



RESEARCH ARTICLE / ARAŞTIRMA YAZISI

The Effects of Childhood Trauma Experiences and Attachment Styles on Cyberbullying and Victimization among University Students

Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Çocukluk Çağı Örselenme Yaşantıları ve Bağlanma Stilllerinin Siber Zorbalık ve Mağduriyete Etkisi

Burcu Türk¹, Aslı Yayak², Nurcan Hamzaoğlu³

Abstract:

The purpose of this research; to reveal the prevalence of cyberbullying and victimization among university students; to determine whether childhood traumatic experiences, attachment styles and cyber bullying and victimization levels differ in terms of some variables and to reveal the effects of childhood trauma experiences and attachment styles on cyberbullying and victimization. Personal Information Form, Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory-II (EII-II), Childhood Trauma Experience Scale (CTES) and Cyber Victimization and Bullying Scale (CVBS) were used as data collection tools in the study. A high level, positive significant relationship was found between the scores of the university students in the Cyber Victim subscale and the Cyber Bully subscale ($r=.656$; $p=.000$). There was a low level, positive significant correlation between the scores of the Cyber Victim subscale and the Avoidant Attachment and Anxious Attachment subscale ($r = .129$; $p = .004$; $r = .193$; $p = .000$). As students' avoidant and anxious attachment levels increase, their cyber victimization levels increase. In addition, a positive significant relationship was found between the scores of the students in the Cyber Victim subscale and Childhood Trauma scores ($r = .286$; $p = .000$). The results obtained in this study show that avoidant, anxious attachment styles and childhood traumatic experiences are predictive factors in terms of cyberbullying and cyber victimization. In this context, it is important for families to establish a healthy communication with their children in terms of preventing cyberbullying and victimization.

Keywords: Cyberbullying, Cyber-victimization, Attachment Styles, Childhood Trauma

¹Assistant Professor, Haliç University, Department of Psychology, İstanbul, Turkey, burcuturk@halic.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-3290-5886

² Assistant Professor, Bursa Technical University, Department of Psychology, İstanbul, Turkey, asli.yayak@btu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-1112-5103

³ Assistant Professor, Istanbul Yeni Yüzyıl University, Institute of Health Sciences, İstanbul, Turkey, nurcan.hamzaoglu@yeniyuzuil.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-8471-0442.

Address of Correspondence/Yazışma Adresi: Burcu Türk, Haliç University, Department of Psychology, İstanbul, Turkey, E-mail: burcuturk@halic.edu.tr

Date of Received/Geliş Tarihi: 26.07.2021, **Date of Revision/Düzeltilme Tarihi:** 25.09.2021, **Date of Acceptance/Kabul Tarihi:** 19.10.2021, **Date of Online Publication/Çevrimiçi Yayın Tarihi:** 01.12.2021

Citing/Referans Gösterimi: Türk, B., Yayak, A. & Hamzaoğlu, N. (2021). The Effects of Childhood Trauma Experiences and Attachment Styles on Cyberbullying and Victimization among University Students, *Cyprus Turkish Journal of Psychiatry & Psychology*, 3(4): 241-249

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Cyprus Mental Health Institute / Cyprus Turkish Journal of Psychiatry and Psychology (www.ktppdergisi.com). This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 license which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes. <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Öz:

Bu araştırmanın amacı; üniversite öğrencileri arasında siber zorbalık ve mağduriyet yaygınlığını ortaya çıkarmak; çocukluk çağı travmatik deneyimlerinin, bağlanma tarzlarının ve siber zorbalık ve mağduriyet düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından farklılık gösterip göstermediğini belirlemek ve çocukluk travması deneyimlerinin ve bağlanma stillerinin siber zorbalık ve mağduriyet üzerindeki etkilerini ortaya çıkarmaktır. Çalışmada veri toplama aracı olarak Kişisel Bilgi Formu, Yakın İlişkilerde Yaşantılar Envanteri-II (YİYE-II), Çocukluk Örsellenme Yaşantıları Ölçeği (ÇÖYÖ) ve Siber Mağduriyet ve Zorbalık Ölçeği (SMZÖ) kullanılmıştır. Üniversite öğrencilerinin siber mağdur alt ölçeğindeki puanları ile siber zorba alt ölçeği arasında yüksek düzeyde, pozitif yönde anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmuştur ($r=.656$; $p=.000$). Siber mağdur alt ölçeğinin puanları ile kaçınan bağlanma ve kaygılı bağlanma alt ölçeği arasında düşük düzeyde, pozitif yönde anlamlı bir korelasyon vardı ($r = .129$; $p = .004$; $r = .193$; $p = .000$). Öğrencilerin kaçınan ve kaygılı bağlanma seviyeleri arttıkça, siber mağduriyet seviyeleri de artmaktadır. Ayrıca, siber mağdur alt ölçeğindeki öğrencilerin puanları ile çocukluk çağı travması puanları arasında pozitif yönde anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmuştur ($r = .286$; $p = .000$). Bu çalışmada elde edilen sonuçlar, kaçınan, kaygılı bağlanma stilleri ve çocukluk çağı travmatik yaşantılarının siber zorbalık ve siber mağduriyet açısından yordayıcı faktörler olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu bağlamda ailelerin çocukları ile sağlıklı bir iletişim kurmaları siber zorbalık ve mağduriyetin önlenmesi açısından önemlidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Siber Zorbalık, Siber Mağduriyet, Bağlanma Stilleri, Çocukluk Çağı Travması

Introduction

Cyberbullying, which is generally considered as an extension of peer bullying, has become an issue in recent years with the development of information and communication technologies. The changing culture of communication and socialization with the developments in the field of informatics and communication has brought traditional violence to the virtual environment. Sending harassing or threatening messages repetitively and maliciously by an individual or group that may harm other individuals, through information and communication technologies, writing derogatory comments about someone on a website or social networking sites (such as Facebook or MySpace); or behavior such as physically threatening or intimidating someone on any site is defined as cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010; Belsey, 2008).

Although there are different definitions of cyberbullying in the literature, there is a consensus on some criteria. These are; 1) the intention of cyberbullying to harm the victim 2) there is an imbalance of power between the bully and the victim, 3) the aggression is often repeated by the bully, and 4) the cyberbully's use of information and communication technology tools (Field, 2018).

When we look at the researches on cyberbullying both in the world and in Turkey, though the results are different, it is clear that the ratios reached to a point where it proves to be an important issue expanding day by day and can not be neglected. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that studies conducted on this subject have focused especially on adolescents.

In a review about cyberbullying, it was stated that the prevalence ranges between 7% and 35% (Bottino, Bottino, Regina, Correia & Ribeiro, 2015). In the study conducted by Peker (2015), it was concluded that 17% of the students were cyber victims, 10.5% cyber bullied others, and 35.2%

both cyber bullied and experienced victimization. DePaolis and Williford (2015) observed that 18% of children in grades 3, 4 and 5 in North America suffered from cyberbullying. In a study conducted on 1,004 university students, it was stated that 6% of the students were cyber victims, 5% were cyberbullies, 5% were both bullies and victims, and 46% witnessed cyberbullying (Cunningham et al., 2015). In a study conducted with 2590 participants of secondary and high school students in China, concluded that 28% of the participants were cyberbullies and 45% were cyber victims in the last six months (Rao et al., 2017).

In recent years, researchers have identified various risk factors for cyberbullying. Among adolescents, time spent online, engaging in risky online behavior, including playing online, have been shown to be important risk factors for cyberbullying victimization. However, participating in traditional bullying is a risk factor for inclusion in cyberbullying (Field, 2018; Kowalski, Limber, & McCord, 2019). In terms of gender, it has been stated that girls are more likely to be exposed to cyberbullying than boys. (Festi & Quandt, 2016; Kowalski, Limber, & McCord, 2019). Moreover, the existence of different factors such as social anxiety, lack of empathy, alexithymia, low self-esteem, psychopathy and narcissism personality traits are mentioned (Bayraktar, Machackova, Dedkova, Cerna & Sevcikova 2015; Fan, Chu, Zhang & Zhou, 2016; Field, 2018 ; Kowalski, Limber, & McCord, 2019).

Considering the familial risk factors, the existence of factors such as living in a single-parent household, the presence of family conflicts, problems with parental attachment and especially in case of avoidant attachment, authoritarian parental attitude, lack of a warm environment in family relationships, and the presence of sexual abuse are the causes associated with cyberbullying. (Li, 2010; Rigby, 2013; Hébert, Cénat, Blais, Lavoie, & Guerrier, 2016; Field, 2018; Kowalski, Limber, & McCord, 2019).

It is known that cyberbullying causes many important problems for both the bully and the victim. Examples of these problems are social isolation, decreased school success, dropping out of school, depression, alcohol and substance use, self-harm, and suicidal behavior (Eroğlu, 2011; Bourassa, 2012; John et al., 2018).

When we look at the studies conducted both in Turkey and in the world, it is clear that cyber-bullying is an important issue. Considering the problems it has created and how widespread it has become, it is important to know why cyberbullying and cyber victimization occur. Because determining the factors that cause this problem to occur will be decisive in terms of developing solutions. The purpose of this research; to reveal the prevalence of cyberbullying and victimization among university students; to determine whether childhood traumatic experiences, attachment styles and cyber bullying and victimization levels differ in terms of some variables and to reveal the effects of childhood trauma experiences and attachment styles on cyberbullying and victimization.

Methods

The participants were reached after the approval of the Ethics Committee of Yeni Yüzyıl University with the 02.09.2019 date and 2019/09 number was obtained for the study. Before the scales were applied, the participants were informed about the research and it was stated that participation to the study was on a voluntary basis.

University students constitute the universe of the study. When the sample was determined by simple random sampling method from the universe, it was determined that at least 385 participants with 95% confidence interval and 5% margin of error would be sufficient for analysis, therefore 500 people were reached for the study. 13 of the scales were excluded because of missing answers, and the data of 487 people were included in the study. The research group consists of a total of 487 participants, 136 men and 351 women. The average age of the participants is 21.77 ± 4.58.

Personal Information Form, Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory-II (EII-II), Childhood Trauma Experience Scale (CTES) and Cyber Victimization and Bullying Scale (CVBS) were used as data collection tools in the study.

Personal Information Form: It was prepared by the researchers to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants; It includes questions on some variables such as gender, age, marital status, educational status, number of siblings, education level of parents, and parenting attitudes of parents.

Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory-II (EII-II): The scale was developed by Fraley and Shaver (2000) and its validity and reliability study of Turkey was conducted by Selcuk and colleagues (2005). In the scale, there are a total of 36 items in 7-Likert type, 18 in anxiety and 18 in avoidance. The score obtained from each sub-dimension ranges between 18 and 126, and as the score obtained from the scale increases, it is stated that avoidant attachment or attachment anxiety increases. While the Cronbach alpha coefficient of the avoidance sub-

dimension is 0,90, the Cronbach alpha coefficient of the anxiety sub-dimension is 0,86. Test-retest reliability coefficients of the scale related to avoidance and anxiety dimensions are 0.81 and 0.82, respectively.

Childhood Trauma Experience Scale (CTES): It is a scale developed by Bernstein et al., which participants can fill in for the purpose of screening trauma experiences before the age of 18 (Bernstein et al., 1994). It is a 5-point Likert type, consisting of forty items, 16 of which are reverse scored. The scale was adapted to Turkish by Aslan and Alparslan (1999) (Aslan & Alparslan, 1999). Response options are given as (1) never, (2) rarely, (3) sometimes, (4) often, and (5) very often. The total score obtained varies between 40-200. Higher scores indicate that this type of abuse occurs more frequently in childhood or adolescence. However, it does not give conclusion as to whether there is relevant abuse or negligence or there is no cut-off score. It has three subscales: a) Emotional abuse and emotional neglect (EA-EN): It is 19 items and the score obtained varies between 19-95. b) Physical abuse (PA): 16 items and the score varies between 16-80. c) Sexual abuse (SA): It is 5 items and the score varies between 5-25 (Aslan & Alparslan, 1999). The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the Turkish version of CTES was 0.96, and the subscales were between 0.94-0.96. The validity and reliability study showed that the internal consistency coefficients of the scale and its three factors were high.

Cyber Victimization and Bullying Scale (CVBS): The Cyber Victimization and Bullying Scale (CVBS) was developed by Çetin, Yaman, and Peker (2011). It consists of two scales, one of which is cyber victimization and the other is cyber bullying, each containing 22 questions. Participants report their cyber victimization using a five-point Likert-type rating from "Always (5)"; to "Never (1)"; in the "Done to Me" section. Likewise, it answers the degree of participation in cyberbullying behaviors by using the five-point Likert-type ranking from "Always (5)" to "Never (1)" in the "I Have Done" section. Getting a high score from the Cyber Victimization Scale of the scale indicates the high level of exposure to cyberbullying, and getting a high score from the Cyber Bullying Scale indicates the high level of cyberbullying behaviors. The test-retest reliability of the scale was found as .85 for the Cyber Victimization Scale (CVS), and .90 for the Cyber Bullying Scale (CBS). In accordance with the aims of the study, the statistical analyzes applied to the collected data were carried out with the SPSS v21 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) program.

Results

94.7% of the participants are single, 20.1% are working in a job. 14.2% are associate degree students, 60.2% are undergraduates, 25.7% are graduate students. 8.4% of the students have a single child, 39.8% two siblings, 46% 3-5 siblings and 5.7% 6 or more siblings. Family income of 10.3% is 2000 TL and below, 17.7% is between 2001-3000 TL, 22.4% is between 3001-4000 TL and 49.7% is 4001 TL and above. 51.1% of the university students reported that they lived with their families, 27.3% at the dormitory, 10.5% at home with their friends, 3.7% at home with their relatives, and 7.4% alone (Table 1).

Table 1. Frequency distributions and percentages regarding the demographic characteristics of university students

		Male		Woman		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
Marital Status	Married	8	5.9	18	5.1	26	5.3
	Single	128	94.1	333	94.9	461	94.7
Employment status	Yes	32	23.5	66	18.8	98	20.1
	No	104	76.5	285	81.2	389	79.9
Education	Undergraduate	32	23.5	37	10.5	69	14.2
	Graduate	79	58.1	214	61.0	293	60.2
	Master's Degree	25	18.4	100	28.5	125	25.7
Sibling	Only child	11	8.1	30	8.5	41	8.4
	2 sibling	57	41.9	137	39.0	194	39.8
	3-5 siblings	58	42.6	166	47.3	224	46.0
	6 or more	10	7.4	18	5.1	28	5.7
Family Income	1-2000 TL	9	6.6	41	11.7	50	10.3
	2001 TL -3000 TL	19	14.0	67	19.1	86	17.7
	3001TL-4000 TL	32	23.5	77	21.9	109	22.4
	4001 TL or more	76	55.9	166	47.3	242	49.7
Living situation	With my family	67	49.3	182	51.9	249	51.1
	Dormitory	26	19.1	107	30.5	133	27.3
	Share home with friends	24	17.6	27	7.7	51	10.5
	With relatives	8	5.9	10	2.8	18	3.7
	Living alone	11	8.1	25	7.1	36	7.4
Total		136	100.0	351	100.0	487	100.0

Fathers of 20.5% of students are primary school graduates, 28.7% are high school graduates, and 27.7% are university graduates. The mothers of 32.4% of the students are primary school graduates, 20.5% are middle school graduates, and 23.6% are high school graduates. 69% of the students' mothers are housewives, 15.7% of their

fathers' is a civil servant, 24.1% is retired, 20.5% is private sector employee, 20.8% is self-employed. Parents of 86.7% of students are together, 8.4% of them are divorced, 1.2% of their mothers and 3.3% of their fathers have passed away.

Table 2. Findings of Spearman correlation analysis between the scores of university students in EII, CTES and CVBS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Cyber Victim	1							
2. Cyber Bully	.656**	1						
3. Avoidant Attachment	.129**	.170**	1					

4. Anxious Attachment	.193**	.224**	.675**	1			
5. Childhood Trauma	.286**	.324**	.163**	.382**	1		
6. Emotional Abuse and Neglect	.274**	.303**	.156**	.366**	.964**	1	
7. Physical Abuse	.265**	.304**	.133**	.346**	.904**	.784**	1
8. Sexual Abuse	.274**	.301**	.180**	.371**	.867**	.807**	.730** 1

*p<.05; **p<.01

A high level, positive significant relationship was found between the scores of the university students in the Cyber Victim subscale and the Cyber Bully subscale ($r = .656$; $p = .000$). Accordingly, as the level of cyber victimization increases, the level of cyberbullying increases.

There was a low level, positive significant correlation between the scores of the Cyber Victim subscale and the Avoidant Attachment and Anxious Attachment subscale ($r = .129$; $p = .004$; $r = .193$; $p = .000$). As students' avoidant and anxious attachment levels increase, their cyber victimization levels increase.

In addition, a positive significant relationship was found between the scores of the students in the Cyber Victim subscale and Childhood Trauma scores ($r = .286$; $p = .000$). Accordingly, as childhood traumatic levels increase, cyber victimization levels also increase. A positive significant relationship was found between the Cyber Victim subscale scores of university students and Childhood Trauma Scale Emotional Abuse and Emotional Neglect scores, Childhood Trauma Scale Physical Abuse scores and Childhood Trauma Scale Sexual Abuse scores ($r = .274$; $p = .000$; $r = .265$; $p = .000$; $r = .274$; $p = .000$). As the childhood emotional, physical and sexual abuse levels of students increase, their cyber victimization levels increase.

A positive significant relationship was found between the scores the participants got from the Cyber Bully subscale and the Avoidant Attachment and Anxious Attachment subscale ($r = .170$; $p = .000$; $r = .224$; $p = .000$). As the students' avoidant and anxious attachment levels increase, their cyberbullying levels increase.

A positive significant relationship was found between the scores of university students in the Cyber Bully subscale and their Childhood Trauma level ($r = .324$; $p = .000$). Accordingly, as the childhood traumatic levels of the students increase, the cyberbullying levels increase. A positive significant relationship was found between the scores of the University students on the Cyber Bully subscale and the Childhood Trauma Scale Emotional Abuse and Emotional Neglect scores, Childhood Trauma Scale Physical Abuse scores and Childhood Trauma Scale Sexual Abuse scores ($r = .303$; $p = .000$; $r = .304$; $p = .000$; $r = .301$; $p = .000$). As the childhood emotional trauma of the students increases, their cyberbullying levels increase.

A positive significant relationship was found between the scores of the University students in the Avoiding Attachment subscale and the Anxious Attachment subscale and their Childhood Trauma scores ($r = .163$, $p = .000$; ($r = .382$, $p = .000$)). As the childhood trauma levels of the students increase, their avoidant attachment levels and anxious attachment levels increase.

Table 3. Average scores, standard deviations, and independent samples Mann Whitney U test results obtained by university students in EII, CTES and CVBS according to their gender

	Gender	n	Med	SS	z	P
Cyber Victim	Male	136	35.39	14.426	-4.409	.000*
	Woman	351	29.84	10.960		
Cyber Bully	Male	136	35.87	13.704	-7.365	.000*
	Woman	351	27.55	8.288		
Avoidant Attachment	Male	136	64.71	17.074	-1.416	.157
	Woman	351	67.09	19.707		
Anxious Attachment	Male	136	58.63	15.712	-3.178	.001*
	Woman	351	53.92	16.076		
Childhood Trauma	Male	136	75.10	24.810	-4.963	.000*
	Woman	351	64.38	23.785		

Emotional Abuseand Neglect	Male	136	37.49	12.461	-4.555	.000*
	Woman	351	32.38	12.878		
Physical Abuse	Male	136	27.88	10.596	-4.698	.000*
	Woman	351	23.40	8.381		
Sexual Abuse	Male	136	9.72	3.802	-3.591	.000*
	Woman	351	8.60	3.940		

*p<.05

The mean scores of the participants in EII, CTES and CVBS when evaluated according to gender, the mean cyber victimization of male university students (mean = 35.39) and cyber bullying (mean = 35.87) are statistically significant compared to the mean of female students (mean = 29.84; mean = 27.55) was high ($z = -4.409$, $p = .000$; $z = -7.365$, $p = .000$). The anxious attachment average of male university students (mean = 58.63) was found to be statistically significantly higher than the average of female students (mean = 53.92) ($z = -3.178$; $p = .001$). However, no significant difference was found between the averages of avoidant attachment by gender.

The average childhood trauma of male university students (mean = 75.10), childhood emotional trauma averages (mean = 37.49), childhood physical trauma averages (mean = 27.88); The mean childhood sexual abuse (mean = 9.72) was found to be statistically significantly higher than the average of female students (mean = 64.38; mean = 32.38; mean = 23.40; mean = 8.60) ($z = -4.963$, $p = .000$; $z = -4.555$, $p = .000$; $z = -4.698$, $p = .000$; $z = -3.591$, $p = .000$).

In the standard regression analysis conducted to predict the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable, the dependent variable is the level of cyber victimization; independent variables are gender, childhood trauma level, avoidant attachment, and anxious attachment.

The standard regression analysis findings regarding the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable are given in Table 4. The regression model obtained as a result of the regression analysis is significant [F (4-482) = 19.618; $p < .01$]; It has been found that 14% of the variance in the cyber victimization dependent variable is explained by the independent variables such as gender, childhood trauma level, avoidant attachment and anxious attachment [$r = .374$; $r^2 = .140$]. Gender [$t = -3.155$; $p = .002$] and childhood trauma [$t = 6.294$; $p = .000$] independent variables predict cyber victimization dependent variable significantly, however, avoidant attachment [$t = .128$; $p = .898$] and anxious attachment [$t = .823$; It was found that $p = .411$] independent variables did not significantly predict cyber victimization dependent variable.

Table 4. Standard Regression Analysis Findings Regarding the Effect of Independent Variables on the Dependent Variable

Model and Variable	r	r ²	F	B	Std. Err	β	t	P
Constant				25.419	3.165		8.032	.000
Gender				-3.790	1.201	-.139	-3.155	.002*
Avoidant Attachment				.005	.039	.008	.128	.898
1 Anxious Attachment	.374	.140	19.618*	.041	.050	.054	.823	.411
Childhood Trauma				.147	.023	.294	6.294	.000*

*p<.05

In Table 5, the findings of the hierarchical regression analysis are made in order to understand the effects of gender and childhood trauma independent variables on the cyber victimization dependent variable, which are observed to be significant predictors in Table 4. The first regression model obtained as a result of hierarchical regression analysis [F (1-485) = 64.792; $p < .01$] and the second regression model [F (2-484) = 38.412; $p < .01$] is

significant; In the first model, 12% of the variance in the cyber victimization dependent variable is explained by childhood trauma experience, which is the independent variable [$r = .343$; $r^2 = .118$]; In the second model, 14% of the variance in the cyber victimization dependent variable is explained by childhood trauma experiences and gender, which are the independent variables [$r = .370$; $r^2 = .137$]; Significant contribution of gender independent variable to

the change in variance [r^2 change = .019; F change (1-484) = 10.733; $p < .01$].

In the first model, childhood trauma experiences significantly predicted cyber victimization [$t = 8.049$; $p =$

.000]. After adding the gender independent variable to the second model, childhood trauma experiences [$t = 7.329$; $p = .000$] and gender [$t = -3.276$; $p = .001$] significantly predicted cyber victimization.

Table 5. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Findings Regarding the Effect of Independent Variables on the Dependent Variable

Model and Variable	r	r ²	F	B	Std. Err	β	t	p
1	Constant			19.824	1.529		12.963	.000
	Childhood Trauma	.343	.118	64.792*	.172	.021	.343	8.049
2	Constant			27.389	2.761		9.919	.000
	Childhood Trauma			.158	.022	.316	7.329	.000*
	Gender	.370	.137	34.412	-3.854	1.176	-.141	-3.276

* $p < .05$

Discussion

It is known that both cyber victimization and cyberbullying have negative effects on individuals. In the study by Hinduja and Patchin (2009), it was stated that cyber victimization can lead people to suicide. On the other hand, it has been stated that cyberbullying negatively affects psychological health and is associated with being angry and having hostile feelings (Pornari & Wood, 2010; Arıcak, 2009). In the present study, the cyber victimization rate of the participants was determined as 31.39% and the cyber bullying rate as 29.87%. When the general literature is examined, it is seen that the rates of cyberbully and cyber victimization vary between 4% and 63% (Arıcak et al., 2008; Burgess-Proctor et al., 2009; Dehue, Bolman and Vollink, 2008; Erdur-Baker, 2009; Kowalski and Limber, 2007; Li, 2007a; Li, 2008; Mishna et al., 2012; Slonje & Smith, 2008; Smith, Mahdavi, Carvalho, & Tippett, 2006; Selkie, Kota & Moreno, 2016; Topçu, Erdur-Baker and Çapa-Aydın, 2008; Twyman et al., 2010; Taştekin, Bayhan, 2018) It is thought that this difference between the rates is due to the measurement tools used or the sample selection. However, it is a fact that the developments in technology, the widespread use of the internet and the widespread use of social media for many purposes in daily life have increased the rates of cyber victimization and bullying.

In the cyber victimization and cyberbullying assessment made according to gender, both cyber victimization and cyberbullying rates of male participants were found to be statistically significantly higher than female participants. In the international literature, there are different opinions on the rates of cyberbullying and cyber victimization by gender (Williams & Guerra, 2007; Juvonen & Gross, 2008; Slonje & Smith, 2008; Kowalski & Limber 2007; Mesch 2009). In the study conducted in Turkey, although there are studies indicating that there was no difference by gender (Topçu, Erdur-Baker, Çapa-Aydın, 2008), numerous studies and cyberbullying shows both is higher in men of cyber victimization rate (Arıcak va al., 2008 ; Cetinkaya, 2010; Erdur-Baker, 2010; Horzum and Ayas, 2011; Peker, Eroglu and Çitemel, 2012; Serin, 2012; Taştekin, Bayhan, 2018) Men in Turkey, cyberbullying and victimization rates have to be higher than in women is

associated with gender roles. While women are raised in gender roles face more control and are expected to be more harmonious in social relations, aggressive behaviors of men are more accepted (Erdur-Baker, 2010; Akbulut & Erişti, 2011), in the meta-analysis study where 109 studies were evaluated by Barlet and Coyne (2014). Especially in studies conducted in Asia, the result that males do more cyber bullying than females supports this view. In our study, the cyber victimization averages of male university students (mean = 35.39) and cyber bullying (mean = 35.87) were found to be statistically significantly higher than the average of female students (mean = 29.84; mean = 27.55) ($z = -4.409$, $p = .000$; $z = -7.365$, $p = .000$) paralleled with the literature.

Because of their ability to explain relationship behavior, it is thought that attachment styles can be useful for understanding cyberbullying and cyber victimization seen in university students. Anxious or avoidant attachment individuals have difficulty in establishing and maintaining friendship and have low empathy. It is possible for them to turn to the online world more, especially when they are in distress and disappointment or when they feel sad and lonely (Varghese & Pistole, 2017). The current research results also revealed that both anxious and avoidant attachment styles have an effect on cyberbullying and victimization. Considering that individuals with insecure attachment styles are less compliant, less skillful in regulating their own emotions, less resistant to coping with stress, have problems in interpersonal relationships and affect the emergence of mental symptoms, it can be considered inevitable that this result has actually come about. It has been observed that there are a limited number of studies investigating the relationship between cyber bullying and attachment in the literature, and more research is needed to examine this issue. Another important point is how the behaviors that lead to cyberbullying are perceived by the practitioner. Whether the person sees such behaviors as a bullying behavior or how they make sense will be useful for prevention and rehabilitation studies.

Another factor that is thought to have an effect on cyber bullying and victimization in the literature, especially in terms of familial risk factors, is childhood traumatic experiences. The results of the present study showed that as childhood trauma levels increase, cyberbullying and victimization increase. The results of the study of Emirtekin, Balta, Kircaburun et al. (2019) also found that adolescents who were exposed to emotional abuse during childhood were more likely to bully others with humiliating verbal attacks online. It can be said that individuals who were traumatized in childhood due to the cycle of violence are more likely to become cyberbullies in the future. More importantly, many studies have shown that childhood maltreatment is a strong predictor of bullying and aggression during adolescence. In addition, Hébert, Cénat, Blais, Lavoie, & Guerrier (2016) examined the effect of childhood traumatic experiences on cyber bullying of adolescents in their study and showed that adolescents who experienced child sexual abuse were more likely to be victims of cyberbullying. In this direction, it is proposed that it would be appropriate to investigate the relationship with cyber bullying and victimization by asking more detailed questions such as the types of childhood traumatic experiences and who committed the violence experienced in future studies.

Conclusion

As a result, cyberbullying and cyber victimization, which have negative behavioral and emotional effects, are important problems among adolescents. The results obtained in this study show that avoidant, anxious attachment styles and childhood traumatic experiences are predictive factors in terms of cyberbullying and cyber victimization. In this context, it is important for families to establish a healthy communication with their children in terms of preventing cyberbullying and victimization.

Therefore, in preventing cyberbullying and victimization; it is necessary to establish preventive-protective programs that will enable the evaluation of the mother-father-child relationship in the early period, the early determination of relational problems, and the provision of counseling and support services. Considering the fact that cyberbullying behaviors are carried out on the internet and the significant impact of technology, informing children and adolescents about correct internet use in the early period and including safe internet use in the course contents can prevent cyberbullying in the future.

The limitation of this study is that the sample of the study is only university students. In order to generalize, working with participants in a wider age range is recommended.

Declarations

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate

The participants were reached after the approval of the Ethics Committee of Yeni Yüzyıl University with the 02.09.2019 date and 2019/09 number was obtained for the study.

Consent for Publication

Not applicable.

Availability of Data and Materials

Data sets used and / or analyzed during the study can be obtained from the relevant author upon appropriate request.

Competing Interests

The author declares that no competing interests in this manuscript.

Funding

Not applicable.

Authors' Contributions

BT worked on the concept of the study, BT, AY and NC worked on gathering data and data analysis, BT and NC write and made the critical revisions about the article.

References

- Akbulut, Y. & Erişti, B. (2011). Cyberbullying and victimization among Turkish university students. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 27(7), 1155-1170.
- Arcak, O.T., Siyanhan S, Uzunhasanoğlu A, Sarıbeyoğlu S, Çıplak S, Yılmaz N, Memmedov, C. (2008). Cyberbullying among Turkish adolescents. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 11(3), 253-261.
- Arcak, O.T. 2009. Psychiatric symptomatology as a predictor of cyberbullying among university students. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 34, 167-184.
- Aslan, S.H & Alparlan, Z.N. (1999). Validity, reliability and factor structure of childhood trauma experiences in a sample of university students. *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry*, 10: 275-85.
- Barlett, C. & Coyne, S.M. (2014). A meta-analysis of sex differences in cyber-bullying behavior: the moderating role of age. *Aggressive Behavior*, 40 (5), 474-488.
- Bayraktar, F., Machackova, H., Dedkova, L., Cerna, A., & Sevcikova, A. (2015). Cyberbullying: The discriminant factors among cyberbullies, cybervictims, and cyberbully-victims in a Czech adolescent sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30(18), 3192-3216.
- Belsey, B. (2006). Cyberbullying: An emerging threat to the always on generation. Retrieved from (25.12.2020) http://www.cyberbullying.ca/pdf/Cyberbullying_Article_by_Bill_Belsey.pdf
- Bernstein DP, Fink L, Handelsman L, Foote J, Lovejoy M, Wenzel K, et al. (1994). Initial reliability and validity of a new retrospective measure of child abuse and neglect. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*;151(8):1132-6.
- Bottino, S.M, Bottino, C.M, Regina, C.G, Correia, A.V, Ribeiro, W.S. (2015) Cyberbullying and adolescent mental health: Systematic review. *Cadernos de saúde de pública*; 31: 463-475. Ref.: <https://tinyurl.com/y7sr8jnr>
- Bourassa, C. A. L. (2012). "Student cyberbullying: raising awareness for school counselors." (Master's thesis). University of Wisconsin-Stout, Menomonie, ABD. <http://www2.uwstout.edu/content/lib/thesis/2012/2012bourassac.pdf>
- Cunningham, C.E, Chen, Y., Vaillancourt, T., Rimas, H., Deal, K, et al.(2015) Modeling the anti-cyberbullying preferences of university students: Adaptive choice-based conjoint analysis. *Aggress Behav*; 41: 369-385.
- Çetin, B., Yaman, E. ve Peker, A. (2011). Cyber Victim and Bullying Scale: A Study of Validity and Reliability. *Computer&Education*; 57 (4): 2261-2271.
- Çetinkaya, B. (2010). The prevalence of cyberbullying among secondary school students. Unpublished Master Thesis, Selçuk University, Konya.
- DePaolis, K., & Williford, A. (2015). The nature and prevalence of cyber victimization among elementary school children. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, 44(3), 377-393. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10566-014-9292-8>.

- Emirtekin, E., Balta, S., Kircaburun, K. et al. (2019) Childhood Emotional Abuse and Cyberbullying Perpetration Among Adolescents: The Mediating Role of Trait Mindfulness. *Int J Ment Health Addiction*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-019-0055-5>
- Erdur Baker, Ö. (2010). Cyberbullying and its correlations to traditional bullying, gender and frequent and risky usage of internet-mediated communication tools. *New Media & Society*, 12 (1), 109-125.
- Eroğlu, Y. (2011) Investigation of the Relationship between Conditional Self-Value, Risky Internet Behaviors, Internet Usage Frequency and Cyber Bullying. Sakarya University Institute of Educational Sciences, Psychological Services in Education, Master's Thesis.
- Fan, C.Y., Chu, X.W., Zhang, M. & Zhou, Z.K. (2016) Are narcissists more likely to be involved in cyberbullying? Examining the mediating role of self-esteem. *J Interpers Violence*. Ref.: <https://tinyurl.com/ydhlf9ze>
- Festi, R., Quandt, T. (2016) The role of online communication in long-term cyberbullying involvement among girls and boys. *J Youth Adolesc*; 45: 1931-1945. Ref.: <https://tinyurl.com/yblbxatp>
- Field, T. (2018). Cyberbullying: A narrative review. *J Addict Ther Res*. 2018; 2: 010-027. <https://dx.doi.org/10.29328/journal.jatr.1001007>
- Hébert, M., Cénat, J. M., Blais, M., Lavoie, F., & Guerrier, M. (2016). Child sexual abuse, bullying, cyberbullying, and mental health problems among high schools students: A moderated mediated model. *Depression and Anxiety*, 33(7), 623–629. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/da.22504>
- Hinduja, S., Patchin, J.W. (2010) Bullying, Cyberbullying, and Suicide, *Archives of Suicide Research*, 14:3, 206-221, DOI: 10.1080/13811118.2010.494133
- Hinduja, S., Patchin, J.W.(2009). Bullying beyond the school yard: Preventing and responding to cyber bullying. California: Carwin Press.
- Horzum, M. B., Ayas, T. (2011). Investigation of secondary school students' cyber bully and victim levels in terms of school type and gender. *Educational Sciences and Practice*, 10 (20), 139-159.
- John, A., Glendenning, A.C., Marchant, A., Montgomery, P., Stewart, A., Wood, S., Lloyd, K., Hawton, K. (2018) Self-Harm, Suicidal Behaviours, and Cyberbullying in Children and Young People: Systematic Review *J Med Internet Res*; 20(4):e129 DOI: 10.2196/jmir.9044
- Juvonen, J., Gross ,E.,F. (2008) Extending the school grounds ? Bullying experiences in cyberspace. *Journal of School Health* 78 (9) 496-505.
- Kowalski, R.M., Limber, S.P. (2007) Electronic bullying among middle school students. *Journal of Adolescent Health* 41.22-30.
- Kowalski, R. M., Limber, S.P., McCord, A. (2019) A developmental approach to cyberbullying: Prevalence and protective factors. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 45 :20–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.02.009>
- Li, Q. (2010). Cyberbullying In High Schools: A Study Of Students' Behaviors And Beliefs About This New Phenomenon. *Journal Of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*. 19. s. 4: 372-392.
- Lonje ,R. Smith ,P.K. (2008) Cyberbullying : Another main type of bully- ing? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 49 ,147-154.
- Mesch, G.S. (2009) Parental mediation,online activities and cyberbullying. *Cyber - psychology and Behavior*, 12 (4) ,387-393.
- Pornari, D. and Wood, J. 2010. Peer and cyber aggression in secondary school students: The role of moral disengagement, hostile attribution bias, and outcome expectations. *Aggressive Behavior*, 36, 81-94.
- Peker, A., Eroğlu, Y., Çitemel, N. (2012). Examination of gender mediation in the relationship between submissive behavior and cyberbullying and cyber victimization. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 9 (1), 205-221
- Peker, A. (2015). Analyzing the risk factors predicting the cyberbullying status of secondary school students. *Education and Science*, 40(181), 57-75.
- Rao, J., Wang, H., Pang, M., Yang, J., Zhang, J., Ye, Y., ... & Dong, X. (2019). Cyberbullying perpetration and victimisation among junior and senior high school students in Guangzhou, China. *Injury prevention*, 25(1), 13-19.
- Rigby, K. (2013). Bullying in Schools and Its Relation to Parenting and Family Life. *Family Matters*, 92, 61.
- Selçuk, E., Günaydın, G., Sümer, N., & Uysal A. (2005). New measure for adult attachment styles: The psychometric evaluation of Experiences in Close Relationships - Revised (ECR-R) on a Turkish sample]. *Turkish Psychological Articles*, 8, 1-11.
- Selkie, E. M., Kota, R. and Moreno, M. (2016). Cyberbullying behaviors among female college students: Witnessing, perpetration and victimization. *College Student Journal*, 50(2), 278–287. doi:10.1126/science.1249098.Sleep
- Serin, H. (2012). Adolescents' cyberbullying / cyber victimization experiences and the opinions of teachers and education administrators regarding these behaviors. PhD Thesis, Istanbul University. Istanbul.
- Topçu ,Ç., Erdur-Baker ,Ö.,ve Çapa- Aydın ,Y. (2008) . Examination of Cyber - bullying experiences among Turkish students from different school types. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior* .11 (6) 643-648
- Varghese, M. E., & Pistole, M. C. (2017). College student cyberbullying: Self-esteem,depression, loneliness, and attachment. *Journal of College Counseling*, 20,7–21.
- Williams, K.R. & Guerra ,N .G. (2007) Prevalence and predictors of internet bull- ying . *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41,14-21.