Executive Summary
This report details the findings from an evaluation of the Geelong Football Club’s Cyber Cats program, as delivered in 2019. The evaluation was funded by the Victorian Government under the Pick My Project grants scheme in 2019 and conducted by Dr Bianca Klettke and Elizabeth Clancy from Deakin University’s School of Psychology.

The Cyber Cats program is an evidence-based, single-day education program, focusing on cyberbullying and online behaviours for young adolescents. It is an activity-based prevention program, delivered to Year 7 students in the Barwon region through a partnership between Geelong Football Club and Barwon Child Youth and Family (Headspace). The program addresses key issues which students have identified as being of concern to them, including cyberbullying and sharing sexts (nudes).

This evaluation applied a longitudinal design, with students completing anonymous surveys at program commencement (N = 309), program completion (N=198) and at follow-up (N=135), approximately 8-12 weeks later. In addition, parents (N=138) completed the parent survey, and a control cohort of students (N=53) who had not attended Cyber Cats also completed follow up surveys.

Key areas of concern for students included receiving unwanted nudes, sharing personal details and locations, and other sexting related issues, while parents were more likely to be concerned about technology and privacy related aspects of use. Female students were more likely to endorse all areas of concern, with body shaming the area of greatest increased concern when compared to boys. Overall, prior to program commencement parents were significantly less likely to report any concerns regarding use of technology than young people.

At baseline, students reported relatively high levels of confidence in responding to cyberbullying (mean score = 7.19, SD = 2.02, comparable to control score 7.02, SD = 2.10). Nevertheless, confidence significantly improved post Cyber Cats attendance to a mean score of 8.68 (SD = 1.82). At follow up confidence had reduced again to a mean score of 6.77 (SD = 2.34).

Measures of positive attitudes towards cyberbullying improved from baseline (Mean = 15.60) to post program (Mean = 15.09) and follow-up (Mean = 15.00), although changes were not significant. However, students who attended the Cyber Cats program were less likely to endorse positive attitudes towards cyberbullying than control students (Mean = 17.45). Parents typically reported significantly less favourable attitudes to cyberbullying (Mean = 12.29, SD 3.46).

Program participants also completed measures of cyberbullying victimization, perpetration and witnessing or bystanding at baseline and follow up, as did parents. Of note, when asked whether their child had experienced any cyberbullying, parents reported significantly lower levels of cyberbullying victimization and witnessing than did their children - but similar rates of cyberbullying perpetration.

Overall, reporting rates for all cyberbullying behaviours, particularly perpetration, were low. At baseline, 50% of students reported having had no experience of victimization and 79% no experiences of perpetration. However, witnessing at least some cyberbullying behaviours was more common, with 69% reporting some exposure. These findings support the importance of teaching young people about how to be effective bystanders.

At follow-up, a slight but non-significant improvement was noted, with 51.2% of students reporting no experience of cyberbullying victimization, and 81% reporting no experience of perpetration since they had attended the program. Importantly, there was significant reduction in witnessing cyberbullying,
with 46% reporting that they had not seen such behaviour in their online communities since attending the program.

Student mental health was assessed at baseline and follow up, with baseline average scores indicative of students being “likely to have some level of psychological disorder”. At follow up, program participant levels of psychological distress had reduced to average scores indicating students were likely to be psychologically well, although the numerical change was not significant.

In qualitative feedback, students also reported increased willingness to take proactive steps to seek out support and disengagement from negative online behaviours post the program, with a significant reduction in students reporting intentions to take no action or being unsure. Informal and/or family and peer self-care responses were most likely, but there was an increase post program in seeking more formal responses such as reporting via apps, blocking offenders or reporting to the e-safety commissioner. Parents were more likely to endorse passive strategies such as ignoring the behaviour, and punitive measures, such as removing the device and speaking with the parents of the perpetrator.

In relation to device usage expectations, at baseline, 43% of students reported having some form of agreement regarding device usage at home, whilst only 34% of parents reported having rules in place at home. Unsurprisingly, 79% of students reported having device contracts at school.

Students reported intentions at post program and actual behavioural changes at follow up, in relation to device use personally, at home, and at school. Across all settings, most common intended personal changes related to monitoring personal behaviour, reaching out to parents for support and implementing time limits, whilst a significant minority (10.2%) reported being unsure as to any changes they might make. At follow up, many had made no personal changes, reinforcing the need for ongoing reinforcement of program ideas, but there were significant increases in being kind, cautious and safe online, and in ceasing to use or removing problematic games or apps.

Students reported positive learnings and engagement with the program, particularly with regards to their understanding and confidence in responding to cyberbullying, personally or as bystanders. Students were positive about the impact of the program on their motivation to respond in better ways both for themselves and for others. They reported that content about how to respond to cyberbullying, and how to help others, was most helpful, and that the interactive and football related activities were enjoyable and promoted engagement.

Overall, this evaluation highlights several positive aspects as a result of attending the Cyber Cats program. Key recommendations arising from this evaluation are:

1. Inclusion of additional material regarding sexting, specifically around associated risks of receiving unwanted sexts, coercive requesting and sending of images, and non-consensual distribution, emphasising empathy, advice on managing requests or receiving images, and legal perspectives for both victims and perpetrators.

2. Additional reinforcing of program messages in students, ideally at a later time point.

3. Reinforcement of program content in the school setting within a whole-school approach.

4. Helping parents to understand more about online safety via a brief video-based parent education module.

The Cyber Cats program has demonstrated benefits in relation to attitudes, behaviours, and mental health and further program investment to continue program delivery, and reinforce key content, is critical to maintain this success.
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Project context
Cyber Cats is an activity-based cyber bullying prevention program, which has been operating as a partnership between Geelong Football Club and Barwon Child Youth and Family (Headspace) for 9 years. More recently in 2019, working with researchers from Deakin University, the program was reviewed and content revised, based on findings from an international literature review and extensive student and parent surveys. The program content is tailored to address issues that students have identified as being of concern to them, including cyberbullying and sharing explicit images. Cyber Cats is offered to year 7 students as a full day, free off-site program, conducted as an excursion to the Deakin Cats Community Centre in Geelong. Presenters include wellbeing staff from Barwon Child Youth and Family Services (BCYF), and generally a police officer and players from the Geelong Cats teams, who are ambassadors for positive online behaviours. To maximise student engagement, students also get to tour the stadium during the day.

Program topics include:

- What is cyberbullying and how to recognise this in the context of communicating using devices.
- How cyberbullying behaviour can become normalised, particularly at school
- How does cyberbullying impact upon an individual
- How to respond to cyberbullying positively towards being bullied or observing others be bullied
- How to seek help
- The law and cyberbullying and the creation and transmission of explicit images
- How to respond to being pressured to send explicit images
- Developing standards of behaviour for device users
Program logic
A program logic for the Cyber Cats program is provided as Appendix A. This details the program assumptions, key activities and outcomes.

Evaluation methodology

Evaluation design
A longitudinal approach was used to evaluate this program. Students completed anonymous surveys online at three time points: at the start of the program day, at the end of the program, and a follow-up survey administered approximately 8-12 weeks following the program. A control cohort of students who had not attended Cyber Cats also completed follow-up surveys.

Measures
Evaluation measures including the following standardised scales:

**Cyberbullying Victimization, Perpetration, and Bystanding** were assessed using measures drawn from Ybarra, Diener-West & Leaf (2007). These scales consist of three items, asking how frequently in the past year the individual engaged in cyberbullying behaviours, was the target of such behaviours or witnessed them online. A sample item is: *In the last year, how many times did you receive rude or nasty comments from someone while online?* Response options provided were everyday/almost everyday, once or twice a week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, less than a few times a year, and never. All scores were reverse coded for analysis, so that higher scores on the scale indicate more cyberbullying behaviours. To obtain a total score, responses were summed, with a possible total score for each behaviour ranging from 0-15. In addition, as a binary measure of behaviour, students who reported any of the three experiences in the previous year were coded as having experienced cyberbullying / perpetrated cyberbullying / witnessed cyberbullying (bystanding).

**Positive Attitudes to Cyberbullying Questionnaire** (PACQ; Barlett & Gentile, 2012). This is a nine-item measure which has been used to assess positive attitudes towards cyberbullying. Respondents were asked to indicate how much they agree or disagree with the statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The scale was slightly adapted from the initial study as follows. The initial measure included reference to “groups on Facebook or MySpace”, whereas in this study we updated this to more current social media sites, specifically Instagram,
Snapchat, WhatsApp and Facebook. Total scale scores vary from 9 - 45, with higher scores indicating more positive attitudes towards cyberbullying, and a mean score of 27 implying neutral attitudes.

**Psychological distress:** Students completed a measure of mental health at both baseline and follow-up. The Kessler-10 (K10) is a 10-item questionnaire designed to measure non-specific psychological distress in community epidemiological surveys (Kessler et al., 2002). The K10 consists of 10 symptoms of anxiety and depression (e.g., “how often did you feel tired out for no good reason?”). Students were asked to indicate on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = “none of the time”, 2 = “a little of the time”, 3 = “some of the time”, 4 = most of the time, 5 = “all of the time”) which statement best describes how they have been feeling during the past 30 days. A total score is calculated from the sum of individual scores, with higher scores indicating greater levels of psychological distress. This measure has been validated in child and adolescent settings in Australia (Smout, 2019).

**Parenting practices:** Parents were asked to complete two brief measures of their parenting practices, drawn from research conducted by the e-safety Commissioner. Parents were asked to indicate how much they agree or disagree with the statements provided, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The Restrictive Parent scale consists of five items: a sample item is “I set clear rules for my child about internet use”, whilst the Open Parent scale consists of four items: a sample item is “I speak to my child about being respectful to others online”. Scale scores are derived from the mean of individual item scores, with a possible range of 1-5, and higher scores indicating stronger levels of these behaviours.

In addition to these standardised measures, customised measures were also included as follows:

**Confidence in responding:** Students were asked to self-assess their confidence in responding to cyberbullying at baseline, post program and follow-up.

**Contextual measures:** Qualitative measures included indicating what actions they would take if they experienced cyberbullying themselves, or witnessed it happening to someone else. Students also reported on whether they had contracts or written expectations regarding online behaviours at home or at school. At baseline, students were asked about their learning aims for the program.

Copies of all survey instruments are provided in Appendix B.

**Participants**

**Pre-program**

A total of 309 students (112 female, 193 male, 1 non binary, 3 not specified) completed the baseline measures. Students came from 13 schools across the Barwon region (Bellarine Secondary, Belmont High School, Christian College Geelong (Bellarine and Highton), Clonard College, Geelong Baptist College, Geelong College, Grovedale College, Newcomb Secondary, North Geelong Secondary, Northern Bay College Peacock, St Ignatius College and St Joseph’s College).

**Post-program**

198 respondents completed the post program measures (1 unspecified, 4 non-binary, 86 female, 107 male respondents), across 12 schools (Belmont High School, Christian College Geelong (Bellarine and Highton), Clonard College, Geelong Baptist College, Geelong College, Grovedale College, Newcomb Secondary, North Geelong Secondary, Northern Bay College Peacock, St Ignatius College, St Joseph’s College).
Follow-up

At follow-up, 135 respondents (including 43 female, 108 male, 1 non-binary, 1 blank) completed surveys, across 9 schools in the Barwon region (Christian College Geelong (Bellarine and Highton), Clonard College, Geelong Baptist College, Newcomb Secondary, Northern Bay College Peacock, and St Joseph’s College).

Control

A total of 53 students from three schools were recruited to the control condition and completed the follow-up survey. All control students attended one of the schools which had participated in the program, but had not attended the program.

Parent surveys

Overall, 138 parents (111 female, 21 male, 6 not specified) from nine schools completed evaluation measures online. Of these, 60 had a female child, and 78 had a male child attend the Cyber Cats program. Parents reported multiple devices at home, with the median number of devices being 7. More than half had older children (58%), whilst a similar number had younger children (57%).

When asked about their own online behaviours, 88% reported having social media accounts themselves, whilst 71% were aware of their children having social media accounts, most typically Instagram (70.5%), Snapchat (45.3%), Messenger (23.2%) and Facebook (18.9%), whilst only 4.2% had Youtube accounts. Where children did have social media, 85% of parents were “friends” online with their children.

Results

Areas of concern

Pre-program

At baseline, both students and parents were asked about whether they had any concerns regarding their use of technology. When asked generally whether they had concerns, parents overall were significantly less likely to report any concerns than their children ($X^2 (1, N = 138) = 58.48, p < .001$), as shown in Figure 1.
However, when prompted, and provided with specific choices in regards to concerns, rates were similar between parents and their children (Figure 2), \(X^2 (1, N = 138) = .71, p = .40\), as shown in Figure 1.

When asked about their specific concerns, students nominated a range of issues, as shown in Figure 3. For Yr 7 students, the most pressing concern related to the receiving of unwanted nudes, then sharing personal details and locations, and other sexting related issues.
When analysed further based on gender, female students were more likely to endorse all specific areas of concern (see Figure 4). This difference was significant for all aspects except nudes being shared without consent, and most significant for body shaming, which was the greatest concern for female students, whereas receiving unwanted nudes was of greatest concern for male students.
In contrast, parents were more likely to be concerned about technology-related aspects than students (Figure 5). When concerns were rank ordered, students were more likely to raise issues related to sexting (pressure to send, receiving unwanted images and images being shared), whilst parents were more concerned about cyberbullying, sharing personal details and location, as well as receiving unwanted nudes and trolling.
Parent concerns – free text

Parents were asked whether they had concerns about their child using online technology, with 54.5% reporting some level of concern. Free text responses were analysed and are presented in Figure 6.

![Figure 6: Parental concerns regarding children using online technology](image)

Understanding of cyberbullying

In order to assess their understanding of cyberbullying behaviours, students were asked to define cyberbullying in their own words, with responses coded as shown in Error! Reference source not found., prior to the program and at follow up. The most common responses related to the online nature of the actions, that it was mean, hurtful and/or harmful and that it involved bullying. At follow up, definitions were generally consistent, with an emphasis on online and/or internet modes, and bullying behaviours. There was increased awareness of the potential for anonymity, with comments about it “occurring from behind a screen”, and that it was targeted harassment. Of note, students were more likely at follow up to use phrases consistent with the definition presented in the program. This included elements of aggressive behaviour, and harm being intentionally inflicted by one or more people through electronic means, as well as identifying the potential for cyberbullying to repeatedly, and from behind a screen, that is, more or less anonymously, in contrast to face-to-face bullying.
Confidence in responding

At baseline, students reported that they were relatively confident in responding to cyberbullying, with a mean score of 7.19 (SD = 2.02), which was comparable to the control group 7.02 (2.10). Immediately following the program, confidence was significantly improved, with a mean score of 8.68 (SD 1.82): $t(478) = -8.52$, $p < .001$. However, at follow up three months following the program, confidence had reduced to below baseline levels, to a mean score of 6.77 (SD = 2.34).

This suggests that further reinforcement of program concepts is critical to retain gains beyond immediate program delivery.
Attitudes towards cyberbullying
Baseline measures of positive attitudes towards cyberbullying indicated a mean score of 15.60 (SD = 5.44), noting that a mean score of 27 suggests neutral attitudes, and scores below 27 indicating less favourable attitudes towards cyberbullying. Immediately following the program, attitudes were less endorsing of cyberbullying, with a mean score of 15.09 (5.58), although this reduction was not statistically significant. Favourable attitudes continued to reduce at follow-up, where the reported mean attitudes score was 15.00 (SD = 4.80), but again, these changes were not significant. However, post-program attitudinal scores were significantly lower than the control group’s mean score: t (295) = -2.69, p = .007 and this improvement was increased at follow up: t (180) = -2.85, p = .005. Parents reported significantly less favourable attitudes to cyberbullying, with a mean score of 12.29 (SD 3.46).

![PACQ Scale](image)

**Figure 9: Positive attitudes towards cyberbullying**

Cyberbullying behaviours
Students and parents completed measures of actual cyberbullying behaviours, including victimization, perpetration and witnessing or bystanding, at baseline and follow up. In all cases, a score of 0 indicates not having experienced the behaviour, whilst the maximum score for any subscale is 15. Parents also completed measures of cyberbullying behaviours. Results (mean scores) are presented in Table 1 below.

When asked about cyberbullying behaviours, parents reported significantly lower levels of cyberbullying victimization and witnessing than their children. However, reported rates of cyberbullying perpetration were similar when comparing parents to their children. One possible explanation for this is that young people might not tell their parents when they are victimized and/or witness cyberbullying online, but that parents are equally aware when their children were engaged in bullying others.
### Table 1: Cyberbullying behavioural measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cyberbullying victimization</th>
<th>Cyberbullying victimization (binary)</th>
<th>Cyberbullying perpetration</th>
<th>Cyberbullying perpetration (binary)</th>
<th>Cyberbullying witnessing</th>
<th>Cyberbullying witnessing (binary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre program (N=235)</td>
<td>1.51 (2.26)</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.50 (1.43)</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>3.14 (3.45)</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow Up (N=129)</td>
<td>1.75 (2.80)</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>0.45 (1.32)</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>3.14 (3.34)</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong> (N=51)</td>
<td>2.82 (3.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84 (1.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.64 (3.32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents</strong></td>
<td>0.91 (1.70)</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>0.55 (1.32)</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>2.70 (3.46)</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noted that reporting rates for any of these behaviours, particularly cyberbullying perpetration, were quite low. At baseline, 50% of students reported having no experience of victimization and 79% no experiences of cyberbullying perpetration. However, witnessing at least some cyberbullying behaviours was more common, with only 31% reporting no exposure to witnessing. This finding supports the importance of teaching young people about how to best respond when being a cyberbullying bystander.

At follow-up, there was a slight but non-significant improvement noted, with 51.2% of students reporting no experience of cyberbullying victimization, and 81% reporting no experience of perpetration since they had attended the program. However, there was a significant reduction in the witnessing of cyberbullying, with 54% of students reporting that they had seen such behaviour after attending the program, in contrast to 70% of students who witnessed it prior to attending the program (t (359) = 2.46, p = .014). There are 2 potential explanations for this. Firstly, the Cyber Cats program discusses the definition of cyberbullying in great detail, so some students may have realized that instances that they initially thought might constitute cyberbullying, in fact, were not. Another potential explanation is that student may be able to recognize the potential for escalating situations more and be more likely to remove themselves from such situations.

### Mental health

The K-10 was used to assess student mental health at baseline and follow up. At baseline, the mean score of 20.27 (SD = 8.72) is just above the threshold for “likely to have a mild disorder”\(^1\). Control students reported similar results, with a mean score of 19.59 (SD = 9.26). However, at follow up, participant levels of psychological distress of those who had attended the Cyber Cats program had

---

\(^1\) The 2001 Victorian Population Health Survey (Department of Human Services, 2001) adopted a set of cut-off scores that may be used as a guide for screening for psychological distress, as follows:

**K10 Score** | **Likelihood of having a mental disorder (psychological distress)**
---|---
10 - 19 | Likely to be well
20 - 24 | Likely to have a mild disorder
25 - 29 | Likely to have a moderate disorder
30 - 50 | Likely to have a severe disorder
reduced to 18.97 (SD = 8.03), which suggests an improvement in student mental health and wellbeing, with most students reporting to be “likely to be well”, although this change was not statistically significant: t (358) = 1.390, p = .165.

![Figure 10: Student Mental health (K10)](image1)

**Qualitative data analysis**

Participants also provided a range of qualitative data prior to the program commencing.

**Responses to cyberbullying**

Students were asked about what actions they would take if they were experiencing cyberbullying themselves, with results provided in Figure 11. While more than seven in ten students reported that they would tell a parent or carer, and most would also block the person, concerningly 16 students were unsure, and 13 would take no action. Immediately after the program, these behaviours had shifted, with increases in most proactive strategies, including help-seeking, blocking the person and going offline. There was a significant increase in willingness to contact the e-safety commissioner. Importantly, most students reported increased willingness to take protective actions, with only six students (out of 300) reporting being unsure, and only one planning on taking no action, at the conclusion of the program. There was also a reduction in students planning to keep it to themselves.

![Figure 11: Personal responses if experiencing cyberbullying](image2)
Self-care actions
Students were also asked to describe what actions they would take to look after themselves, with results provided in Figure 12. Most commonly endorsed suggestions include seeking assistance from parents, adults or friends, and blocking or ignoring the person, whilst almost 10% suggesting disconnecting or going offline. Post program, students reported greater proactive strategies, particularly reporting the behaviour to the e-safety commissioner and reporting via the app, telling adults (parents and teachers), and blocking the person.

Parents were more likely to endorse either passive strategies such as ignoring the behaviour, and also noted more punitive measures, such as removing the device and speaking with the parents of the perpetrator.

Device usage contracts and expectations
Students and parents were asked about expectations regarding device usage at home and at school. At baseline, 43% of students reported having some form or formal agreement or contract regarding device usage at home. Interestingly, only 34% of parents reported having rules or a contract about device usage at home. However, 79% of students reported having device contracts at school. Content of these contracts, whether written or verbal, was generally similar, as noted below in Figure 13 and Figure 14. Given the discrepancy in the number of internet contracts present at school versus home, it is recommended for schools to require (or recommend) to parents to have similar contracts in line with those at school to reinforce the message and to have a consistent approach at both school and home.
Parents were asked about their parenting practices in relation to online content, using two subscales of restrictive and open parenting (with possible scores ranging from 1-5). Parents were generally quite supportive of both approaches, with similar mean scores for restrictive parenting of 4.23 (SD = .93) and for open parenting of 4.24 (SD = .22), indicating moderate to strong endorsement of these practices.

However, it is important to note that parents were much more likely to have reported punitive strategies, such as removing device access, if their child reported having experienced cyberbullying.

Program feedback and learnings
Following the program, young people were asked about their learnings with free text results. Responses were coded for themes, as presented in Figure 15. Most endorsed general information about cyberbullying, with one in four learning about the consequences for others, including legal and...
psychological impacts, and one in five noted their most improve learnings related to how to respond to cyberbullying if they see it online. Just over 15% specifically noted content, including legislation, regarding sexting and nude images, which is consistent with high reported rates of concern regarding these behaviours at pre-program. Very few reported having gained no knowledge, and this typically related to a sense that they were already aware of information regarding cyberbullying from other sources.

**Figure 15: Program learnings**

**Behavioural changes**
Students were asked immediately following the program about what changes they intended to make in relation to their online behaviours personally, at home and at school. At follow up, students were asked to report on the changes they had actually implemented since the program, with responses coded and results presented in Figure 16, Figure 17 and Figure 18.

Intended personal changes largely related to monitoring personal behaviour, and implementing time limits, but a significant minority (10.2%) reported being unsure as to any changes. At follow up three months later, many had made no personal changes, reinforcing the need for ongoing reinforcement of program ideas, and 8.2% remained unsure as to any changes. However, there were significant increases in being kind, cautious and safe online, and in ceasing to use or removing problematic games or apps.
Figure 16: Planned personal changes

Intentions for changes at home typically related to an increased willingness to reach out for assistance from parents, and self-directed limitations on device usage and monitoring behaviour to be kinder. Again, several students reported planning no specific changes, with typical comments reporting that they felt they already acted consistent with the program guidelines. At follow up, similar to above, almost half of students had made no changes, but there was increased self-monitoring, including being aware and safe behaviours, and an increased likelihood of reducing device usage through going offline or getting outside.

Figure 17: Planned home changes
School-based intended changes were most commonly related to behavioural monitoring, including not joining in with cyberbullying behaviours when seen, and seeing assistances from teachers, adults or friends. Unsurprisingly, given high levels of school-based policies around device usage, a large group of students planned no specific changes. At follow-up, similar to above, almost half of students had implemented no changes. However, for those who had taken action, this included limiting or reducing their time online and/or on sites and calling out behaviours.

Lastly, at follow up, students were asked about their reflections on Cyber Cats. Students were asked to rate their confidence in a range of areas, as indicated in Table 2. Possible scores could range from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean response</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Cyber Cats program helped me understand cyberbullying</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cyber Cats program has improved my confidence in responding to</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cyberbullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cyber Cats program has motivated me to better respond to cyberbullying if I were to be cyberbullied</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cyber Cats program has motivated me to better respond to cyberbullying if someone else were being cyberbullied</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students were positive about the impact of the program on their understanding and confidence in responding to cyberbullying, as well as their motivation to respond better both for themselves and for others.
Program learnings
When asked about the important learnings they had taken away, students found the information about how to respond to cyberbullying most important, following by how to help others, as shown in Figure 19.

Students reported the football related activities, and interactive program elements, and the engagement from the police offers, to be the most liked program elements, as shown in Figure 20.

Students also had the opportunity to identify if there was something that the program did not cover and that they would have liked more information about. Overwhelmingly, there was little left out, with almost four in five saying there were no additional elements, as shown in Figure 21.
Discussion
This evaluation report was commissioned to understand the immediate and medium-term outcomes arising from the Cyber Cats program. The program aims to teach students about positive online behaviours and develop an understanding of the risks and consequences of cyberbullying and associated behaviours. Students then work on developing skills and strategies to respond appropriately to online situations they experience, take proactive steps for self-care and support others.

Baseline evaluation findings highlight a disparity between the risks perceived by parents, and the greater awareness of risks, particularly in relation to receiving or being pressured to share nude images, perceived by students. Of note, female students were significantly more likely to endorse almost all specific areas of concern than male students, particularly body shaming. This may reflect broader body image concerns and the role of general media and social pressures, as noted by various authors (Ata, Ludden, & Lally, 2007; McCabe & Ricciardelli, 2003). Interestingly, the receipt of unwanted nudes was of greatest concern to male students. Whilst students in this cohort are relatively young, the pressure of receiving unwanted and/or unwelcome images has been shown to have a significantly greater negative effect on mental health for young adult males than females (Klettke, Halford, Clancy, Mellor, & Toumbourou, 2019), possibly due to females being more accustomed to such behaviours.

Parents appeared to be more concerned about technology-related aspects of online behaviours, such as grooming and predatory behaviours, privacy concerns and inappropriate content, which may reflect public media attention on these topics as being of greater potential harm, as well as reduced parental awareness of the relative frequencies of such behaviours.

At baseline, students demonstrated a relatively sound understanding of cyberbullying, but immediately following the course, there was increased awareness of the issues of anonymity of bullying perpetrators, and that it could be targeted and occur from “behind a screen”. The program seemed to engender greater consistency in definitions, which was sustained to three month follow up,
with students more likely at follow up to use phrases consistent with the program’s definition. This included aggressive behaviour, harm being intentionally inflicted by one or more persons via electronic means, and identifying the potential for cyberbullying to occur repeatedly, and more anonymously, than face-to-face bullying.

Confidence in responding to cyberbullying was positive at baseline, but significantly increased directly after the program. However, confidence reduced to below baseline levels by follow up, which indicates that reinforcement of program concepts and integration of the learning into other activities is critical to retain gains beyond immediate program delivery, as emphasised in learning studies in cognitive psychology (e.g., Conway, Cohen, & Stanhope, 1991).

Similarly, behavioural attitudes towards cyberbullying were relatively low at baseline, suggesting that most students do not endorse most aspects of cyberbullying. Attitudes towards cyberbullying became less favourable at post program and follow up, although the changes were not significant. However, it was noted that students who participated in the program did have significantly more favourable attitudes than students who had not participated, suggesting some positive impact of the program, which was retained over time. The finding that parents had significantly less favourable attitudes than students is unsurprising, and consistent with other measures of parental attitudes towards risk behaviours they consider may represent harms for their children, such as drinking, drug taking or online gambling.

When questioned about their actual engagement in cyberbullying behaviours, students were most likely to report having witnessed cyberbullying, then to have been a victim of such behaviours, whilst perpetration was least common, although all three behaviours were reported at low frequencies. Binary descriptions of having ever experienced cyberbullying bystand ing reduced from baseline to follow-up, whilst rates of victimisation and perpetration was similar. Of note, students who had not participated in the program were likely to report higher rates of all three behaviours, again supporting a positive impact of the program sustained to follow up.

In comparison to students, parents seemed to be less aware of cyberbullying victimisation and bystand ing in their children, reporting lower rates and frequencies. However, parent and student reports of cyberbullying perpetration were similar, which may reflect parents being notified when cyberbullying perpetration has occurred, whilst youth are less likely to disclose either victimisation or bystand ing. This presents an opportunity to continue to engage parents and carers in openly discussing cyberbullying issues with their children.

Importantly, mental health symptomatology was reduced over the course of the program from baseline to follow up, with the average score moving from being diagnostically indicative of mild distress, to a level where the average participant is “likely to be well”. While mental health conditions such as anxiety and depression were not the explicit focus of the program, it is considered likely that the emphasis on self-care and finding positive and health promoting activities may have supported this improvement in mental health symptoms for students who participated in the program.

When considering program learnings, students who participated in the program reported an increased likelihood following the program to actively seek out support and taking protective steps for self-care. This included help-seeking from parents, teachers, friends and others, blocking the individual and reporting unacceptable behaviours and going offline to engage in other activities. It was noted that only six students (out of 300) were unsure as to what to do at the conclusion of the program, with only one student planning on taking no action. There was also a reduction in students planning to keep it to themselves. These findings indicate that students were able to take on learning around the
importance of help-seeking and may also have contributed to the positive trends on mental health indicators, as many of these strategies are also protective in relation to other mental health conditions.

Contracts and expectations in relation to device usage are recommended by most experts, as adolescents learn to negotiate the online space. This includes helping youth to set time limits on their use of devices, limiting access to inappropriate content, and having devices used and stored in shared open spaces, rather than in bedrooms, as recommended by the e-Safety Commissioner (2020b). However, our evaluation found that while almost four in five students had explicit contracts at school (which is likely to increase with recent policy changes), less than half of students reported having rules in place at home, and only one third of parents reported having set such rules. This again endorses the importance of sharing information directly with parents to emphasise their role and opportunities to promote safe practices.

Parents were asked about their approaches, and responses indicated the use of both restrictive and open parenting strategies. Restrictive approaches included actively monitoring and setting rules, based on age guidelines, about internet use, whilst open strategies included talking to youth about online risks, behaviours and demonstrating how to use safety features. Whilst these indicators are positive, it is noted that the results are not supported by the low reported levels of explicit agreements or contracts. In addition, the reported punitive strategies, such as removing device access, in response to their child having experienced cyberbullying, may present a barrier to youth reporting concerns to their parents, and is not consistent with established guidelines:

“Removing your child’s phone or computer could be really unhelpful. Cutting off their online access does not teach them about online safety or help build resilience. It could alienate them from their peers, and it also removes an essential tool for them to communicate and connect with friends.” (e-Safety Commissioner, 2020a)

Student behavioural intentions at the end of the program largely related to monitoring personal behaviour, and implementing time limits, but a significant minority reported being unsure about identifying any changes. At follow up three months later, many had made no personal changes, again reinforcing the need for ongoing reinforcement of program ideas. However, there were significant increases in being kind, cautious and safe online, and in ceasing to use or removing problematic games or apps, which may again provide some explanation as to the improvements in mental health symptoms.

Overall, students who participated in the program were positive about the impact of the program, finding the day engaging and positive, and learning new information in a shared environment. Students positively endorsed statements in relation to the value of the program, and enjoyed the interactive and positive nature of the program delivery.

Limitations

Whilst this evaluation highlights program findings, some important limitations should be noted. Firstly, all responses relate to self-reported behaviours and attitudes, and in the interests of brevity, no survey response measures such as truthfulness indicators were included. Secondly, whilst efforts were made to follow up with all participants, we were not able to obtain full data sets across baseline, post-program and follow-up time points, which impacts the statistical power of findings. In addition, due to student confidentiality, we were unable to match individual responses for longitudinal analysis, and have relied on cohort findings.
Recommendations
Arising from this review, several major recommendations are made for program development:

1. Students:

   Noting the high levels of concern reported by students in relation to nudes (receiving unwanted images, being pressured to send images or having images shared with others), inclusion of additional material regarding sexting and how to manage these risks, is critical. International evidence suggests that this content could include an emphasis on developing empathy for others, to promote consideration prior to sending, requesting or sharing images, as well as advice on how to manage requests or the receipt of information.

   In addition, inclusion of a legal perspective, which addresses and provides advice for both victims and perpetrators, could be a positive addition to the program.

   Given that students did not retain program ideas fully to follow up, provision of a small flyer with key messages at the end of the program, could provide a helpful reinforcement of program messages. This could also include contact numbers for helplines, particularly if the program has raised particular issues of distress for anyone (which may also address concerns regarding the use of mental health screening tools).

2. Schools

   While the Cyber Cats program has demonstrated strong gains immediately post program, retention of learning at follow up was reduced. Reinforcement of program content in the school setting is critical to ensure that students have the opportunity to refresh and integrate the program learnings into their regular settings, including school and home.

3. Parents

   Engagement of parents, whilst challenging, is critical to the success of social and emotional learning programs such as this. However, parents are time poor and reluctant to attend evening parenting education sessions, which they can often see as stigmatising and/or inconvenient. For example, the development of a brief online video-based parent education module may be a positive step to engage parents in understanding and providing positive support for their children.

Conclusions
The Cyber Cats program is an evidence-based, single-day education program, focusing on cyberbullying and online behaviours for young adolescents. This program has demonstrated benefits in relation to attitudes and behaviours, and further program investment to continue program delivery, and reinforce key content, is critical to maintain this success and further the impact it has on keeping young people safe online.
Appendices

Appendix A: Program logic

Program Objective: A community based program for young adolescents (Yr 7, 12-13 yrs), that promotes positive online behaviours, develops skills and resilience in understanding dynamics and nuances of online communication and addresses risks and protective factors for cyberbullying perpetration, victimization and bystand ing and associated risky online behaviours.

### Problem statement
Cyberbullying behaviours are prevalent for Geelong adolescents, with up to 80% reporting concerns locally. Cyberbullying has resulted in significant ramifications including distress, self-harm and documented suicide.

### Inputs
Program facilitators: 1:20-25), skilled in youth group facilitation, risk behaviour prevention and understanding of program content, technology and social media.
Partnership between Geelong Football Club, BCYF/headspace and Geelong region secondary schools.
Funding via Pick my Project
Male & female player ambassadors
Appropriate rooms/spaces for group work

### Outputs: Activities
Facilitate a 1-day (5.5 hr) workshop with student groups. Content includes:
- Defining cyberbullying perpetration, victimization and bystand ing
- Causes and effects of cyberbullying
- Consequences and legal implications of cyberbullying and nudes
- Potential impacts of positive and negative bystander behaviour
- Education on positive online behaviours
- Tactics and approaches for safe online communications,

### Outputs: Participants
Yr 7 students at local secondary schools.
Students attend in whole-class cohorts from a single school.

### Short-term outcomes
Pre-post program delivery
Increased understanding of what constitutes cyberbullying
Increased confidence when responding to cyberbullying
Reduction in positive attitudes towards cyberbullying
Increased willingness to respond when witnessing cyberbullying

### Medium-long term outcomes
3-6 months
Improved behaviours:
1) Reduction in cyberbullying perpetration
2) Reduction in cyberbullying victimisation
3) Improved willingness to respond when witnessing cyberbullying
Increased understanding of cyberbullying
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop materials (ipads, consumables)</th>
<th>e.g., responding to requests for nudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Strategies and pathways for help seeking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop activities provide scenarios, practice opportunities and a safe environment to learn about positive online communications, discussions and experiential learning around the topics listed above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition to the above, the program provides collateral for schools and parents to reinforce key messages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| witnessing cyberbullying |
| Increased willingness to access and/or engage with supports |

| Reduced anxiety and stress |
| Continued willingness to access and/or engage with supports |

### Assumptions:
- Schools are willing to participate in the program and understand the benefits
- Funding and ongoing support from Geelong Cats, partners is provided

### External Factors:
- Policy and funding environment
- Availability of qualified facilitators
- Access to Geelong Football Club support
- Level of support from schools
Pre survey

Demographics

Are you: Male, Female, Non-binary/fluid

What school do you go to: (List of local schools)

Cyberbullying

1. Briefly describe what you think cyberbullying is (open-ended)?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. How confident do you feel about responding to cyberbullying when you see it online?
   1 = Not at all, 10 = Very confident

3. Do you find yourself feeling uncomfortable or unsafe when using social media/gaming platforms?
   Yes - a lot
   Yes - sometimes
   Yes - rarely
   No - not at all
   No - I do not use social media or gaming platforms

4. Do any of the following worry you?
   Body Shaming
   Cyberbullying: ongoing abuse or being excluded
   Sharing personal details with apps
   Sharing location with apps
   Receiving unwanted nudes
   Being pressured to send nudes
   Nudes being shared without consent
   Trolling
   Fake news
   Other

5. In the last year, how many times did you
   (1) receive rude or nasty comments from someone while online;
   (2) were you the target of rumours spread online, whether they were true or not; and
   (3) receive threatening or aggressive comments while online.

6. In the last year, how many times did you
   (1) make rude or nasty comments to someone while online;
   (2) spread rumours about someone online, whether they were true or not; and
   (3) make threatening or aggressive comments while online.

7. In the last year, how many times did you
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1) read or witness someone making rude or nasty comments to someone else while online;
2) read or witness someone spreading rumours about someone else online, whether they were true or not; and
3) read or witness someone make threatening or aggressive comments while online.

Response options are: everyday/almost everyday, once or twice a week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, less than a few times a year, and never. Youth who reported any of the three experiences in the previous year were coded as being harassed/harassing/witnessing harassment online.

8. If you saw any of the above, how did you respond, or would you have responded?

Not sure
Did nothing
Told an adult
Called out the bully
Offered help to the person being bullied
Spoke to another friend about what to do
Spoke to the person to see if they were ok
Other (please specify)

9. If you were being bullied or harassed online, what would you do to make yourself feel better or manage your feelings?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

10. If you were being bullied or harassed online, would you

Keep it to yourself
Tell a friend
Tell a parent or carer
Tell a school staff member
Report it through the app
Block the person
Report it to the e-safety commissioner
Call out the bully
Stop using the technology
Call the police
Call Kids Helpline
Not sure
Do nothing

11. Please rate each of the following items on how much you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale provided.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1) It is acceptable to send mean messages to others when they deserve it.
2) People who join groups online (e.g. Instagram, Snapchat, WhatsApp, Facebook) that make fun of others are justified in doing so.
3) It makes me feel good to send texts that make fun of others.
4) Sometimes using passive aggressive ways of sending mean messages to others is the only way to get even.
5) I do not find it appropriate to send mean text messages or e-mails to others.*
6) I feel bad sending mean text messages or e-mails to others.*
7) I have sent text messages to others after they have messaged me hurtful comments.
8) Teasing others online, via e-mails, or text messages is fun.
9) Online groups (e.g. Instagram, Snapchat, WhatsApp, Facebook) that are socially exclusive are fun to join.
   * = Reverse Coded

12. These questions relate to how you've been feeling over the past four weeks. Tick a box next to each question that best reflects your thoughts, feelings and behaviour.

Response options: None of the time, a little of the time, some of the time, most of the time, all of the time

1) About how often did you feel tired out for no good reason?
2) About how often did you feel nervous?
3) About how often did you feel so nervous that nothing could calm you down?
4) About how often did you feel hopeless?
5) About how often did you feel restless or fidgety?
6) About how often did you feel so restless you could not sit still?
7) About how often did you feel depressed
8) About how often did you feel that everything was an effort?
9) About how often did you feel so sad that nothing could cheer you up?
10) About how often did you feel worthless?

13. Do you have a contract in place regarding online behaviours and device at home?

Yes/No

If yes, what are the rules about?
   - Time
   - Etc

Do you also have a contract for your parents’ online behaviours and device use?

Yes/No

If yes, what are the rules about?
   - Time
   - Etc

14. Do you have a contract in place regarding use of your devices at school?

Yes/No

If yes, what are the rules about?
   - Time
   - Etc

Are you aware of any guidelines for your teachers with regard to their online behaviours and device use?
15. What are you hoping to learn about today?
Post survey

Demographics

Are you: Male, Female, Non-binary/fluid

What school do you go to: (List of local schools)

Cyberbullying

1. Briefly describe what you think cyberbullying is (open-ended)

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

2. If you saw any cyberbullying behaviours, how would you respond?

Not sure
Do nothing
Tell an adult
Call out the bully
Offer help to the person being bullied
Speak to another friend about what to do
Speak to the person to see if they were ok
Other (please specify)

3. If you were being bullied or harassed online, what would you do to make yourself feel better or manage your feelings?

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

4. If you were being bullied or harassed online, would you
   a. Keep it to yourself
   b. Tell a friend
   c. Tell a parent or carer
   d. Tell a school staff member
   e. Report it through the app
   f. Block the person
   g. Report it to the e-safety commissioner
   h. Call out the bully
   i. Stop using the technology
   j. Call the police
   k. Call Kids Helpline
   l. Not sure
   m. Do nothing
5. Please rate each of the following items on how much you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale provided.

1  2  3  4  5

Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree

a) It is acceptable to send mean e-mails to others when they deserve it.
b) People who join groups online (e.g. Instagram, Snapchat, WhatsApp, Facebook) that make fun of others are justified in doing so.
c) It makes me feel good to send texts that make fun of others.
d) Sometimes using passive aggressive methods of sending mean e-mails to others is the only way to get even.
e) I do not find it appropriate to send mean text messages or e-mails to others.*
f) I feel bad sending mean text messages or e-mails to others.*
g) I have sent mean text messages to others after they have text messaged me hurtful comments.
h) Teasing others online, via e-mails, or text messages is fun.
i) Online groups (e.g. Instagram, Snapchat, WhatsApp, Facebook) that are socially exclusive are fun to join.

* = Reverse Coded

6. What did you learn today?

7. What changes in relation to your online behaviours and device usage would you like to put in place following today’s session:
   a. Personally
   b. At home
   c. At school
Follow up survey

Please confirm that you have attended Cyber Cats (yes/no)

Demographics

Are you: Male, Female, Non-binary/fluid

What school do you go to: (List of local schools)

Cyberbullying

1. Briefly describe what you think cyberbullying is (open-ended)

__________________________________________________________________________

2. How much has your Understanding of Cyber Bullying improved since you attended Cyber Cats?

   1 = Not at all
   10 = Completely

3. How confident do you feel about responding to cyberbullying when you see it online?

   1 = Not at all
   10 = Completely

4. If you saw any cyberbullying behaviours, how would you respond?

   Not sure
   Do nothing
   Tell an adult
   Call out the bully
   Offer help to the person being bullied
   Speak to another friend about what to do
   Speak to the person to see if they were ok
   Other (please specify)

5. If you were being bullied or harassed online, what would you do to make yourself feel better or manage your feelings?

__________________________________________________________________________

6. If you were being bullied or harassed online, would you

   Keep it to yourself
   Tell a friend
   Tell a parent or carer
   Tell a school staff member
   Report it through the app
   Block the person
   Report it to the e-safety commissioner
7. Please rate each of the following items on how much you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale provided.

1  2  3  4  5

Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree

1) It is acceptable to send mean e-mails to others when they deserve it.
2) People who join groups online (e.g. Instagram, Snapchat, WhatsApp, Facebook) that make fun of others are justified in doing so.
3) It makes me feel good to send texts that make fun of others.
4) Sometimes using passive aggressive methods of sending mean e-mails to others is the only way to get even.
5) I do not find it appropriate to send mean text messages or e-mails to others.*
6) I feel bad sending mean text messages or e-mails to others.*
7) I have sent mean text messages to others after they have text messaged me hurtful comments.
8) Teasing others online, via e-mails, or text messages is fun.
9) Online groups (e.g. Instagram, Snapchat, WhatsApp, Facebook) that are socially exclusive are fun to join. 
   * = Reverse Coded

8. In the last year, how many times did you
   a) receive rude or nasty comments from someone while online;
   b) were you the target of rumours spread online, whether they were true or not; and
   c) receive threatening or aggressive comments while online.

9. In the last year, how many times did you
   a) make rude or nasty comments to someone while online;
   b) spread rumours about someone online, whether they were true or not; and
   c) make threatening or aggressive comments while online.

10. In the last year, how many times did you
   a) read or witness someone making rude or nasty comments to someone else while online;
   b) read or witness someone spreading rumours about someone else online, whether they were true or not; and
   c) read or witness someone make threatening or aggressive comments while online.
   Response options are: everyday/almost everyday, once or twice a week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, less than a few times a year, and never. Youth who reported any of the three experiences in the previous year were coded as being harassed/harassing/witnessing harassment online.

11. What (if any) changes in relation to your online behaviours and device usage have you put in place since Cyber Cats?
   a. Personally
   b. At home
   c. At school

12. These questions relate to how you've been feeling over the past four weeks. Tick a box next to each question that best reflects your thoughts, feelings and behaviour.
   Response options: None of the time, a little of the time, some of the time, most of the time, all of the time
   a) About how often did you feel tired out for no good reason?
   b) About how often did you feel nervous?
   c) About how often did you feel so nervous that nothing could calm you down?
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d) About how often did you feel hopeless?
e) About how often did you feel restless or fidgety?
f) About how often did you feel so restless you could not sit still?
g) About how often did you feel depressed
h) About how often did you feel that everything was an effort?
i) About how often did you feel so sad that nothing could cheer you up
j) About how often did you feel worthless

13. The Cyber Cats program helped me understand Cyber bullying (1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree)

14. The Cyber Cats program has improved my confidence in responding to Cyberbullying (1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree)

15. The Cyber Cats program has motivated me to better respond to Cyberbullying if I were to be Cyberbullied (1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree)

16. The Cyber Cats program has motivated me to better respond to Cyberbullying if someone else were being cyberbullied (1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree)

17. What was the most important thing you learned from Cyber Cats?

18. What did you like most about the Cyber Cats program?

19. Is there something Cyber Cats did not cover that you would have liked more information about?
Parent survey
Demographics

Please select your child’s school: (List of local schools)

Are you: Male, Female, Other

Age group (by decade, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60+)

What is the gender of your child attending Cyber Cats? (Male, Female, Non-binary/Fluid)

Considering the child attending Cyber Cats, do they have older siblings? Y/N

Considering the child attending cybercast, do they have younger siblings? Y/N

1. How many devices do you have at home?

2. Do you have one or more social media accounts (e.g. Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat, etc.)?

3. To your knowledge, does your child have one or more social media accounts (e.g. Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat, etc.)?

4. Are you “friends” with your child online?
   a. If yes, on which apps... (Select as many as apply: Facebook, Instagram, Messenger, Snapchat, Gaming platforms, YouTube, Other (please specify)

5. Do you have any concerns about your child using online technology? Y/N
   a. If yes, please explain

6. Do any of the following worry you in regard to your child/ren?
   - Body Shaming
   - Cyberbullying: ongoing abuse or being excluded
   - Sharing personal details with apps
   - Sharing location with apps
   - Receiving unwanted nudes
   - Being pressured to send nudes
   - Nudes being shared without consent
   - Trolling
   - Fake news
   - Other (please specify – free text)

7. To your knowledge, in the last year (response scale for all these needs to be the same – everyday/almost everyday, once or twice a week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, less than a few times a year, never)
   a. how many times did your child
      (1) receive rude or nasty comments from someone while online;
      (2) was the target of rumours spread online, whether they were true or not; and
      (3) receive threatening or aggressive comments while online.
   b. How many times did your child
      (1) make rude or nasty comments to someone while online;
      (2) spread rumours about someone online, whether they were true or not; and
      (3) make threatening or aggressive comments while online.
c. How many times did your child

(1) read or witness someone making rude or nasty comments to someone else while online;
(2) read or witness someone spreading rumours about someone else online, whether they were true or not; and
(3) read or witness someone make threatening or aggressive comments while online.

8. If your child has been / were to be cyber-bullied, what did you / would you recommend they do?
   • Keep it to themselves
   • Tell a friend
   • Talk to you or another parent or carer
   • Tell a school staff member
   • Report it through the app
   • Block the person
   • Report it to the e-safety commissioner
   • Call out the bully
   • Stop using the technology
   • Call the police
   • Call Kids Helpline
   • Not sure
   • Other (Please specify – free text)
9. Please rate each of the following items on how much you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale provided.

1  2  3  4  5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) It is acceptable to send mean messages to others when they deserve it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) People who join groups online (e.g. Instagram, Snapchat, WhatsApp, Facebook) that make fun of others are justified in doing so.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) It makes me feel good to send texts that make fun of others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Sometimes using passive aggressive ways of sending mean messages to others is the only way to get even.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) I do not find it appropriate to send mean text messages or e-mails to others.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) I feel bad sending mean text messages or e-mails to others.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) I have sent text messages to others after they have messaged me hurtful comments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Teasing others online, via e-mails, or text messages is fun.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Online groups (e.g. Instagram, Snapchat, WhatsApp, Facebook) that are socially exclusive are fun to join.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Reverse Coded

10. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following, on a 5-point Likert scale from Strongly disagree to Strongly agree.

**Restrictive parent**

a) I take an active role in monitoring what my child does online
b) I limit the amount of time my child spends online
c) I set clear rules for my child about internet use
d) I use age guidelines in relation to my child’s use of social media, apps and games
e) Parental controls are important to how I limit my child’s exposure to inappropriate content such as pornography

**Open Parent**

f) I talk to my child regularly about online risks and what to do
g) I speak to my child about being respectful to others online
h) I show my child how to use safety features when online
i) I listen to my child’s online social problems, if they have any

11. Do you have a contract in place regarding online behaviours and devices at home? Yes/No
a. If yes, what are the rules about? (open responses)
   - Time
   - Etc
References