hayır ()

15) Kendinize ait tabletiniz var mı?

Evet () Hayır ()

16) Kişisel internet bağlantınız var mı?

Evet () Hayır ()

17) Kendinize ait elektronik cihazınız (cep telefonu, bilgisayar, tablet vb.) dışında başka elektronik cihaz (aile üyelerine ait, arkadaşlarınıza ait, internet kafedeki bilgisayarlar gibi) kullanır mısınız?

Evet ()

Hayır ()

18) Kişisel internet bağlantınız dışında internete bağlanıyor musunuz?

Evet ()

Hayır ()

19) Evet ise nereden/kimden bağlanıyorsunuz, lütfen belirtiniz

.....

20) İnterneti günde ne kadar süre ile kullanıyorsunuz lütfen belirtiniz (cep telefonundan internete bağlanma süresi dahil)

1-3 saat () 3-5 saat () 5-7 saat () 7-9 saat () 9 saatten fazla ()

21) İnternete girme sürenizi anne/babanız ya da aile büyüklerinden herhangi biri denetliyor mu?

Evet ()

Hayır ()

22) Cevabınız evet ise;

İnternete giriş ve çıkış saatleri takip çizelgesi uyguluyor ()

İnternete oynadığım oyunlara süre belirleniyor ()

Bilgisayardan ebeveyn denetimi penceresini aktifleştirdi ()

Kullandığım internete kota koyarak ()

Diğer ()

23) İnternet kullanma amacınızı sıra vermeden ilk üç tanesini işaretleyiniz.

Ders çalışmak/ödev hazırlamak ()
 Film izlemek/indirmek ()
 Sosyal ağlar ()
 Eğlence (oyun oynama) ()
 Alışveriş yapmak ()
 Müzik indirmek ()
 E-mail alıp göndermek ()
 Haber okumak ()
 Diğer (yazınız).....

24) İnternete en çok hangi cihaz ile bağlanıyorsunuz?

Cep telefonu ()
 Bilgisayar ()
 Tablet ()
 Diğer (belirtiniz).....

25) İnternete en çok nerede iken bağlanıyorsunuz?

Evde ()
 Okulda ()
 İnternet kafede ()
 Diğer (belirtiniz).....

26) İnternete bağlanmadan bir günde bilgisayar başında ne kadar zaman geçiriyorsunuz?

.....saat

27) Gün içinde aşağıdaki yollardan hangisi ile yaklaşık kaç adet mesaj aldığınızı belirtiniz?

E-posta.....adet
 SMS.....adet
 Sosyal ağlar (belirtiniz).....adet

SİBER ZORBALIK ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda son zamanlarda yaşadığınızla ilgili sorular sorulmaktadır. Lütfen en uygun cevabı işaretleyiniz.

1) Başka çocuklar aşağıdakilerden herhangi birini sizi rahatsız etmek için kullanıyor mu? (başınıza gelenleri işaretleyiniz, birden fazla seçenek işaretleyebilirsiniz)

- Elektronik posta ile ()
- Kişisel videolarınız ile ()
- Yazılı mesaj ile (SMS vb gibi) ()
- Sosyal iletişim ağları ile ()
- Resimli mesaj ile (MMS ile) ()
- Sosyal iletişim ağları ile (chat) ()
- Anında karşılıklı mesaj ile ()
- Sanal ortamlardaki oyunlar esnasında ()
- Sizinle ilgili geliştirilen küçük düşürücü bir site ya da form sitesi ile ()

2) Aşağıdakilerden herhangi birini siz başka çocukları rahatsız etmek için kullanıyor musunuz? (başınıza gelenleri işaretleyiniz, birden fazla seçenek işaretleyebilirsiniz)

- Elektronik posta ile ()
- Kişisel videolarınız ile ()
- Yazılı mesaj ile (SMS vb gibi) ()
- Sosyal iletişim ağları ile ()
- Resimli mesaj ile (MMS ile) ()
- Sosyal iletişim ağları ile (chat) ()
- Anında karşılıklı mesaj ile ()
- Sanal ortamlardaki oyunlar esnasında ()
- Sizinle ilgili geliştirilen küçük düşürücü bir site ya da form sitesi ile ()

3) Başka bir çocuktan sizi fiziksel olarak incitmekle ilgili online (çevrim içi) ya da yazılı mesaj alır mısınız?

- Hiç ()
- Neredeyse hiç ()
- Bazen ()
- Hemen hemen her zaman ()
- Her zaman ()

4) Başka çocuklar sizi kasıtlı olarak online (çevrim içi) gruplardan çıkarır mı?

- Hiç ()
- Neredeyse hiç ()
- Bazen ()
- Hemen hemen her zaman ()
- Her zaman ()

5) Başka bir çocuk yazılı mesaj ya da online (çevrim içi) ortamda size kaba

bir şey söyler mi?

- Hiç ()
- Neredeyse hiç ()
- Bazen ()
- Hemen hemen her zaman ()
- Her zaman ()

6) Size kızgın olan çocuk sizi online (çevrim içi) gruplardan çıkararak intikam alır mı?

- Hiç ()
- Neredeyse hiç ()
- Bazen ()
- Hemen hemen her zaman ()
- Her zaman ()

7) Güvenliğinizi tehdit eden yazılı veya online (çevrim içi) mesaj alır mısınız?

- Hiç ()
- Neredeyse hiç ()
- Bazen ()
- Hemen hemen her zaman ()
- Her zaman ()

8) Bir çocuk diğer çocukların artık sizden hoşlanmaması için yazılı ya da online (çevrim içi) mesajlarla sizin hakkınızda yalan söyler mi?

- Hiç ()
- Neredeyse hiç ()
- Bazen ()
- Hemen hemen her zaman ()
- Her zaman ()

9) Başka bir çocuk tarafından isteklerini gerçekleştirmediğiniz takdirde sevilmeyeceğinizi belirten yazılı ya da online (çevrim içi) mesaj alır mısınız?

- Hiç ()
- Neredeyse hiç ()
- Bazen ()
- Hemen hemen her zaman ()
- Her zaman ()

10) Herhangi bir arkadaşın diğer arkadaşlarını sizden uzak tutacak, sizi aşağılayıcı yazılı ya da online (çevrim içi) mesaj atar mı?

- Hiç ()
- Neredeyse hiç ()
- Bazen ()
- Hemen hemen her zaman ()
- Her zaman ()

11) İsteklerini yapmadığın takdirde diğer çocuklardan fiziksel olarak incitici mesajlar alır mısın?

- Hiç ()
- Neredeyse hiç ()
- Bazen ()
- Hemen hemen her zaman ()
- Her zaman ()

12) Online (çevrim içi) kavgalarda bulunur musunuz?

- Hiç ()
- Neredeyse hiç ()
- Bazen ()
- Hemen hemen her zaman ()
- Her zaman ()

13) Başka bir çocuk online (çevrim içi) ortamda acımasız dedikodu, söylenti veya başka kırıcı bir şey göndererek ya da paylaşarak sizi küçümser mi?

- Hiç ()
- Neredeyse hiç ()
- Bazen ()
- Hemen hemen her zaman ()
- Her zaman ()

14) Başka bir çocuk sizin yerinize geçerek itibarınızı zedeleyecek ve arkadaşlık ilişkilerinize zarar verecek mesajlar gönderir mi?

- Hiç ()
- Neredeyse hiç ()
- Bazen ()
- Hemen hemen her zaman ()
- Her zaman ()

15) Başka bir çocuğun, izniniz olmadan, sırlarınızı ve fotoğraflarınızı online (çevrim içi) olarak paylaşması başınıza gelir mi?

- Hiç ()
- Neredeyse hiç ()
- Bazen ()
- Hemen hemen her zaman ()
- Her zaman ()

16) Online (çevrim içi) ortamda başınıza gelen kötü bir şey için bir yetişkinden yardım istemek zorunda kaldınız mı?

- Hiç ()
- Neredeyse hiç ()
- Bazen ()
- Hemen hemen her zaman ()
- Her zaman ()



Sevgili öğrenciler;

Siber zorbalık; bilgi ve iletişim teknolojileri kullanılarak (bilgisayar,tablet,akıllı telefon,sosyal medya ve oyunlar v.s.) bir birey ya da grup tarafından insanları korkutmayı, kızdırmayı, utandırmayı ve zarar vermeyi amaçlayan kasıtlı, tekrarlanan ve düşmanca davranışlar içeren bir süreçtir.

Eğer siz de bu tür davranışlara maruz kaldıysanız, aşağıdaki soruları kimliğinizi kullanmadan (ad-soyad bilgilerinizi yazmanıza gerek yoktur) yanıtlayıp çalışmamıza destek olarak bu tür davranışların önlenmesini sağlayabilirsiniz. Desteginiz için teşekkür ederiz.

ÖZGÜL ŞEKER

Bilgi Teknolojileri Ve Sosyal Medya Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans

Programı

Siber Zorbalığın Öğrenciler Üzerindeki Etkileri		ayır	ismen	K vet
	Üzüntü duydum.	1)	2)	(3)
	İçinde bulunduğum durumdan utandım.	1)	2)	(3)
	Bu tür davranışlara maruz kalınca öfkelenim.	1)	2)	(3)
	Gerçek hayatta saldırganın bana zarar vermesinden korktum.	1)	2)	(3)
	İnsanların beni önemsemediğini düşündüm.	1)	2)	(3)
	Etrafımdaki insanlardan şüphe duymaya başladım.	1)	2)	(3)
	İçime kapandım.	1)	2)	(3)
	Teknolojik aletleri kullanmaktan soğudum.	1)	2)	(3)
	Hayal kırıklığına uğradım.	1)	2)	(3)
0	Her an bana ulaşabileceklerini düşünerek huzursuzluk yaşadım.	1)	2)	(3)
1	Arkadaşlarıma duyduğum güven azaldı.	1)	2)	(3)
2	Günlük aktivitelere odaklanmada zorlandım.	1)	2)	(3)
3	Dersleri dinlerken dikkatimi toplamakta güçlük yaşadım.	1)	2)	(3)
4	Derslerden aldığım puanlar düştü.	1)	2)	(3)
5	Arkadaşlarımla olan ilişkilerim bozuldu.	1)	2)	(3)
6	Okula gitmemeye başladım.	1)	2)	(3)
7	Ailemle olan ilişkilerim kötüleşti.	1)	2)	(3)
8	Özgüvenimi kaybettim.	1)	2)	(3)

9	Yalnız başına dışarıya çıkmaktan tedirginlik duydum.	1)	2)	3)
0	Kendimi korumasız hissettim.	1)	2)	3)
1	Takip edildiğimi düşündüm.	1)	2)	3)
2	Stres altında kaldım.	1)	2)	3)
3	Ailem hakkımda olumsuz düşünür diye endişelendim.	1)	2)	3)

Öğrencilerin Siber Zorbalıkla Baş Etme Stratejileri		vet	ayır
	Zorbalığı yapan kişiden gelen mesajları bloke ettim.	1)	2)
	Zorbalığı yapan kişiden davranışını sonlandırmasını istedim.	1)	2)
	Aile büyüklerime durumu anlattım.	1)	2)
	Zorbalığı yapan kişiyle karşılaşınca şiddete başvurdum.	1)	2)
	Zorbalığı yapan kişiye karşı kaba kelimeler kullandım.	1)	2)
	Bilgisayar ve interneti daha az kullanmaya başladım.	1)	2)
	Zorbalığa uğradığım hesabı kapattım.	1)	2)
	Zorbalığa uğradığım internet sitesinden ayrıldım.	1)	2)
	Öğretmenime veya okul müdürüne anlattım.	1)	2)
0	Arkadaşıma anlattım.	1)	2)
1	Tanımadığım insanlarla konuşmamaya başladım.	1)	2)
2	Zorba davranışa aynı şekilde karşılık verdim.	1)	2)
3	Zorbalığa uğradığım sitenin yöneticisine şikâyet ettim.	1)	2)
4	Kullandığım internet hesaplarının şifrelerini değiştirdim.	1)	2)
5	Telefon numaramı değiştirdim.	1)	2)
6	Bilinmeyen ve özel numaralardan gelen aramaları cevaplamadım.	1)	2)
7	Psikoloğa başvurdum.	1)	2)
8	Adli yollara başvurdum. (Polise şikâyet ettim.)	1)	2)
9	Sosyal medyayı kullanmayı bıraktım.	1)	2)
0	Sosyal medya hesaplarımı dondurdum.	1)	2)
1	Farklı sosyal medya hesabı açtım.	1)	2)
2	Telefonumu kullanmaya bir süre ara verdim.	1)	2)

3	Hiçbir şey yapmadım, sessiz kaldım.	1)	2)
---	-------------------------------------	----	----

