YEDITEPE UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES MASTER'S PROGRAM IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES AND SOCIAL MEDIA EDUCATION

EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DIGITAL MEDIA LITERACY AND SENSITIVITY TO CYBERBULLYING OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

ÖZGE PATLAR

ISTANBUL- 2023

THESIS TITLE

EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DIGITAL MEDIA LITERACY AND SENSITIVITY TO CYBERBULLYING OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

by

Özge PATLAR

Approved by:

Prof.Dr.Gonca KIZILKAYA CUMAOĞLU .....

(Yeditepe University)

(Thesis Supervisor)

Prof.Dr.Yelkin DİKER COŞKUN .....

(Yeditepe University)

(Co-Supervisor)

Dr.Alper BAYAZIT .....

(Ankara Üniversitesi)

DATE OF APPROVAL: 14/08/2023

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 material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : ÖZGE PATLAR

Signature :

ABSTRACT

EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DIGITAL MEDIA LITERACY AND SENSITIVITY TO CYBERBULLYING OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Patlar, Özge

MA, Information Technologies and Social Media Education

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Gonca Kızılkaya Cumaoğlu

June, 2023

In this study, it was aimed to examine the relationship between university students' digital media literacy and their sensitivity to cyberbullying. The scales were distributed to the students in printed form. The sample of the study consists of a group of 200 undergraduate students in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th grades. Digital Media Literacy Scale (Bayrakcı & Narmanlıoğlu, 2021) was used to determine the digital media literacy levels of the students. Sensitivity Scale Regarding Cyberbullying (Tanrıkulu, 2015) was used to determine the cyberbullying levels of the students. The data were analyzed with descriptive and relational statistics. When the research results were examined, a weak positive correlation was found between university students' digital media literacy and their sensitivity to cyberbullying. In addition, students' cyberbullying and digital media literacy were examined in terms of demographic variables.

Keywords: media, digital media, digital media literacy, bullying, cyberbullying, university students

ÖZ

ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN DİJİTAL MEDYA OKURYAZARLIKLARI İLE SİBER ZORBALIĞA İLİŞKİN DUYARLILIKLARI ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİNİN İNCELENMESİ

Patlar, Özge

Yüksek Lisans, Bilgi Teknolojileri ve Sosyal Medya Eğitimi

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Gonca Kızılkaya Cumaoğlu

Haziran, 2023

Bu çalışmada üniversite öğrencilerinin dijital medya okuryazarlıkları ve siber zorbalığa ilişkin duyarlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Ölçekler öğrencilere basılı olarak dağıtılmıştır. Çalışmanın örneklemi 1.,2.,3. ve 4. sınıf lisans öğrencilerinden oluşan 200 kişilik bir gruptan oluşmaktadır. Öğrencilerin dijital medya okuryazarlık düzeylerini belirlemek için Dijital Medya Okuryazarlık Ölçeği (Bayrakcı & Narmanlıoğlu, 2021) kullanılmıştır. Öğrencilerin siber zorbalık düzeylerini belirlemek için ise Siber Zorbalığa İlişkin Duyarlılık Ölçeği (Tanrıkulu, 2015) kullanılmıştır. Veriler betimsel ve ilişkisel istatistikler ile analiz edilmiştir. Araştırma sonuçları incelendiğinde, üniversite öğrencilerinin dijital medya okuryazarlıkları ile siber zorbalığa ilişkin duyarlılıklarının zayıf düzeyde pozitif korelasyon bulunmuştur. Ayrıca öğrencilerin siber zorbalık ve dijital medya okuryazarlıkları demografik değişkenleri açısından da incelenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: medya, dijital medya, dijital medya okuryazarlığı, zorbalık, siber zorbalık, üniversite öğrencileri

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you very much to my dear consultant Prof. Dr. Gonca KIZILKAYA CUMAOĞLU who shares her vast knowledge, always supports me and produces solutions at every point I hang out during my thesis work.

I would also like to thank my dear friend and colleague Göksu KAPANCI, who help me in this process.

I would like to thank dear Yasemin BULUT, who I had the chance to get to know thanks to my work and who has been very supportive and helpful in my process.

And thank to my dear family, my dear mother Sultan PATLAR, my dear father Murat PATLAR and my dear brother Hasan Can PATLAR throughout my life and as in this process, due to their unconditional love, support and trust.

TABLE OF CONTENT

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDIX

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ER: Ethics and Responsibility

DU: Daily Use

GKFS: General Knowledge and Functional Skills

FM: Frequency Modulation

AM: Amplitude Modulation

TRT: Turkish Radio Television Corporation

USA: United States of America

DVD: Digital Versatile Disc

ARPA: Advanced Research Projects Agency

NFSNET: National Science Foundation Network

CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION

This section presents the background of the study.

1.1.Background of the Study

Today, with the progress of media and technology, digital media has become an indispensable part of people. So much so that at every moment of our lives, the digital world has one or more products.

Throughout history, the unique expectations, values and variables of each period shape the definition of literacy according to that period (Coşkun, Cumaoğlu, & Seçkin, 2013). Although concepts such as information literacy, network literacy, visual literacy, numerical literacy, and library literacy are considered among the sub-branches of the concept of literacy, the concept of digital literacy stands out in relation to today's information and communication technologies. In this digital age, digital literacy skills have become increasingly important with the rapid development of information and communication technologies. As a result, the ability to accurately evaluate information in the digital media environment, develop critical thinking skills and communicate safely and effectively on digital platforms is possible thanks to digital media literacy. Researchers who are of this opinion think that media literacy competencies can provide the function of digital media literacy education by adapting and developing them to the original structure of digital media (Kamerer, 2013); (Kahne, Lee, & Feezel, 2012); (Dezuanni, 2015).

Although the ease of access to information and the diversity of content have increased in the digital age, this also brings with it risks such as the spread of misleading information and cyberbullying.

In some studies, it has been stated that the concept of cyberbullying is different from traditional bullying due to the relational, physical, verbal dimension of cyberbullying and the lack of place and time limitations worldwide when compared to traditional bullying (Juvonen & Gross, 2008). In some studies, it has been stated that cyberbullying is carried out through electronic media and is a different type of traditional bullying (Smith, Mahdavi, Carvalho, Fisher, Russell, & Tippett, 2008).

Considering this concept, the main problem of the research is "Is there a relationship between university students' digital media literacy and their sensitivity to cyberbullying?" .

CHAPTER 2

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1.MEDIA

Media is an important means of transferring news, information, ideas and entertainment between societies through the use of communication tools. Different media is a type of media where news flow is provided and information is transmitted.(Akyıldız, 2019). The media, which conveys the message to the masses by coding, shapes the thoughts of individuals. This tool, which is used to shape thoughts, can benefit from many physical, technical and social channels (Yengin, 2012). Various platforms such as television, radio, newspaper, magazine, internet and social media represent different forms of media. Media facilitates access to information, raises awareness of social events, and enables people to follow news and content about the world. The media shapes the thought world of the society with the help of the terms and concepts it presents (Yaylagül, 2017). In the context of communication sociology, media is handled in the context of individual and social relations. It has a learning and education effect in terms of informing the society and forming public opinion through the media. In

addition to these effects, it has an effect on the economy and thus the economy of society in the evaluation of free time, in the shaping of attitudes and behaviors (Aziz, 2016).

The main items of the media can be expressed as follows: (Aydeniz, 2011)

- First of all, the media is obliged to ensure the right of the public to receive information.
- Media is a means of communication; it produces a message, than transmits it.
- Media is a commercial enterprise and keeps up with the industry.
- Media is a commercial enterprise, it operates according to market rules.
- Media sells the messages he produces. It also sells its users to the advertiser with reader, listener and audience measurements.
- Due to the nature of the service it provides, the media is expected to observe moral principles and rules.
- It has multi-dimensional and multi-functional tools.
- It provides entertainment, information and promotional content along with uninterrupted news.
- It keeps institutions that adopt one-way communication. Despite it is said that the media is a means of communication, it is only a transmitter. It does not communicate with each other. This situation causes a misconception that he is the sole authority of mass communication.

2.1.1. Media Types

Today, it is obvious that media tools, which operate in every subject and field and are very accessible thanks to technology, are an indispensable part of people. Media facilitates communication between people, facilitates the flow of information, presents different views and supports cultural interaction, a tool that many people actively use in daily life.

The types of media vary and are constantly changing with technological advances. Traditional media types include newspapers, magazines, television and radio, while digital media types include the internet, social media, blogs, podcasts and video sharing platforms.

2.1.1.1. Printed Media

Printed media is a type of media where written texts are presented in printed format. Materials such as newspapers, magazines, books, brochures, posters are examples of printed media. Print media have a long history and have traditionally been used for information, news entertainment and advertising purposes.

Book

Books are examples of printed media where written texts are presented in a more comprehensive way. Books offer fictional or non-fictional content and may cover literary, scientific, historical, philosophical, religious, or educational topics. However, it aims to convey information in depth, storytelling and thought sharing. The fact that books were printed by hand before the middle of the 15th century explains why they were rare and expensive. Reading and learning were among the privileges of the rich only until the development of printing by Johannes Gutenberg. Gutenberg began writing words using moving metal letters in the 1440s. Thanks to the portable printing machines, many copies of the same page could be produced. In this way, book production became much faster and lower cost. All kinds of reading materials have reached wider audiences. At the time of Gutenberg, Europe was on the verge of a new era in which world discovery, scientific breakthroughs, and political and religious changes had erupted. Gutenberg's printing press has pushed Europe into the modern era and continues to inform and entertain us by printing millions of books and newspapers every day since then (Childress, 2008).

Newspaper

Newspapers are publications that are published on a daily, weekly or monthly basis and usually consist of a series of pages. Newspapers include news, articles, comments, columns and advertisements. It is widely used to follow news, keep up to date with current events and obtain information on different topics. In addition, newspapers provide a platform for advertisers. Since ancient times, people have been in contact with people and societies. So much so that the written communication provided with the pictures in the caves and the symbols starting with hieroglyphic writings has been replaced by the texts created by writing on papyrus and parchment papers over time. News letters, which emerged in the 13th century and reproduced by handwriting, are an important element of the printed media, enabling the communication of sailors. Thanks to the journalism industry revolution, which has been developing at an ever-increasing rate since the 17th century, it has started to reach wider masses and regions and has increased its quality in terms of content and news value (Özçağlayan, 2008).

Magazine

Magazines are written publications that focus on a specific topic and have a longer publication period. There are magazines for various subjects such as fashion, sports, music, health, technology, travel. Magazines can have visually appealing designs and aim to deliver more in-depth content. Magazines often cater to the target audience for their interests and can attract a more specific audience. Journal publishers emphasize that many journals have a larger readership than the figures in circulation indicate. For example, a magazine can be read not only by the buyer, but also by other family members or office workers. Today, as with many other types of media, journals exhibit the process of decomposition. While there are

more magazine titles in circulation today, the circulation of magazines is decreasing. In other words, there are more magazines, but fewer readers per magazine (Paxon, 2010).

2.1.1.2.Audio Visual Media

This media type refers to the type of media in which image and sound come together. This type of media includes television movies, radio, video games, music videos, advertisements and other multimedia content. Audio visual media offer audiences a rich experience and are used for a variety of purposes in terms of storytelling, information transmission, entertainment and communication.

Radio

Radio is a type of media that provides audio experience to listeners through broadcast audio programs and music. Radio programs include content such as music news chat interviews and podcasts. Radio broadcasts are usually performed by frequency modulation (FM) or amplitude modulation (AM) methods and listened to via the radio receiver. Radio has an important place among the developments of the 20th century. Radio waves were first proposed by Maxwell in 1860, while in the 1880s the German physicist H. Hertz proved the existence of radio waves and that sound vibrations propagate electronically at the speed of light (Çiftçi, 1999).

Television

Television is a type of media that provides audiovisual experience to viewers through broadcast programs and content. Television programs can be of various types such as news, series, documentaries, sports events, game programs. It is a widely used media tool in homes, hotels, workplaces and public places. The first experimental television broadcasts began in the United States in the 1920s, and the first regular television broadcasts took place in England in 1936. The introduction of regular broadcasting in the USA also coincides with the same years

(Pekman, 1997). In Turkey, the first television broadcast was carried out by Istanbul Technical University in 1952 as a closed circuit broadcast. In 1964, the Turkish Radio and Television Corporation (TRT) was established. In 1968, the TRT law was reorganized and television broadcasting was started. Until the first years of the 1990s, television broadcasts continued to be broadcast in TRT's hand, and this situation changed with the emergence of private televisions (Turam, 1996).

Cinema

A movie is a form of audiovisual media in which moving images are recorded and a story told. Movies shown in the cinema can be viewed on the big screen in movie theaters, while DVDs, Blu-ray discs, digital platforms and television broadcasts can also be viewed in different environments. Movies are produced in different genres and in various subjects such as drama, comedy, action, science fiction, romantic. The period until the mid-1920s was a period when all films were silent and subtitles were used instead of soundtracks for places that actors could not express with their gestures. Following these years, although the 1930s were the Great Depression Period, it cannot be ruled out that the film industry did a good job. The economic difficulties experienced during the period led people to different escape routes. Many film historians see the 1930’s and early 1940’s as the height of Hollywood's Golden Age. There was also a section who preferred to go to the theater to see the war. In addition to these, short documentary films, called news films, constitute an important part of the film experience between the late 1920s and the early 1960s. While news programs were the only way to present contemporary and visual accounts of the day's news, this situation changed with the advent of television (Paxon, 2010).

Video

Video is a type of media that provides viewers with an image and audio experience through its format. It is an audio-visual content created by recording and playing back moving images. Videos can be viewed, shared and posted on various platforms. Video literally means the recording of a chronologically arranged array of pixel images. Resolution and number of images per second are decisive factors for the amount of data. Although analog recording and transmission is still common on television, the roles of digital formats are increasing day by day. Since all videos distributed over the Internet are digital, this process will accelerate (Kipphan, 2001).

2.1.1.3.Portable Information Technologies

Portable information technologies refer to portable devices that users can use to meet their information and communication needs while on the move. These technologies provide mobility, connectivity and convenience, giving users access to information and communication.

Smartphones

Smartphones are portable devices that offer a wide range of features such as communication, access to the internet, applications, e-mail, music, photos and video. It allows users to make calls, messaging, use social media, browse the web and many other functions. Communication with smartphones 20. It started to develop in the first years of the century. The basic services of one-to-one communication between people depend on communication with voice. Thanks to smartphones, users can specify their geographical locations, and thanks to the location notification feature, many service providers, organizations, etc. can learn their locations. In addition, locations can be learned mutually with registered friends (Ling, 2004).

Laptops

Laptops are computer systems that provide portability and ease of use. It offers users a wide range of functionality and can perform office work, media editing, gaming and many other tasks. They also provide access to the internet thanks to their wireless connectivity features. They save time and energy. On the other hand, laptop systems can also be used by connecting to a larger screen when needed. In addition, such systems support almost all screen, television and projection systems. Modern laptops used today also have components such as internal and external cameras and/or microphones. With the inclusion of the camera and microphone in the system and the contribution of some other environments and technologies, the need for social and one-on-one interaction is effectively met for business or educational purposes (Aydın, et al., 2015).

Tablet Computers

Tablet computers are lightweight and portable devices, usually with a touch screen. Tablets provide a balance between smartphones and laptops, offering users functions such as web browsing, email, media consumption, gaming, e-book reading, and productivity apps. It is observed that these devices, which function with wireless internet connection and touch screen, are preferred by users for a variety of reasons such as ease of transportation, keeping with them, interface/operating system usefulness, fast opening and closing, size, lightness, but not limited to these (Aydın, et al., 2015).

Wearable Technologies

Wearable technologies are electronic devices and sensors that users can carry on their bodies or clothes. These technologies can be used for various purposes such as health and fitness tracking, communication, data collection, entertainment and fashion. However, wearable devices have a very important place in terms of sharing information by offering users the

opportunity to share their saved information instantly on third-party Web 2.0 sites or share it with other users as e-mail (Akkoyunlu, İşman, & Odabaşı, 2015).

2.1.1.4.Digital Media

The environment in which digital technologies are used is included in the definition of digital media. It covers media content that can be accessed and consumed through computers, smartphones, tablets, the internet and other digital platforms. Many sources use the concepts of digital media and new media interchangeably. Akar defines the concept of digital media not only as the form of traditional media transferred to the digital environment, but also as an independent interactive medium or form of distribution in which more information is disseminated (Akar, 2010). In the following section, digital media are discussed in more detail.

2.2.DIGITAL MEDIA

Digital media is a type of media that allows individuals to share their ideas and works, and where sharing and discussion can be made (Vural & Bat, 2010). Ceremonial (2005) defines digital media as providing an interactive communication that allows many people to receive messages at the same time, eliminating the changes arising from the vehicle and environment (Törenli, 2005). According to Dewdney & Ride, "digital and code" are prominent concepts in digital media (Dewdney & Ride, 2006). Digital coding forms the basis of the functioning of digital media tools. By means of the existence of digital media, it has digitized all media types. Thus, with digital media, much wider masses are reached and the media is now "programmable" (Manovich, 2001).

Digital media has emerged with the development and intertwined use of computers, internet and media. We can attribute the emergence of digital media to some developments. According to Lev Manovich, digital media started in the 1830s. The process that started with the

invention of Charles Babbage's "analytical machine" and Louis Daguerre's "daguerotype" continued until the 20th century. With the invention of Charles Babbage's "analytical machine", the development process of the computer began, and on the other hand, the process that started with Louis Daguerre's "daguerreotype" led to the transfer of the image to the surface and the development of media technologies (Manovich, 2001).

In terms of the development of digital media, it was accepted by many researchers that US President Dwight Eisenhower instructed the establishment of the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) one year after the Soviet Union carried out its first manned space flights with the Sputnik satellite in 1957 (Castells, 2008); (Dijk, 2018); (Tokgöz, 2015). Following this instruction, an internet system was designed by Paul Baran that would not be affected by any attack between 1960-1964 (Castells, 2008). In 1969, the first connection was made with 4 centers within the framework of Arpanet and the first form of internet emerged with host connections. In 1971, Arpanet started to work under the name of control protocol (Tokgöz, 2015). The Arpanet, which was used until 1990, was closed on February 28 and the "NFSNET", which was its developed version, was started (Castells, 2008).

2.3.DIGITAL MEDIA LITERACY

The situation where users can access information in digital media, make analysis, synthesis, evaluation and communication is called digital media literacy. It is the conscious use of digital technology and communication tools. Digital media literacy means the production, distribution and use of computer and communication technologies and media by combining technical knowledge and sociocultural dimensions (Lin, Li, Deng, & Lee, 2013).

So much so that this concept has become important in a world where we encounter an increasing amount of digital content today. Creating new content in digital media environments comes to the fore. It is very important for digital media literacy that individuals

are now more active, participatory and able to produce content in digital environments (Karaduman, 2019). We are constantly bombarded with information through the internet, social media, blogs, online news sites, podcasts and other digital platforms. Therefore, accessing information, distinguishing between accurate and reliable sources, and being aware of online security and privacy issues are important components of digital media literacy.

According to Rogow it consists of the following nine components (Rogow, 2014):

- **Access:** To reach high-level media technologies and their content concretely and to use them correctly.
- **Understanding:** It is to comprehend the technological messages used in the access stage.
- **Awareness:** Understanding the information conveyed by the media and realizing one's place in one's life.
- **Analysis:** To analyze the infrastructure of the information in order to observe the media information impartially and without prejudice.
- **Assessment:** Making relevant decisions about the power, importance and benefits of the media for framed goals.
- **Creation:** Using multiple media sizes for a specific purpose

to create media messages.

- **Impact:** To judge the reaction of individual facts to the media message and to analyze their effects on other people.
- **Participation:** Initiating and bringing together collaborations led by media technologies.
- **Action:** It is to provide support from the awareness of the person with the information of the media and to take a step.

2.4.BULLYING

Bullying is a form of social relationship in which constant acts of threat, aggression, harassment, or physical or emotional harm are committed by one person or group against another.

Bullying often occurs when the powers are unequal, the bully exhibits these behaviors to control, manipulate, or gain dominance. Bullying is abusing the victim in a way that shows physical, verbal, strength and superiority (Tamer & Vatanartıran, 2014). All kinds of bullying behaviors are a big problem for both the bully and the bully, but the behavior settles and leaves a permanent mark because the continuity causes the behavior to reinforce (Ertuğrul, 2019). Individuals exposed to bullying can become depressed and even commit suicide (Özer & Şad, 2021).

To combat bullying, it is important to raise awareness and educate the community. Talking about bullying encourages people to take the damage of bullying and encourages standing by victims. In addition, policies and procedures should be established in schools, workplaces and other areas of society to prevent bullying.

2.4.1. Types of Bullying

Bullying behaviors are classified under 4 main headings. (Brank, Hoetger, & Hazen, 2012)

2.4.1.1. Physical Bullying

It is characterized by physical attacks such as hitting, punching, pushing, kicking.

2.4.1.2.Verbal Bullying

Behaviors such as naming, verbal aggressions, and ridicule are seen.

2.4.1.3. Related Bullying

It is the type of bullying in which the person is exposed to situations such as spreading rumors, being excluded from activities and interactions, and preventing from forming friendships.

2.4.1.4.Cyber Bullying

Bullying can manifest itself in many different ways, from nicknames to physical attacks, and it can also occur in online environments, such as social media posts, emails, messages (Rettew & Pawlowski, 2016). Bullying encountered on online platforms is examined under the heading of cyberbullying. In the following section, cyberbullying is discussed in more detail.

2.5.CYBER BULLYING

Cyberbullying is a type of bullying carried out using electronic communication tools such as internet, social media, messaging applications and other digital platforms. This type of bullying involves aggressive behavior aimed at harming, harassing, or damaging people's reputations.

With the developing technology, technologies that enter into all areas of our lives have led to the formation of new concepts or changes in existing concepts. One of them is the concept of cyberbullying adapted to the digital world. Bullying has moved from physical environments to cyber environments with developing technologies, and as a result, the concept of cyberbullying has emerged (Aksaray, 2011). Cyberbullying is defined as "the whole of the damaging behaviors done to a person, institution or any private-legal entity using digital technologies" (Arıcak, 2009)." In some studies, this concept is defined as the transfer of real-life aggression to the cyber environment using communication Technologies (Lacey, 2007). It is seen that cyberbullying is also used with different names such as digital bullying, internet

bullying and electronic bullying in the literatüre (Kowalski, Limber, & Agatston, 2007); (Duman & Bridge, 2019).

In order for the actions taken to be defined as cyberbullying, it should be aimed to harm the other party and these actions should be repeated (Belsey, 2007). The personal factors of the individual, the current situation factors and the characteristics of the individual affect whether the individual thinks before doing cyberbullying and then does this behavior (Kawalski, Giumetti, Schroeder, & Lattaner, 2014). In the emergence of cyberbullying behavior, reasons such as the sense of revenge in individuals, having previously been exposed to cyberbullying or having done cyberbullying, the desire to show their abilities in the cyber environment, the feeling of being strong, anxiety and depression, the possibility of wasting time on off-limits internet or having easy access to the internet, smoking/alcohol use can play an active role (Akgül, 2020).

Research on cyberbullying, which has become a serious problem in our country as well as all over the world, has started in our country since the beginning of the 2000s (Özer G. , 2016). In the researches conducted, it is seen that in addition to emotions such as fear, sadness and anger, individuals who are exposed to cyberbullying feel feelings of humiliation intensely with disappointment (Sezer, Şahin, & Aktürk, 2013), their self-esteem and self-confidence decrease, they cause failures in their academic lives and serious negativities occur in their social relationships (Price & Dalgleish, 2010). In addition to being effective in the emergence of negative emotions and behaviors in individuals, cyber victimization is also thought to cause school burnout and academic incompetence (Özer & Şad, 2021).

2.6.RELATED RESEARCH

When the relevant literature is examined, various studies have been conducted to determine the digital media literacy and cyberbullying sensitivity of university students.

2.6.1. Research on Digital Media Literacy

Ata and Yiğit (2022) wanted to determine the digital media literacy levels of students studying communication, and for this purpose, they screened students according to some demographic types (Ata & Yiğiter, 2022). The results of the analysis determined that the students' digital media literacy levels were high. The study showed that no significant difference was found when looking at the variables of gender and place of residence. In the study, a significant difference was found in the student's educational status variable that supports them, and in the monthly income variable, there is a significant difference in the functional production sub-dimension that supports the low-income students. In addition, in the variable of daily digital media usage time, it was seen that there was a significant difference supporting critical consumption, functional production dimension and those with more than 4 hours of usage time for the whole scale. In a study conducted by Güner (2022), it was aimed to provide a measurable framework for the European Union countries of digital media literacy based on statistics on media literacy, internet use and basic digital skills (Güner, 2022). In this study, activities that prioritize digital media literacy in the European Union were determined. In this case, it was concluded that there are serious differences between the European Union countries.

In a study conducted by Uzun (2022), the effect of primary school students' connected learning and stem approach on 21st century learning and renewal skills, digital media literacy and social entrepreneurship intentions was examined (Uzun, 2022). As a result of the research, while stem activities positively affected students' 21st century skills and digital literacy skills with the connected learning approach, no statistically significant difference was found in social entrepreneurship intentions.

2.6.2. Research on Cyberbullying

Erdur-Baker and Kavşut (2007) examined high school students' use of digital media and the incidence of cyberbullying in their study (Baker & Kavşut, 2007). The cases of cyberbullying and cyberbullying of male students were higher than that of female students. In addition, while a positive relationship was found between the use of internet-based communication resources and cyberbullying or victimization, it was observed that school type, economic income of the family, age and class variables were not associated with cyberbullying or cyber victimization.

Another study conducted by MacDonald and Roberts-Pittman (2010) on university students shows that 38% of university students know someone who has been cyberbullied, 21.9% have been cyberbullied and 8.6% have exposed another to cyberbullying (MacDonald & Roberts-Pittman, 2010). It was bring to an end that there was a significant positive correlation between all cyberbullying behaviors and traditional bullying behaviors, and that there was no crucial gender discrimination in any of the cyberbullying conducts.

Cross et al. (2016) developed a web-based program to prevent cyberbullying of high school students (Cross, Hadwen, Corsado, Slee, Roberts, & Barnes, 2016). The program called "The Cyber Friendly Schools" has been prepared in various sessions consisting of topics such as understanding cyberbullying, dealing with it, providing peer support, and developing friendship relationships. At the end of the research, it was watched that the program applied reduced cyberbullying both in the pre-test and post-test process and in the monitoring process. However, it has been suggested that research should be conducted on what actions will be taken to prevent the harm caused by bullying, especially during the hours students spend outside the school.

Johnson et al. (2016) examined the cyberbullying behaviors of university students through social media and revealed the prevalence of cyberbullying among students (Johnson, et al.,

2016). As a result of the survey applied to the students online, it was concluded that the ratio of cyberbullying among the students was low, and cyber victimization was seen in one out of every five students.

In a study conducted by Gönültaş (2019), it was examined whether there was a change in students' cyberbullying level and cyber victimization level according to various variables to determine the power of university students' problematic internet use level to predict cyberbullying and cyber victimization levels (Gönültaş, 2019). As a result of the research, it was concluded that cyberbullying and cyber victimization are common problems among university students. In addition, students' cyberbullying and victimization levels differed significantly according to gender and family income level, but did not differ significantly according to class level and father's education level.

CHAPTER 3

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1.Research Model

In this study, the relational screening model was used to determine whether digital media literacy has an effect on university students' susceptibility to cyberbullying. The approach that expresses a situation in terms of the item it is in is the relational scanning model definition (Karasar, 2005)**.** Demographic information form, Digital Media Literacy Scale and Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale were used for the participants in the study. Necessary findings were obtained in line with this information.

3.2.Purpose of the Research:

The main aim of this study is to investigate the relationship inter digital media literacy and cyberbullying sensitivity. For this purpose, it was tried to determine whether the digital media literacy of the participants and their sensitivity levels to cyberbullying differ statistically according to various demographic characteristics.

3.3. Importance of Research

With the rapid development of digital technologies today, digital media literacy skills are becoming increasingly important. Digital media literacy involves a set of perfections and skills that allow individuals to act consciously, effectively and safely in the digital world. While these skills facilitate people's access to information, they also provide the ability to question the accuracy of information and critically evaluate media content.

Eventually the digital world, the notion of cyberbullying has emerged and has increased rapidly with the increase of digital platforms. Sensitivity to cyberbullying is a condition that helps us combat the downsides of digital environments. Acting consciously and responsibly in the digital world can prevent cyberbullying.

In line with these two concepts, the labour was carried out to detect students'digital media literacy and sensitivity to cyberbullying and to provide feedback that will positively affect their position in digital environments in line with the results.

3.4.Counts

The counts of the research are as follows:

• Participants answered the scales used to collect data accurately and sincerely.

• The people selected to form the sample of the research are qualified to represent the relevant group.

• The data collection tools are in a quality that will reveal the current situation of university students on the subject.

3.5.Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study are as follows:

This study;

- Limited to students studying at a foundation university.

- Determinaed to questions in questionnaires.

- It is restricted to the answers given by university students.

-The data obtained were made through a single region and university in Istanbul.

-The data obtained are finite to the scales used.

3.6.Population and Sampling

In this study, the data were applied to 200 undergraduate students studying in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th grades of a foundation university in Istanbul.

Detailed information about the research group is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of Participants by Gender, Class and Faculty

Variables	Category	N	Percentage
	Female	103	51.5
Gender	**Male**	97	48.5
	Total	200	100.0

Class	**1.**	37	18.5
	2.	60	30,0
	3.	55	27.5
	4.	47	24.0
	Total	200	100.0
Faculty	**Education**	19	9.5
	Science and Literature	28	14,00
	Fine Arts	5	2,5
	Law	5	2.5
	Economics and Administrative Sciences	16	8.0
	Communication	22	11,0
	Architecture	6	3.0
	Engineering	64	32.0
	Health Sciences	20	10,0
	Commercial Sciences	13	6.5
	Applied Science	2	1,0
	Total	200	100.0

3.7.Research Problem

The main problem of the research: Is there a statistically significant relationship between "Digital Media Literacy" and "Sensitivity to Cyberbullying" of university students?

Sub-problems of the Research:

1. Is there a significant relationship between the gender variable of university students and their digital media literacy?

2. Is there a significant relationship between the gender variable and the sensitivity of university students to cyberbullying?

3. Is there a significant difference between the digital media literacy of university students according to their ages?

4. Is there a significant difference between the digital media literacy of university students according to their grade level?

5. Is there a significant difference between the sensitivity of university students to cyberbullying according to their grade level?

6. Is there a significant difference between university students' digital media literacy according to the time spent on social media variable?

7. Is there a significant difference between the sensitivity of university students to cyberbullying and the digital media tools they use most often?

8. Is there a significant difference between digital media literacy of university students according to gender variable?

9. Is there a significant difference between digital media literacy of university students according to age variable?

10. Is there a significant difference between the digital media literacy of university students according to the grade level variable?

11. Is there a significant difference between university students' digital media literacy according to the variable of social media use year?

12. Is there a significant difference between digital media literacy of university students according to the mother's education level variable?

13. Is there a significant difference between the digital media literacy of university students according to the father's education level variable?

14. Is there a relationship between university students' digital media literacy and their sensitivity to cyberbullying?

3.8.Data Collection Tools Used in the Research

Three different measurement tools were used to collect the data within the scope of the research.

Demographic Information Form

Within the scope of the research, a Demographic Information Form was used to determine the demographic characteristics of university students. In this form, a Demographic Information Form was applied to the participants by the researcher in order to obtain information about their demographic characteristics such as gender, age, faculty, grade level, average time spent on social media tools, the most frequently used digital media tools, how many years they have used digital media tools, mother's education status and father's education status. (Appendix 1)

Scales of the Research

Digital Media Literacy Scale

The 16-item Digital Media Literacy Scale (Annex 2) was used by Bayrakcı and Narmanlıoğlu (2021) to measure the digital media literacy skills of the participants. The scale consists of four sub-dimensions. These are Ethics and Responsibility (ER), General Knowledge and Functional Skills (GKFS) and Daily Use (DU). The scale was made with a 5-point Likert-type rating (1: Strongly Disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Neutral, 4: Agree, 5: Strongly Agree). TheCronbach Alpha value of the scale was determined as 0.846. As a result of the validity and reliability analysis for the items constituting the ER sub-dimension, the Alpha value of Cronbach was determined as 0.824, 0.795 for the GKFS sub-dimension and 0.729 for DU.

The Cronbach alpha value calculated for internal consistency in the original study of the scale is 0.911 (Bayrakcı & Narmanlıoğlu, 2021).

Sensitivity Scale Regarding Cyberbullying

The 13-item Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale (Annex 3) developed by Tanrıkulu (2014) was used to measure the sensitivity of the participants to cyberbullying. The scale was made with a 3-point Likert-type rating (1: No, 2: Sometimes, 3: Yes). The scale has no subscales. The Cronbach Alpha value of the scale was determined as 0.748. In the original study of the scale, the Cronbach alpha value calculated for internal consistency was 0.80 (Tanrıkulu, 2015).

Process and Data Analysis Techniques

Necessary calculations were made with statistical techniques for the research. All data collected from the scales were encoded and transferred to the computer environment. Data were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) program. Independent Sample t-test, Levene Test and One-Way ANOVA test were applied in normally distributed data. Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare paired groups in data that did not show normal distribution, and Kruskal Wallis test was used to compare groups of three or more.

CHAPTER 4

4. RESULTS

Analysis of Demographic Variables

Table 2 shows the frequency analysis of the participants in terms of gender variable.

Table 2: Distribution By Gender

Distribution by Gender		
Gender	**N**	**Percentage**
Female	103	51.5
Male	97	48.5
Total	200	100.0

In terms of gender variable, 51.5% of the participants were female and 48.5% were male. Then, the participants were discussed in terms of age groups and the results in Table 3 were obtained. Table 3 shows the frequency analysis of the participants in terms of age variable.

Table 3: Distribution by Age

Distribution by age - 2018		
Age	**N**	**Percentage**
18-20	31	15,5
20-22	96	48,0
22-24	42	21,0
24 and above	31	15,5
Total	200	100.0

In terms of age variable, 48% of the participants are in the age range of 20-22 years. 21% are in the age range of 22-24 years, 15.5% are in the age group of 24 years and above.

The students participating in the study were examined in terms of the faculty they studied and the results obtained are given in Table 4.

Table4: Distribution by Faculty

Distribution in terms of Faculty		
Faculty	**N**	**Percentage**
Education	19	9.5
Science and Literature	28	14,0
Fine Arts	5	2.5
Law	5	2.5
Economics and Administrative Sciences	16	8.0
Communication	22	11,0
Architecture	6	3.0
Engineering	64	32.0
Health Sciences	20	10,0
Commercial Sciences	13	6.5
Applied Science	2	1,0
Total	200	100.0

In terms of faculty, it is seen that 64of 200 participants are from the Faculty of Engineering. This rate is 32% in total. Then, it is seen that the highest participation was from the Faculty of

Science and Letters with 28 students, followed by the Faculty of Communication with 22 students.

Then, those who participated in the study were discussed in terms of class variable. The results obtained are given in Table 5.

Table 5: Distribution by Class

Distribution By Class		
Class	**N**	**Percentage**
1st Grade	37	18.5
2nd Grade	60	30,0
3rd Grade	55	27.5
4th Grade	47	24.0
Total	200	100.0

In terms of grade, it was determined that 30% of 200 participants were 2nd grade students and 27.5% were 3rd grade students.

The participants were asked **"How many hours do you spend on social media tools on average?"** question was asked and the following results were obtained. The results obtained in terms of this variable are given in Table 6.

Table 6: Distribution of Time Spent on Social Media

Distribution of time spent on social media		
Duration	**N**	**Percentage**
Less than 1 hour	16	8.0
1-3 hours	63	31,5
3-5 hours	71	35,5
5 hours and above	50	25.0
Total	200	100.0

35.5% of the participants spend 3-5 hours on social media. 31.5% spend 1-3 hours and 25% spend 5 hours or more.

Participants were asked, **"What digital media tool do you use most often?"** question and the following results were obtained. The results obtained in terms of this variable are given in Table 7.

Table 7: Distribution Regarding the Most Frequently Used Digital Media Tool

Distribution of the most frequently used digital media tool		
Media	**N**	**Percentage**
Instagram	115	57.5

Twitter	54	27.0
Facebook	7	3.5
Snapchat	24	12,0
Total	200	100.0

57.5% of the participants stated that they use Instagram, 27% Twitter, and 12% Snapchat.

Participants were asked "**How many years have you been using digital media tools?"** question was asked and the following results were obtained. The results obtained in terms of this variable are given in Table 8.

Table 8: Distribution Regarding How Many Years Digital Media Has Been Used

Distribution of how many years digital media has been used

Year	**N**	**Percentage**
5 - 7 Years	39	19,5
7 - 10 years	89	44.5
10-12 years	43	21.5
12-15 years	29	14,5
Total	200	100.0

44.5% of the participants use digital media between 7-10 years, 21.5% between 10-12 years, 19.5% between 5-7 years.

Finally, the education levels of the parents were discussed. The distribution of maternal education level is given in Table 9.

Table 9: Distribution Regarding Mother's Education Level

Distribution of Maternal Education Level		
Education Level	**N**	**Percentage**
Primary School	42	21,0
Secondary school	89	44.5
Higher education	69	34.5
Total	200	100.0

44.5% of the mothers of the participants have secondary education. Then, this is followed by mothers with higher education level education with 34.5%. Mothers with primary education level education with 21% are the last group.

The distribution of the father's education level is given in Table 10.

Table 10: Distribution Regarding Father's Education Level

Distribution Regarding Father's Education Level		
Education Level	**N**	**Percentage**
Primary School	34	17.0
Secondary school	76	38.0

Higher education	90	45.0
Total	200	100.0

38% of the fathers of the participants have secondary education. Then, this is followed by fathers with higher education level education with 45% and fathers with primary education level education with 17%.

In the study, the general grade point averages of the participants were asked. Since this variable has a continuous and proportional measurement level, descriptive statistics were calculated and the results in Table 11 were obtained.

Table 11: Descriptive Statistics for Grade Point Average

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
CPGA grade (out of 4.00)	165	1	4	2,4905	0,57665	0,232	-0,293

Since 35 of the 200 students participating in the study are 1st grade students, the GPA is not clear. When the GPA of the remaining 165 students is examined, it is seen that there are students with a minimum of 1 and a maximum of 4 averages. The GPA of 165 students was 2.4905 and the standard deviationwas 0.57665. The fact that the skewness and kurtosis values have a value between -2 and +2 is accepted as an indication that the variables show normal

distribution (George & Mallery, 2010). It shows a normal distribution of the overall grade point average.

Before proceeding to the detailed examination of the study, the validity and reliability analysis of the scale items were performed. Two different scales were used in the study. The Digital Media Literacy Scale has 3 sub-dimensions. The first 7 questions constitute the Ethics and Responsibility sub-dimension, the next 6 questions constitute the General Knowledge and Functional Skills sub-dimension, and the last 3 questions constitute the Daily Use sub-dimension. The Sensitivity Scale for Cyberbullying consists of 13 questions. According to Table 12, Cronbach's Alpha value of the Digital Media Literacy scale was determined as 0.846. This value indicates that the reliability level of the scale items is quite high. In other words, the questions in this scale measure the subject we want to measure with 84.6% accuracy. As a result of the validity and reliability analysis for the items constituting the Ethics and Responsibility sub-dimension, the Alpha value of Cronbach was determined as 0.824, 0.795 for the General Information and Functional Skills Sub-dimension and 0.729 for daily use. According to Table 13, the Alpha value of Cronbach's obtained for Sensitivity to Cyberbullying is 0.748. This value indicates that the reliability level of the scale items is high.

Table 12: Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient of Digital Media Literacy Scale and Sub-Dimensions

Reliability Analysis		
Digital Media Literacy Scale	**Reliability Coefficient**	**Number of Items**
Digital Literacy	0.846	16

Ethics and Responsibility	0.824	7
General Knowledge and Functional Skills	0.795	6
Daily Use	0.729	3

Table 13: Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient of the Sensitivity Scale Regarding Cyberbullying

Reliability Analysis		
Sensitivity Scale Regarding Cyberbullying	**Reliability Coefficient**	**Number of Items**
Sensitivity to Cyberbullying	0.748	13

In the continuation of the study, a normality test was performed to determine which statistical methods would be used in the analysis of the mean scores obtained from the answers given by the students participating in the study for the scales discussed. Based on the results of normality analysis, parametric statistical methods or non-parametric statistical methods can be used in the analysis of data. Parametric tests are used if the data have a normal distribution, and non-parametric statistical methods are used if the data are not normally distributed.

Normality Analysis

Before investigating whether there was a statistically significant difference between the scale averages in terms of demographic variables, basic statistical indicators were calculated for the scale items. Mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis values, which are the first 4 moments, were calculated and given in Table 14.

Table 14: Descriptive Statistics of Scales

Scale/Sub-dimensions	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Digital Media Literacy	4.0119	0.6129	969	2,404
Ethics and Responsibility	4.2736	0.68096	-1.757	4,731
General Knowledge and Functional FunFunctional Skills	3.5317	0.92794	0, 290	439
Daily Use	4.3617	0.77278	-1.532	2,479
Sensitivity to Cyberbullying	2.4365	0.35136	-.536	0.128

In normality studies, the fact that the skewness and kurtosis values of the relevant variable have a value between -2 and +2 is accepted as an indication that the variables show a normal distribution (George & Mallery, 2010).

1) The Digital Media Literacy Scale is a 5-point Likert scale. The mean scale was calculated as 4.0119 and the standard deviation as 0.6129. The skewness value was -0.969 and the kurtosis value was 2.404. Since the skewness and kurtosis values are outside the range of +2 to -2, it is thought that the mean scores of the scale do not show a normal distribution.
2) The mean and standard deviation for the Ethics and Responsibility sub-dimension were calculated as 4.2736 and 0.68096, respectively. The skewness value was -1.757 and the kurtosis value was 4.731. Since the skewness and kurtosis values are outside the range of +2 to -2, the mean scores of the Ethics and Responsibility sub-dimension do not show normal distribution.

3) The mean of the General Knowledge and Functional Skills sub-dimension was calculated as 3.5317 and the standard deviation as 0.92794. The skewness value was -0.2900 and the kurtosis value was -0.439. Since the skewness and kurtosis values are within the range of +2 to -2, the mean scores of the General Knowledge and Functional Skills sub-dimension show normal distribution.
4) The average daily use sub-dimension was calculated as 4.3617 and the standard deviation as 0.77278. The skewness value was -1.532 and the kurtosis value was 2.479. Since the skewness and kurtosis values are outside the range of +2 to -2, the mean scores of the Daily Use sub-dimension do not show normal distribution.
5) Finally, the normality of the Sensitivity Scale for Cyberbullying was investigated. This scale is a 3-pointLikert scale. The mean scale was 2.4365 and the standard deviation was 0.35136. The skewness value was -0.536 and the kurtosis value was -0.128. Since the skewness and kurtosis values are within the range of +2 to -2, the mean scores of the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale show normal distribution.

In the continuation of the study, it will be investigated whether there is a significant difference between the scale averages in terms of demographic variables. However, since the mean scores of the Digital Media Literacy, Ethics and Responsibility, Daily Use scales do not have a normal distribution, the comparisons of these scales will be made with non-parametric statistical methods. Since the data of the General Information and Functional Skills sub-dimension and the Sensitivity Scale Regarding Cyberbullying have a normal distribution, parametric tests will be used in the analysis of these two.

First, parametric tests were performed for scales with normal distribution. In terms of gender variable, it was investigated whether the difference between the mean scores of the General Knowledge and Functional Skills sub-dimension was statistically significant. Here, since the

data of this scale has a normal distribution and the gender variable is a two-level variable, the independent sample t-test was used. General Knowledge and Functional Skills and test results are given in Table 15.

Question 1: Is there a significant relationship between the gender variable of university students and their digital media literacy?

Table 15: Tests Regarding the Difference Between Digital Media Literacy Score Averages in terms of Gender Variable

Descriptive Statistics					**Levene Test**		**t test**		
Scale	**Gender**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**F**	**sig(p)**	**t**	**Df**	**sig (p)**
General Knowledge and Functional Skills	**Female**	103	3.1699	0.85653	0,002	0,963	-6.191	198	0,000
	Male	97	3.9158	0.84613					

The average response score of the girls to the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale was 3.1699, and the average response score of the boys was 3.9158. In order to perform two independent sample t-tests, it should first be determined whether the group variances are equal. For this purpose, Levene test was performed. In Table 15, the F statistical value calculated for the Levene test was found to be 0.002 and the sig (p) value was found to be 0.963. Since the Sig (p) value was greater than the significance level of 0.05, it was determined that the variances were not equal. Then, two independent sample t tests were performed and the results of the analysis are given in Table 14.

The H_0 hypothesis, which is expressed as "There is no significant difference between the means of the response scores of girls and boys to the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale", is rejected because the sig (p) value is less than 0.000 and the significance level

is less than 0.05. In other words, there is a statistically significant difference between the response scores of female and male students to the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale.

Question 2: Is there a significant relationship between the gender variable and the sensitivity of university students to cyberbullying?

Table 16: Tests Regarding the Difference Between Sensitivity Score Averages Regarding Cyberbullying in terms of Gender Variable

Descriptive Statistics					**Levene Test**		**t test**		
Scale	**Gender**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**F**	**sig(p)**	**t**	**Df**	**sig (p)**
Sensitivity to Cyberbullying	**Female**	103	2.4787	0.33650	0.223	.637	1.758	198	0.080
	Male	97	2.3918	0.36286					

Similarly, the average response score of the girls to the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale was 2.4787 and the average response score of the boys was 2.3918. In Table 16, the F statistical value calculated for the Levene test was found to be 0.223 and the sig (p) value was found to be 0.637. Since the Sig (p) value was greater than the significance level of 0.05, it was determined that the variances were not equal. Then, two independent sample t tests were performed and the results of the analysis are given in Table 16.

The H_0 hypothesis, which is expressed as "There is no significant difference between the mean scores of the response scores of girls and boys to the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale", is accepted as the sig (p) value is 0.000 and the significance level is greater than 0.05. In other

words, there is no statistically significant difference between the response scores of female and male students to the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale.

Since the other demographic variables discussed in the study had 3 or more levels, ANOVA (One-Way Analysis of Variance) test was used to test the differences regarding these two scale averages. ANOVA (One-way analysis of variance) was performed because the number of levels of the age variable was 4 and the scale averages had a normal distribution. The results of the ANOVA analysis performed for these two scales according to the age variable are given in Table 17.

Table 17: Comparison Table Between Scale Averages by Age Level

Scale		Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	Sig.(p)
General Knowledge and Functional Skills	Intergroup	11,320	3	3,773	4,621	0.004
	Intragroup	160,035	196	0,817		
	Total	171,355	199			
Sensitivity to Cyberbullying	Intergroup	0,310	3	0,103	0,836	0,475
	Intragroup	24,257	196	0,124		
	Total	24,567	199			

If the sig. (p) value calculated in the analysis of variance table is less than 0.05 determined for the hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the levels of the age variable, it

is determined that this difference is statistically significant. According to Table 17, when the variance analysis results for the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale were evaluated, the sig. value was calculated as 0.004. It was determined that there was a statistically significant difference between the averages of the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale for the age variable at the 0.05 significance level.

When the variance analysis results for the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale were evaluated, the sig. value was calculated as 0.475. It was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the averages of the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale for the age variable at the 0.05 significance level. Multiple Comparison Analysis was performed to determine which age groups caused the difference in the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale and is given in Table 17. LSD was used as the test statistic.

Question 3: Is there a significant difference between the digital media literacy of university students according to their ages?

Table 18: Multiple Comparison Analysis (Age)

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable			**Mean Difference (I-J)**	**Std. Error**	**Sig.**
General Knowledge and Functional Skills	18-20	20-22	0,22788	0,18667	0,224
		22-24	0,00243	0,21396	0,991
		24 ve üzeri	**-,46237***	0,22952	0,045
	20-22	18-20	-0,22788	0,18667	0,224
		22-24	-0,22545	0,16717	0,179

		24 ve üzeri	**-,69024***	0,18667	0,000
	22-24	18-20	-0,00243	0,21396	0,991
		20-22	0,22545	0,16717	0,179
		24 ve üzeri	**-,46480***	0,21396	0,031
	24 ve üzeri	18-20	**,46237***	0,22952	0,045
		20-22	**,69024***	0,18667	0,000
		22-24	**,46480***	0,21396	0,031

When Table 18 is examined, the significant differences are marked as bold. There is a statistically significant difference between the responses of the group aged 24 and over to the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale compared to the participants in other age groups.

In the continuation of the study, ANOVA analysis was performed for the class variable and given in Table 19.

Question 4: Is there a significant difference between the digital media literacy of university students according to their grade level?

Table 19: Comparison Table Between Digital Media Literacy Averages by Grade Variable

Scale		**Sum of Squares**	**sd**	**Mean of Squares**	**F**	**Sig.(p)**
General Knowledge and Functional Skills	**Intergroup**	7,345	4	1,836	2.183	0.072
	Intragroup	164,010	195	0.841		
	Total	171,355	199			

According to Table 19, when the variance analysis results for the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale were evaluated, the sig. value was calculated as 0.072. Since this value is greater than 0.05 significance level, it was determined at 0.05 significance level that there was no statistically significant difference between the averages of the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale for the class variable.

Question 5: Is there a significant difference between the sensitivity of university students to cyberbullying according to their grade level?

Table 20: Comparison Table Between Sensitivity Averages Regarding Cyberbullying by Class Variable

Scale		Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	Sig.(p)|
Sensitivity to Cyberbullying	Intergroup	0.182	4	0.046	0.364	0.834
	Intragroup	24.385	195	0,125		
	Total	24,567	199			

When the results of the analysis of variance performed for the Sensitivity to Cyberbullying scale in Table 20 are evaluated, the sig. value was calculated as 0.834. There was no statistically significant difference between the averages of the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale for the class variable at the 0.05 significance level.

In the continuation of the study, ANOVA analysis was performed for the time spent on social media variable and is given in Table 21.

Table 21: Comparison Table Between Scale Averages According to the Time Spent on Social Media Variable

Scale		Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	Sig.(p)
General Knowledge and Functional Skills	**Intergroup**	13.714	3	4.571	5,684	0,001
	Intragroup	157,641	196	0.804		
	Total	171,355	199			
Sensitivity to Cyberbullying	**Intergroup**	0.088	3	0,029	0.236	0,871
	Intragroup	24,479	196	0,125		
	Total	24,567	199			

According to Table 21, when the variance analysis results for the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale were evaluated, the sig. value was calculated as 0.001. It was determined that there was a statistically significant difference between the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale averages for the time spent on social media variable at the 0.05 significance level.

When the results of the variance analysis performed for the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale were evaluated, the sig. value was calculated as 0.871. It was determined that there was no

statistically significant difference between the averages of the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale for the time spent on social media variable at the 0.05 significance level.

Multiple Comparison Analysis was performed to determine which social media time groups caused the difference in the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale and is given in Table 22.

Question 6: Is there a significant difference between university students' digital media literacy according to the time spent on social media variable?

Table 22: Multiple Comparison Analysis (Time Spent)

Multiple Comparisons					
LSD					
Dependent Variable			**Mean Difference (I-J)**	**Std. Error**	**Sig.**
General Knowledge and Functional Skills	**less than 1 hour**	1-3 hours	0,34606	0,25107	0,170
		3-5 hours	**,82702***	0,24819	0,001
		5 hours and more	0,38792	0,25759	0,134
	1-3 hours	less than1 hour	-0,34606	0,25107	0,170
		3-5 hours	**,48096***	0,15522	0,002
		5 hours and more	0,04185	0,16986	0,806
	3-5 hours	less than 1 hour	**-,82702***	0,24819	0,001
		1-3 hours	**-,48096***	0,15522	0,002
		5 hours and more	**-,43911***	0,16557	0,009
	5	less than 1 hour	-0,38792	0,25759	0,134

	hours and more	1-3 hours	-0,04185	0,16986	0,806
		3-5 hours	**,43911***	0,16557	0,009

When Table 22 is examined, it is seen that there is a statistically significant difference between the answers of those who spend less than 1 hour on social media and those who spend 3-5 hours. Similarly, there are statistically significant differences between those who spend 3-5 hours on social media and those who spend 1-3 hours and more than 5 hours.

ANOVA analysis was performed for the most frequently used digital media tool variable in the continuation of the study and is given in Table 23.

Table 23: Comparison Table Between Scale Averages According to the Most Common Digital Media Tool Variable

Scale		**Sum of Squares**	**sd**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.(p)**
General Knowledge and Functional Skills	**Intergroup**	1.089	3	0,363	0.418	0,740
	Intragroup	170,266	196	0.869		
	Total	171,355	199			
Sensitivity to Cyberbullying	**Intergroup**	1,708	3	0,569	4.883	0.003
	Intragroup	22,859	196	0.117		
	Total	24,567	199			

When the variance analysis results for the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale according to Table 23 were evaluated, the sig. value was calculated as 0.740. There was no

statistically significant difference between the averages of the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale for the most commonly used digital media tool variable at the 0.05 significance level.

When the results of the variance analysis performed for the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale were evaluated, the sig. value was calculated as 0.003. A statistically significant difference was found between the averages of the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale for the most frequently used digital media tool variable at the 0.05 significance level.

Multiple Comparison Analysis was performed to determine which digital media tools caused the difference in the Sensitivity to Cyberbullying scale and is given in Table 24.

Question 7: Is there a significant difference between the sensitivity of university students to cyberbullying and the digital media tools they use most often?

Table 24: Multiple Comparison Analysis (Media)

Multiple Comparisons					
LSD					
Dependent Variable			**Mean Difference (I-J)**	**Std. Error**	**Sig.**
Sensitivity to cyberbullying	**Instagram**	Twitter	,15371*	0,05634	0,007
		Facebook	,35375*	0,13295	0,008
		Snapchat	-0,04002	0,07664	0,602
	Twitter	Instagram	-,15371*	0,05634	0,007

		Facebook	0,20004	0,13719	0,146
		Snapchat	-,19373*	0,08378	0,022
		Instagram	-,35375*	0,13295	0,008
	Facebook	Twitter	-0,20004	0,13719	0,146
		Snapchat	-,39377*	0,14670	0,008
		Instagram	0,04002	0,07664	0,602
	Snapchat	Twitter	,19373*	0,08378	0,022
		Facebook	,39377*	0,14670	0,008

***. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.**

When Table 24 is examined, it is seen that there is a statistically significant difference between the answers of Instagram and Facebook and Twitter users. Similarly, there are statistically significant differences between Twitter and Snapchat users. Significant differences are marked as bold.

In the continuation of the study, ANOVA analysis was performed for the digital media use year variable and is given in Table 25.

Table 25: Comparison Table Between Scale Averages by Digital Media Year of Use Variable

Scale		**Sum of Squares**	**sd**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.(p)**
General Knowledge and Functional Skills	**Intergroup**	6.289	3	2.096	2.489	0,062
	Intragroup	165,066	196	0.842		

	Total	171,355	199			
Sensitivity to Cyberbullying	**Intergroup**	0.275	3	0, 092	0,740	530
	Intragroup	24,292	196	0,124		
	Total	24,567	199			

According to Table 25, when the variance analysis results for the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale were evaluated, the sig. value was calculated as 0.062. It was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the averages of the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale for the digital media use year variable at the 0.05 significance level.

When the variance analysis results for the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale were evaluated, the sig. value was calculated as 0.530. It was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the averages of the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale for the digital media use year variable at the 0.05 significance level.

In the continuation of the study, tests were carried out on the differences between the mother's education level and the averages of this scale.

Table 26: Comparison Table Between Scale Averages According to Maternal Education Level Variable

Scale	**Sum of Squares**	**sd**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.(p)**

General Knowledge and Functional Skills	**Intergroup**	4.453	2	2.226	2.628	0.075
	Intragroup	166.902	197	0.847		
	Total	171,355	199			
Sensitivity to Cyberbullying	**Intergroup**	0,332	2	0.166	1.351	0, 261
	Intragroup	24,235	197	0.123		
	Total	24,567	199			

According to Table 26, when the variance analysis results for the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale were evaluated, the sig. value was calculated as 0.075. There was no statistically significant difference between the averages of the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale for the mother education level variable at the 0.05 significance level.

When the results of the variance analysis performed for the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale were evaluated, the sig. value was calculated as 0.261. It was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the averages of the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale for the mother education level variable at the 0.05 significance level.

Finally, it was investigated whether there was a statistically significant difference between the scale averages according to the father's education level and the ANOVA results are given in Table 27.

Table 27: Comparison Table Between Scale Averages According to Father's Education Level Variable

Scale		Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	Sig.(p)
General Knowledge and Functional Skills	**Intergroup**	1,440	2	0,720	0.835	0,436
	Intragroup	169,915	197	0.863		
	Total	171,355	199			
Sensitivity to Cyberbullying	**Intergroup**	0,126	2	0,063	0,509	0,602
	Intragroup	24,441	197	0,124		
	Total	24,567	199			

According to Table 27, when the variance analysis results for the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale were evaluated, the sig. value was calculated as 0.436. There was no statistically significant difference between the averages of the General Knowledge and Functional Skills scale for the father education level variable at the 0.05 significance level.

When the variance analysis results for the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale were evaluated, the sig. value was calculated as 0.602. It was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the Cyberbullying Sensitivity Scale for the father education level variable at the 0.05 significance level.

In the continuation of the study, since the scores given to the Digital Media Literacy, Ethics and Responsibility, Daily Use scales were not distributed normally, non-parametric tests were used to investigate the differences between these scale averages according to demographic variables. First, it was investigated whether there was a significant difference between the mean scores of the scale in terms of gender factor. Since the Digital Media Literacy data did not have a normal distribution, the Mann-Whitney U test was used for comparison. The Mann-Whitney U test is a non-parametric method used to compare the averages of two independent groups in a data set that does not have an ormal distribution. Since gender has 2 levels, this test was used. The results obtained are given in Table 3.

Question 8: Is there a significant difference between the digital media literacy of university students according to the gender variable?

Table 28: Tests Regarding the Difference Between Scale Score Averages in terms of Gender Variable

Scale	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Rank Totals	Mann-Whitney U	C	Sig (p)
Digital Media Literacy	**Female**	Female	103	88.37	3746,500	-3,055	0,002
	Male	Male	97	113,38			
	Total	Total	200				
Ethics and Responsibility	**Female**	Female	103	102,93	4745,000	0,616	0,538
	Male	Male	97	97,92			
	Total	Total	200				

Daily Use	**Female**	Female	103	103,34	4702,500	0,746	456
	Male	Male	97	97.48			
	Total	Total	200				

As a result of the Mann-Whitney U test performed for the digital media literacy scale in Table 28, the test statistic is 3746.5. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was calculated as 0.002. The H_0 hypothesis, which is expressed as "There is no significant difference between the rank scores of the digital media literacy scale between girls and boys", is rejected because the sig (p) value is 0.002<0.05. In other words, since the sig (p) value is less than 0.05 significance level, there is a significant difference between the responses of girls and boys to the digital media literacy scale.

Then, it was investigated whether the difference between the mean scores of the Ethics and Responsibility scale in terms of gender variable was statistically significant. As a result of the Mann-Whitney U test, the test statistic is 4702.5. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was calculated as 0.538. The H_0 hypothesis, which is expressed as "There is no significant difference between ethics and responsibility scale rank scores between girls and boys", is accepted as the sig (p) value is 0.538>0.05. In other words, since the sig (p) value is greater than 0.05 significance level, there is no significant difference between the answers given by girls and boys to the ethics and responsibility scale.

Finally, it was investigated whether the difference between the mean scores of the daily use scale in terms of gender variable was statistically significant. As a result of the Mann-Whitney U test, the test statistic is 4745. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was calculated as 0.456. The H_0 hypothesis, which is expressed as "There is no significant

difference between the rank scores of the daily use scale between girls and boys", is accepted as the sig (p) value is 0.456>0.05. In other words, since the sig (p) value is greater than 0.05 significance level, there is no significant difference between the responses of girls and boys to the daily use scale.

Since the other demographic variables discussed in the study had 3 or more options in terms of the number of levels and the scale averages did not have a normal distribution, analyzes were performed with the Kruskal-Wallis test.

Question 9: Is there a significant difference between digital media literacy of university students according to age variable?

Table 29: Tests Regarding the Difference Between Scale Score Averages in Terms of Age Variable

Scale	Age	N	Mean Rank	Kruskal -Wallis H	sd	sig(p)
Digital Media Literacy	**18-20**	31	103,98	4,688	3	0,196
	20-22	96	93,25			
	22-24	42	101,08			
	24 and above	31	118,68			
	Total	200				
Ethics and Responsibility	**18-20**	31	100,97	0,003	3	1,000
	20-22	96	100,30			
	22-24	42	100,50			
	24 and above	31	100,65			

	Total	200				
Daily Use	**18-20**	31	108,61	1,600	3	0,659
	20-22	96	101,55			
	22-24	42	92,35			
	24 and above	31	100,18			
	Total	200				

As a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the digital media literacy scale in Table 29, the test statistic was calculated as 4.688. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.196. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean rank scores of the digital media literacy scale in terms of age variable.

As a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the ethics and responsibility scale, the test statistic was calculated as 0.003. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 1.00. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the ethics and responsibility scale in terms of age variable.

Finally, as a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the daily use scale, the test statistic was calculated as 1.600. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.659. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the daily use scale in terms of age variable.

Then, Kruskall-Wallis H test was performed for the class variable and the results in Table 30 were obtained.

Question 10: Is there a significant difference between the digital media literacy of university students according to the grade level variable?

Table 30: Tests Regarding the Difference Between Scale Score Averages in Terms of Class Variable

Scale	Class	N	Mean Rank	Kruskal-Wallis H	sd	sig(p)
Digital Media Literacy	**1st Grade**	37	86.80	7.173	4	0,127
	2nd Grade	60	94,42			
	3rd Grade	55	103,53			
	4th Grade	47	116,52			
	5th Grade	1	53,00			
Ethics and Responsibility	**1st Grade**	37	97,11	4.642	4	0.326
	2nd Grade	60	92,12			
	3rd Grade	55	101,30			
	4th Grade	47	113.94			
	5th Grade	1	53,50			
Daily Use	**1st Grade**	37	90,73	4,135	4	0,388
	2nd Grade	60	103.93			
	3rd Grade	55	105,05			
	4th Grade	47	100,32			
	5th Grade	1	14,50			

As a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the digital media literacy scale in Table 30, the test statistic was calculated as 7.173. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test

statistic was found to be 0.127. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean rank scores of the digital media literacy scale in terms of the class variable.

As a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the ethics and responsibility scale, the test statistic was calculated as 4.642. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.326. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean rank scores of the ethics and responsibility scale in terms of the class variable.

Finally, as a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the daily use scale, the test statistic was calculated as 4.135. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.388. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the daily use scale in terms of the class variable.

Then, Kruskall-Wallis H test was performed for the time spent on social media and the results in Table 31 were obtained.

Table 31: Tests Regarding the Difference Between Scale Score Averages in Terms of Time Variable Spent on Social Media

Scale	Duration	N	Order Mean	Kruskal-Wallis H	sd	sig(p)
Digital Media Literacy	**Less than 1**	16	111.28	3.892	3	0,273
	1-3 hours	63	108.70			
	3-5 hours	71	90.63			
	5 hours and	50	100,74			
	Total	200				
Ethics and	**Less than 1**	16	88,59	1,911	3	0,591
	1-3 hours	63	104,13			

Responsibility	**3-5 hours**	71	104,51			
	5 hours and	50	94,04			
	Total	200				
Daily Use	**Less than 1**	16	97,06	1,511	3	0,680
	1-3 hours	63	99,63			
	3-5 hours	71	106, 43			
	5 hours and	50	94,28			
	Total	200				

As a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the digital media literacy scale in Table 31, the test statistic was calculated as 3,892. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.273. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean rank scores of the digital media literacy scale in terms of the time spent on social media variable.

As a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the ethics and responsibility scale, the test statistic was calculated as 1.911. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.591. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the ethics and responsibility scale in terms of the time spent on social media variable.

Finally, as a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the daily use scale, the test statistic was calculated as 1.511. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.680. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the daily use scale in terms of the time spent on social media variable.

Then, Kruskall-Wallis H test was performed for the digital media tool used and the results in Table 32 were obtained.

Table 32: Tests Regarding the Difference Between Scale Score Averages in terms of Digital Media Tool Variable

Scale	Digital Media Tool	N	Order Mean	Kruskal-Wallis H	sd	sig(p)
Digital Literacy	**Instagram**	115	103,70	1,443	3	0,695
	Twitter	54	92,96			
	Facebook	7	94,07			
	Snapchat	24	103,98			
	Total	200				
Ethics And responsibility	**Instagram**	115	107.75	6,422	3	0,093
	Twitter	54	90,20			
	Facebook	7	63,71			
	Snapchat	24	99,65			
	Total	200				
Daily Use	**Instagram**	115	101,11	1,703	3	0.636
	Twitter	54	100.94			
	Facebook	7	74.14			
	Snapchat	24	104.29			
	Total	200				

As a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the digital media literacy scale in Table 32, the test statistic was calculated as 1.443. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.695. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean rank scores of the digital media literacy scale in terms of the digital media tool used.

As a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the ethics and responsibility scale, the test statistic was calculated as 6.422. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.093. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the ethics and responsibility scale in terms of the digital media tool used.

Finally, as a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the daily use scale, the test statistic was calculated as 1.703. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.636. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the daily use scale in terms of the digital media tool used.

Then, Kruskall-Wallis H test was performed on how many years digital media have been used and the results in Table 33 were obtained.

Question 11: Is there a significant difference between university students' digital media literacy according to the variable of social media use year?

Table 33: Tests Regarding the Difference Between Scale Score Averages in Terms of How Many Years Digital Media Has Been Used

Scale	Years	N	Order Mean	Kruskal-Wallis H	sd	sig(p)
Digital Media Literacy	**5 - 7 Years**	39	94,79	6,008	3	0,111
	7 -10 Years	89	96,14			
	10-12 years	43	98,40			
	12-15 years	29	124,67			
	Total	200				
Ethics and	**5 - 7 Years**	39	101.62	2,931	3	0,402
	7 -10 Years	89	93,75			

Responsibility	**10-12 years**	43	104,78			
	12-15 years	29	113,38			
	Total	200				
Daily Use	**5 - 7 Years**	39	100,65	1,128	3	0,770
	7 -10 Years	89	101,59			
	10-12 years	43	93,57			
	12-15 years	29	107,22			
	Total	200				

As a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the digital media literacy scale in Table 33, the test statistic was calculated as 6.008. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.111. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean rank scores of the digital media literacy scale in terms of digital media usage time.

As a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the ethics and responsibility scale, the test statistic was calculated as 2,931. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.402. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the ethics and responsibility scale in terms of digital media usage time.

Finally, as a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the daily use scale, the test statistic was calculated as 1.128. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.770. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the daily use scale in terms of digital media usage time.

Then, Kruskall-Wallis H test was performed for the mother's education level and the results in Table 34 were obtained.

Question 12: Is there a significant difference between the digital media literacy of university students according to the mother's education level variable?

Table 34: Tests Regarding the Difference Between Scale Score Averages in terms of Mother's Education Level

Scale	Mother's Education Level	N	Mean Rank	Kruskal-Wallis H	sd	sig(p)
Digital Media Literacy	Primary School	42	89,68	5,810	2	0,055
	Secondary school	89	95,33			
	Higher education	69	113,76			
	Total	200				
Ethics and Responsibility	Primary School	42	100,18	1,037	2	0,595
	Secondary school	89	96,48			
	Higher education	69	105,88			
	Total	200				
Daily Use	Primary School	42	90.83	5,097	2	0,078
	Secondary school	89	95,80			

	Higher education	69	112,45
	Total	200	

As a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the digital media literacy scale in Table 34, the test statistic was calculated as 5.810. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.055. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the digital media literacy scale in terms of mother's education level.

As a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the ethics and responsibility scale, the test statistic was calculated as 1.037. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.595. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the ethics and responsibility scale in terms of mother's education level.

Finally, as a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the daily use scale, the test statistic was calculated as 5,097. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.078. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the daily use scale in terms of maternal education level.

Finally, Kruskall-Wallis H test was performed for paternal education level and the results in Table 35 were obtained.

Question 13: Is there a significant difference between the digital media literacy of university students according to the father's education level variable?

Table 35: Tests Regarding the Difference Between the Means of the Scale Scores in terms of Father's Education Level

Scale	Father's Education	N	Mean Rank	Kruskal-Wallis H	sd	sig(p)
Digital Media Literacy	Primary School	34	92.21	2,123	2	0,346
	Secondary school	76	96,67			
	Higher education	90	106,87			
	Total	200				
Ethics and responsibility	Primary School	34	99,01	0,659	2	0,719
	Secondary School	76	96,94			
	Higher education	90	104,07			
	Total	200				
Daily Use	Primary School	34	87,93	2,130	2	345
	Secondary School	76	103,93			
	Higher education	90	102,35			

Total	200	

As a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the digital media literacy scale in Table 35, the test statistic was calculated as 2.123. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.346. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the digital media literacy scale in terms of father's education level.

As a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the ethics and responsibility scale, the test statistic was calculated as 0.659. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.719. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the ethics and responsibility scale in terms of father's education level.

As a result of the Kruskall-Wallis H test performed for the daily use scale, the test statistic was calculated as 2,130. The sig (p) value corresponding to this test statistic was found to be 0.345. Since this value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the daily use scale in terms of father's education level.

Finally, correlation analysis was performed between the scales discussed. The results obtained are given in Table 36.

Question 14: Is there a relationship between university students' digital media literacy and their sensitivity to cyberbullying?

Table 36: Interscale Correlation Matrix

Interscale Correlation Matrix

Digital Media Literacy Scale Sub-Dimensions and Cyberbullying Scale		Digital Media Literacy	Ethics and Responsibility	General Knowl. and Funct. Skills	Daily Use	Sensitivity to Cyberbullying
Digital Media Literacy	r	1	,785**	,807**	,679**	,258**
	p		0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
	N	200	200	200	200	200
Ethics and Responsibility	r	,785**	1	,319**	,497**	,383**
	p	0,000		0,000	0,000	0,000
	N	200	200	200	200	200
General Knowl. and Funct. Skills	r	,807**	,319**	1	,355**	0,058
	p	0,000	0,000		0,000	0,418
	N	200	200	200	200	200
Daily Use	r	,679**	,497**	,355**	1	,165*
	p	0,000	0,000	0,000		0,020
	N	200	200	200	200	200
Sensitivity to Cyberbullying	r	,258**	,383**	0,058	,165*	1
	p	0,000	0,000	0,418	0,020	
	N	200	200	200	200	200

Note: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In line with the data in Table 36, there is a positive relationship of 0.807 between the digital media literacy scale and the general knowledge and functional skills sub-dimension (r=0.807, p=0.000>0.05). This relationship is statistically significant. Similarly, there is a positive relationship between the digital media literacy scale and the ethics and responsibility sub-dimension of 0.785 (r=0.785, p=0.000>0.05). This relationship is also statistically significant. There is a positive correlation of 0.679 between the digital media literacy scale and the daily use sub-dimension (r=0.679, p=0.000>0.05). This relationship is also statistically significant.

More important are the correlation values between the sensitivity scale related to cyberbullying and digital media literacy and its sub-dimensions. There is a positive relationship of 0.258 between the sensitivity scale regarding cyberbullying and the digital media literacy scale. This correlation is statistically significant since p=0.000<0.05. There is a positive correlation of 0.383 between the sensitivity scale regarding cyberbullying and the ethics and responsibility sub-dimension. Since p=0.000<0.05 in this relationship, it is statistically significant. There is a positive relationship of 0.058 between the sensitivity scale related to cyberbullying and the general knowledge and functional skills sub-dimension. Since this relationship is p=0.418> 0.05, it is not statistically significant. Finally, there is a positive relationship of 0.165 between the cyberbullying sensitivity scale and the daily use sub-dimension. Since this relationship is p=0.020<0.05, it is statistically significant.

CHAPTER 5

5. DISCUSSION

5.1.Conclusion and Discussion

As a result, in this study, the relationship between university students' digital media literacy and their sensitivity to cyberbullying was examined in terms of different variables. As a result

of the evaluation in terms of gender variable, the digital media literacy of female students was found to be generally high and significant differences were found ($p<0.05$). There is no significant difference between male and female students in their susceptibility to cyberbullying. In terms of the time spent on social media tools, no significant difference was found between students' digital media literacy and the time spent on social media tools. Similarly, no significant difference was found between students' sensitivity to cyberbullying and their time spent on social media tools. In terms of the most frequently used digital media tools variable, no significant difference was found between students' digital media literacy and the digital media tools they use most frequently. Considering the sensitivity of cyberbullying with the same variable, there are significant differences between the digital media tools they use most frequently.

In the research conducted, digital media literacy of female students was found to be higher than male students in terms of gender variable. On the other hand, in some studies, it was seen that the digital media literacy levels of male students differed significantly from female students and this difference was in favor of male students (Özerbaş & Kuralbayeva, 2018). This situation was evaluated as male students were better in the dimension of technology use. In another study, it was determined that the information technology teacher candidates' level of knowledge about the concept of digital literacy from the field of informatics was insufficient and that different candidates used the related concept in different meanings (Coşkun, Cumaoğlu, & Seçkin, 2013).

The years of digital media use of university students participating in the research were determined, and it was observed that as the years of computer use of the candidates increased, their digital media literacy levels increased as well. Çetin (2016), on the other hand, concluded that the frequency of internet use affects digital literacy positively (Çetin, 2016). The increase in computer usage time increases users' experience with digital technologies. It

can be said that increasing knowledge and experience over time has an important place in increasing the digital literacy levels of the candidates.

There was no significant difference between the sensitivity of the university students participating in the research on cyberbullying and the time they spent on social media tools. There are other studies that have similar results (Dalmaz, 2014).

Considering the gender variable, it was concluded that there was no significant difference between female and male students in their sensitivity to cyberbullying. Similarly, Dikmen (2015) concluded in her study that there is no significant relationship between gender and sensitivity to cyberbullying (Dikmen, 2015).

There is a weak positive relationship between the digital media literacy scale and the cyberbullying sensitivity scale. In other words, it can be said that when students' digital media literacy increases, their sensitivity to cyberbullying may also increase.

5.2.Suggestions

In line with the findings acquired during the research process, some proposals were presented:

- We are aware of the importance of the concept of digital media in the world and in our country, and people such as courses, training, conferences can be made aware of it.
- Regardless of the department in universities, digital media literacy can be added as a course.
- Outside of the university, the concept of cyberbullying can be used to enable students to progress as more conscious and aware individuals in their school life until they reach that level.
- More scientific studies can be done on digital media literacy and cyberbullying.

REFERENCES

Akar, E. (2010). *Sosyal Medya Pazarlaması: Sosyal Web'te Pazarlama Stratejileri.* Ankara: Efil Yayınevi.

Akgül, G. (2020). Siber Zorbalığın Nedenleri Üzerine Kuramsal Açıklamalar. *Gelişim ve Psikoloji Dergisi*, 149-167.

Akkoyunlu, B., İşman, A., & Odabaşı, H. F. (2015). *Eğitim Teknolojileri Okumaları 2015.* Ankara: TOJET.

Aksaray, S. (2011). Siber zorbalık. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 405-432.

Akyıldız, F. (2019). Habere Ulaşmada Geleneksel Medyadan Yeni Medyaya Geçiş. 10-10.

Arıcak, O. T. (2009). Psychiatric symptomatology as a predictor of cyberbullying among university students. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research (EJER)*, 167-184.

Ata, F., & Yiğiter, A. (2022). Dijital Medya Okuryazarlığı Becerisi: İletişim Alanında Eğitim Gören Lisans Ve Ön Lisans Öğrencilerine Yönelik Karşılaştırılmalı Bir Uygulama. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1-19.

Aydeniz, H. (2011). *Medyayı Tanımak.* İstanbul: Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı.

Aydın, H. C., Mutlu, M. E., Karadağ, N., Usta, İ., Aydın, S., Fırat , M., et al. (2015). *Temel Bilgi Teknolojileri I.* Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayını.

Aziz, A. (2016). *İletişime Giriş.* İstanbul: Hiperlink Yayınları.

Baker, Ö. E., & Kavşut, F. (2007). A New Face of Peer Bullying. *Journal of Euroasian Educational Research*, 31-42.

Bayrakcı, S., & Narmanlıoğlu, H. (2021). Digital Literacy as Whole of Digital Competences: Scale Development Study. *Düşünce ve Toplum Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 28.

Belsey, B. (2007). Cyberbullying: A real and growing threat. *ATA Magazine*, 14-21.

Brank, E. M., Hoetger, L. A., & Hazen, K. P. (2012). Bullying. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 213-230.

Castells, M. (2008). *Ağ Toplumunun Yükselişi.* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.

Childress, D. (2008). *Johannes Gutenberg And The Printing Press.* Minneapolis, ABD: Twenty- First Century Books.

Coşkun, Y. D., Cumaoğlu, G. K., & Seçkin, H. (2013). Bilgisayar Öğretmen Adaylarının Bilişim Alanıyla İlgili Okuryazarlık Kavramlarına Yönelik Görüşleri. *Internatioanal Journal of Human Sciences*, 1259-1272.

Cross, D., Hadwen, K., Corsado, P., Slee, P. T., Roberts, C., & Barnes, A. (2016). Longitudinal impact of the cyber friendly schools program on adolescents' cyberbullying behavior. *Aggressive Behavior*, 166-180.

Çetin, O. (2016). Pedagojik Formasyon Programı ile Lisans Eğitimi Fen Bilimleri Öğretmen Adaylarının Dijital Okuryazarlık Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 676-680.

Çiftçi, A. (1999). *Radyo ve Televizyon Hukuku.* Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Basımevi.

Dalmaz, E. (2014). Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Siber Zorbalık/Mağduriyet, Depresyon ve Anksiyete Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. *Yayımlanmış yüksek lisans tezi,Haliç Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul*, 88-89.

Dewdney, A., & Ride, P. (2006). *The New Media Hand Book.* London and New York: Routledge.

Dezuanni, M. (2015). The Building Blocks of Digital Media Literacy: Socio-Material Participation and the Production of Media Knowledge. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 416-439.

Dijk, J. V. (2018). *Ağ Toplumu.* İstanbul: KAFKA Epsilon Yayıncılık.

Dikmen, M. (2015). Bilgisayar ve Öğretim Teknolojileri Öğretmen Adaylarının Bilgisayar Öz-Yeterlik Algıları ile Siber Zorbalık Duyarlılıkları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. *Istanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 231-249.

Duman, N., & Bridge, E. N. (2019). Siber mağduriyet. *OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1156-1178.

Ertuğrul, F. (2019). Ön ergenlik döneminde karşıt olma- karşı gelme bozukluğu ile zorbalık davranışı ve anne baba tutumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü*.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2010). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference.* Boston: Pearson.

Gönültaş, M. (2019). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Siber Zorbalık Ve Siber Mağduriyet Düzeylerinin Problemli İnternet Kullanım Düzeyleri Ve Demografik Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi. *YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi-Ege Üniversitesi*, 71.

Güner, O. (2022). Avrupa Birliği'nde Dijital Medya Okuryazarlığına Dair Bir Değerlendirme. *Dicle Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 473-499.

Johnson, L. D., Haralson, A., Batts, S., Brown, E., Collins, C., Buren-Travis, A., et al. (2016). Cyberbullying on social media among college students. *Ideas and Research You Can Use: VISTAS*, 1-8.

Juvonen, J., & Gross, E. F. (2008). Extending School Grounds? –Bullying Experiences in Cyberspace. *Journal of School Health*, 496-505.

Kahne, J., Lee, N., & Feezel, J. T. (2012). Digital Media Literacy Education and Online Civic and Political Participation. *International Journal of Communication*, 24.

Kamerer, D. (2013). Media Literacy. *Communication Research Trends*, 4-25.

Karaduman, S. (2019). Yeni Medya Okuryazarlığı: Yeni Beceriler/Olanaklar/Riskler. *Erciyes İletişim Dergisi*, 683-700.

Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi.* Ankadar: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Kawalski, R., Giumetti, G., Schroeder, A., & Lattaner, M. (2014). Bullying in the digital age: A critical review and meta-analysis of cyberbullying research among youth. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1073-1137.

Kipphan, H. (2001). *Handbook of Print Media, Technologies and Production Methods.* Almanya: Springer.

Kowalski, R. M., Limber, S. P., & Agatston, P. W. (2007). Electronic bullying among middle school students. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 22-30.

Lacey, B. (2007). Social Aggression: A study of internet harassment. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Long Island University, ABD*.

Lin, T.-B., Li, J.-Y., Deng, F., & Lee, L. (2013). Understanding New Media Literacy: An Explorative Theoretical Framework. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 160-170.

Ling, R. (2004). *The Mobile Connection, The Cell Phone's Impact on Society.* San, ABD: Morgan Kaufmann.

MacDonald, C. D., & Roberts-Pittman, B. (2010). Cyberbullying among college students:Prevalence and demographic differences. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2003-2009.

Manovich, L. (2001). *The Language of New Media.* Cambridge: The Mit Press.

Özçağlayan, M. (2008). Gazetelerin Gelişimi ve Gazeteciliğin Geleceği (Yeni Teknolojiler ve Medya Ekonomisi Açısından Genel Bir Değerlendirme). *Marmara İletişim Dergisi*, 133-134.

Özer, G. (2016). Ortaokul Öğrencilerinin Siber Zorbalık Yaşama Düzeyleri ile Siber Zorbalığın Öğrenciler Üzerindeki Etkileri ve Öğrencilerin Siber Zorbalıkla Baş Etme Stratejileri. *Gazi Üniversitesi*.

Özer, N., & Şad, S. N. (2021). Lise Öğrencilerinde Siber Zorbalık,Siber Mağduriyet ve Okul Tükenmişliği. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 393-417.

Özerbaş, M. A., & Kuralbayeva, A. (2018). Türkiye ve Kazakistan Öğretmen Adaylarının Dijital Okuryazarlık Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. *MSKU Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23-24.

Paxon, P. (2010). *Mass Communications and Media Studies An Introduction.* New York, ABD: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Paxon, P. (2010). *Mass Communications And Media Studies An Introduction.* New York, ABD: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Pekman, C. (1997). *Televizyonda Özelleşme Avrupa'da Yayıncılığın Değişim Süreci.* İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.

Pişkin, M. (2010). Examination of peer bullying among primary and middle school children in Ankara. *Egitim ve Bilim*, 175-189.

Price, M., & Dalgleish, J. (2010). Cyberbullying: Experiences, impacts and coping strategies as described by Australian young people. *Youth Studies Australia*, 51-59.

Rettew, D. C., & Pawlowski, S. (2016). Bullying. *Child Adolesc Psychiatr Clin N Am*, 235.

Rogow, F. (2014). Media literacy in early childhood education: Inquiry-based technology integration. *Technology and digital media in the early years:Tools for teaching and learning*, 91-103.

Sezer, M., Şahin, İ., & Aktürk, A. O. (2013). Cyber bullying victimization of elementary school students and their reflections on the victimization. *International Journal of Social, Human Science and Engineering*, 1989-1992.

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*, 376-385.

Tamer, N., & Vatanartıran, S. (2014). Ergenlerin teknolojik zorbalık algıları. *Online Journal Of Technology Addiction & Cyberbullying*, 1-20.

Tanrıkulu, İ. (2015). The relationships between cyber bullying perpetration motives and personality traits: Testing uses and gratifications theory. *Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü*.

Tokgöz, O. (2015). *Temel Gazetecilik.* Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Törenli, N. (2005). *Yeni medya, yeni iletişim ortamları: Bilişim teknolojileri temelinde haber medyasının yeniden biçimlenişi.* Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.

Turam, E. (1996). *2000'li Yıllara Doğru Türkiye'de TV.* İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar.

Uzun, Y. (2022). Bağlantılı Öğrenme İle Stem Yaklaşımının İlkokul 3. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin 21. Yüzyıl Öğrenme Ve Yenilenme Becerilerine, Dijital Medya Okuryazarlıklarına Ve Sosyal Girişimcilik Niyetlerine Etkisinin İncelenmesi. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi,Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi*, 70-76.

Vural, B. A., & Bat, M. (2010). Yeni bir iletişim ortami olarak sosyal medya: Ege Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesine yönelik bir araştirma. *Yaşar Üniversitesi EDergisi*, 3348-3382.

Yaylagül, L. (2017). *Kitle İletişim Kuramları Egemen ve Eleştirel Yaklaşımlar.* Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.

Yengin, D. (2012). *Yeni Medya ve Dokunmatik Toplum.* İstanbul: Derin Yayınları.

Appendix 1: Demographic Information Form

1. Your Gender: Female ☐ Male ☐

2. Age: 18-20 ☐ 20-22 ☐ 22-24 ☐ 24 and above ☐

3. Your faculty:

4. Your Grade Level:

5. CPGA: _____ / 4.00

6. How many hours do you spend on social media tools on average?

Less than 1 hour ☐ 1-3 hours ☐ 3-5 hours ☐ 5 hours and more ☐

7. Which digital media tool do you use most often?

Instagram ☐ Twitter ☐ Facebook ☐ Snapchat ☐

8. How many years have you been using my digital media tools?

5-7 years ☐ 7-10 years ☐ 10-12 years ☐ 12-15 years ☐

9.Mother's Educational Status:

- ☐ Illiterate
- ☐ Literate
- ☐ Primary school
- ☐ Secondary School
- ☐ High School
- ☐ University
- ☐ Master degree
- ☐ Doctorate

10. Father's Educational Status:

- ☐ Illiterate
- ☐ Literate
- ☐ Primary school
- ☐ Secondary School
- ☐ High School
- ☐ University
- ☐ Master degre
- ☐ Doctorate

Appendix 2: Digital Media Literacy Scale

	DIGITAL LITERACY SCALE Explanation: Mark your degree of approval of the situation in the sentence as "Strongly Disagree 1, Disagree 2, Undecided 3,Agree 4, Strongly Agree 5" by reading the following statements.	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neither Agree, Nor Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
Ethics and Responsibility	As in daily life, my personal or legal rights (privacy, copyright, freedom of speech, etc.) continue in digital environments.	1	2	3	4	5
	Personal data of myself and others in online environments (photo, address, family information, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
	I can question from different sources whether the information I access in online environments is correct.	1	2	3	4	5
	Cyberbullying in online environments (humiliation, swearing, hate speech, etc.); and i am aware of the ethical and legal responsibilities of behaviors such as abuse.	1	2	3	4	5
	I can distinguish digital games and content that are suitable for cognitive and moral development.	1	2	3	4	5
	I am aware that everything I do online is recorded.	1	2	3	4	5
	Ethical and legal issues that may arise from copyright infringement in digital environments i am aware of responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5

General Knowledge and Functional Skills	Licensed software, demo software, pirated software, malware and crack i know what your concepts are.	1	2	3	4	5
	I know what hardware and software technologies are.	1	2	3	4	5
	I can install/format the operating system on my computer.	1	2	3	4	5
	To my computer or other electronic i can install software or programs on my devices.	1	2	3	4	5
	I know what Torent, Internet, World Wide Web (WWW) means.	1	2	3	4	5
	Proxy/dns settings of devices to access prohibited websites i can change it.	1	2	3	4	5
Daily Use	e-Government applications (MHRS, UYAP, tax&ceza query, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
	I can use cloud computing technologies (Google Drive, iCloud, Dropbox, etc.) effectively in daily life.	1	2	3	4	5
	On mobile devices, I can use the calendar not only to look at history, but also for reminder, note-taking, event creation, etc.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix 3: Sensitivity Scale Regarding Cyberbullying

Items	None.	Sometimes	Yes
1. Considering that my information may be stolen by others when I access the Internet i'll keep it.	None.	Sometimes	Yes
2. Others of my private information on social networking sites (Facebook, Twitter, etc.) I think it can be used for malicious purposes.	None.	Sometimes	Yes
3. Not to meet people I have problems with in real life in virtual environments	None.	Sometimes	Yes
4. Taking some measures to prevent others from harming me in virtual environments i feel the need.	None.	Sometimes	Yes
5. Danger to me when a hacker is in virtual environments I can see that you can create.	None.	Sometimes	Yes
6. Someone who wants to harm me can also do so via the internet, mobile phone, etc. I think you can do it.	None.	Sometimes	Yes
7. I do not share my membership passwords with anyone on the internet such as e-mail, forum sites, etc.	None.	Sometimes	Yes
8. I cut off communication with people who swear or insult in virtual environments.	None.	Sometimes	Yes
9. Unbeknownst to me, a picture or image of me that I do not want to be seen I think there is a danger that it could spread.	None.	Sometimes	Yes
10. I am also aware of untrue rumors about me in communication in virtual environments I think it can spread.	None.	Sometimes	Yes
11. When I access the Internet, I use the Internet for the purpose of harming others I keep in mind that it can be used.	None.	Sometimes	Yes
12. What happens if an incorrect information about me is spread on the internet I think I will.	None.	Sometimes	Yes
13. I can receive threats via email or text message (SMS) from my mobile phone I do not communicate with people in virtual environments.	None.	Sometimes	Yes

T.C.
YEDİTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ

18.04.2023

Sayı : E.50532705-302.14.01-1536
Konu : Özge Patlar Kurul Onayı

İLGİLİ MAKAMA

Üniversitemiz Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Bilgi Teknolojileri ve Sosyal Medya Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi Özge Patlar'ın, Doç. Dr. Gonca Kızılkaya Cumaoğlu danışmanlığında gerçekleştireceği ''Examining the Relationship Between Digital Literacy and Sensitivity to Cyberbullying of University Students (Öğrencilerinin Dijital Okuryazarlıkları ile Siber Zorbalığa İlişkin Duyarlılıkları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi)'' başlıklı araştırmasının Beşeri Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğuna ilişkin Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşeri ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu Onayı ekte sunulmuştur.

Gerekli iznin verilmesi hususunu bilgilerinize arz ve rica ederim.

İmza
Prof. Dr. Fatma Yeşim EKİNCİ
Rektör a.
Rektör Yardımcısı

Ek: Etik Kurul Onayı.pdf

YEDİTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ BEŞERİ VE SOSYAL BİLİMLER ETİK KURULU KOMİSYONU

24.03.2023 TARİHLİ
38/2023 No'lu TOPLANTI KARARLARI

16) Yeditepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Bilgi Teknolojileri ve Sosyal Medya Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Öğrencilerinden Özge Patlar'ın, Doç. Dr. Gonca Kızılkaya Cumaoğlu danışmanlığında gerçekleştireceği ''Examining the Relationship Between Digital Literacy and Sensitivity to Cyberbullying of University Students (Öğrencilerinin Dijital Okuryazarlıkları ile Siber Zorbalığa İlişkin Duyarlılıkları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi)'' başlıklı araştırmasının Beşeri Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğu Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşeri ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır.

17) Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Bilişsel Bilimler Yüksek Lisans Öğrencilerinden İlkay Arı'nın, Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Funda Yıldırım danışmanlığında gerçekleştireceği ''Influence of Emotional Outcome Valence on Sense of Agency in a Free Choice Task (Duygusal Sonuç Valansının Serbest Seçimli bir Görevde Faillik Hissine Etkisi)'' başlıklı araştırmasının Beşeri Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğu Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşeri ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır.

18) Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Doktora Öğrencilerinden Yudum Tuğçe Erkli'nin, Doç. Dr. Aslı Tolunay danışmanlığında gerçekleştireceği ''Consumers' Motivations in Food Waste Management and Sustainable Food Consumption and the Effectiveness of Sustainability Communication in Social Media'' başlıklı araştırmasının Beşeri Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğu Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşeri ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır.

19) Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Antropoloji Yüksek Lisans Öğrencilerinden Özge Özkefeli Yılmaz'ın, Doç. Dr. Ebru Kayaalp danışmanlığında gerçekleştireceği ''Evden Çalışmanın Ötesinde: Özel Alandan Çalışma Alanına Geçiş'' başlıklı araştırmasının Beşeri Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğu Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşeri ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır.

20) Yeditepe Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü Mimarlık Yüksek Lisans Öğrencilerinden Zeynep Selcen Narin'in, Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Faruk Can Ünal danışmanlığında gerçekleştireceği ''An Evaluation of Sketching in Early Conceptual Design Processes: Physical and Immersive Environments'' başlıklı araştırmasının Beşeri Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğu Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşeri ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır.